



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 12, 2013

Ms. Monica Hernandez  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
P.O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2013-15885

Dear Ms. Hernandez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 499360 (COSA File No. W016604-062713).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for the three most recent financial statements Animal Defense League of Texas ("ADL"), San Antonio Pets Alive! ("SAPA!"), and Pet Shotz, Inc. ("Pet Shotz") submitted in their proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of ADL, SAPA!, and Pet Shotz. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified ADL, SAPA!, and Pet Shotz of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Pet Shotz. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days after receiving a written request the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a

governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state the city received the request for information on May 29, 2013. Accordingly, the ten-business-day deadline was June 12, 2013, and the fifteen-business-day deadline was June 19, 2013. However, the city submitted the information required under both subsections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) in an envelope meter-marked July 8, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308(a) (deadline under the Act is met if document bears post office mark indicating time within the deadline period). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). In this instance, third party interests are at stake and, thus, we will consider whether the submitted information must be withheld under the Act based on third party interests.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from ADL or SAPA! explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude ADL or SAPA! has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest ADL or SAPA! may have in the information.

Pet Shotz raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage

to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. We note section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body’s interest in competitive bidding situation). As the city does not argue section 552.104 is applicable, we will not consider Pet Shotz’s claim under this section. *See id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Pet Shotz asserts its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

Pet Shotz asserts the release of its information will hurt its business and give its competitors an advantage. Upon review, we find Pet Shotz has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of its information would cause Pet Shotz substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Accordingly, no portion of Pet Shotz’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DLW/dls

Ref: ID# 499360

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Ellen Jefferson  
San Antonio Pets Alive!  
P.O. Box 830006  
San Antonio, Texas 78283  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Janice Darling  
Animal Defense League  
11300 Nacodgoches  
San Antonio, Texas 78217  
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Fretorry Rogers  
Pet Shotz  
P.O. Box 760266  
San Antonio, Texas 75245  
(w/o enclosures)