



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 24, 2015

Mr. Matthew L. Grove  
Assistant County Attorney  
County of Fort Bend  
401 Jackson Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Richmond, Texas 77469

OR2015-17627

Dear Mr. Grove:

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# 576671.

Fort Bend County (the "county") received a request for copies of all contracts related to the site maintenance of cell tower or wireless communications sites. Although the county takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the county informs us release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Mercury Networks, Inc. and CJ Communications. Accordingly, the county states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 reviewed the submitted information.

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) of the Government Code 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 either of the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude either third party 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 county may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest either third party may have in the information.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”<sup>1</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining 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.

In summary, the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released 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/>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470(1987).

[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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 576671

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mercury Networks, Inc.  
c/o Matthew L. Grove  
Assistant County Attorney  
County of Fort Bend  
401 Jackson Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Richmond, Texas 77469  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Carlos Cardona  
CJ Communications  
c/o Matthew L. Grove  
Assistant County Attorney  
County of Fort Bend  
401 Jackson Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Richmond, Texas 77469  
(w/o enclosures)