



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 22, 2015

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Counsel for the City of Eagle Pass
Langley & Banack, Inc.
401 Quarry Street
Eagle Pass, Texas 78852

OR2015-19857

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 580017 (Eagle Pass# 2015-074).

The City of Eagle Pass (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to specified proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Quality Print Solutions ("QPS") and Ricoh USA ("Ricoh"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties 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 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why the requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision

¹We note the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b) (requiring governmental body to ask for ruling and state exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving written request). Nonetheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Moreover, third party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* § 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Thus, we will address the applicability of section 552.101 and any third party interests regarding the submitted information, notwithstanding the city's violation of section 552.301 in requesting this decision.

No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exceptions to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted the proposals related to the third parties. However, you have not submitted any information responsive to the remaining categories of the request, in which the requestor seeks the evaluation sheets, the areas of placement of the new machines, and information used in the tabulation of the proposals. To the extent information responsive to the remaining portions of the request existed and was maintained by the city on the date it received the request, we assume the city has released it to the requestor. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. Gov't Code § 552.301(a), .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if a governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to the requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances).

Next, we note 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 QPS or Ricoh explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude either of the third parties 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, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest QPS or Ricoh may have in the information.

You contend the submitted information is or may be protected by copyright law under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes. We understand you to claim the submitted information is confidential under the Federal Copyright Act, title 17 of the United States Code. However, copyright law does not make information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Open Records Decision No. 660 at 5 (1999) (Federal Copyright Act does not make information confidential, but rather gives copyright holder exclusive right to reproduce his work, subject to another person's right to make fair use of it.). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). However, 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 you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released; however, the city may only release the information subject to copyright 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, 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,



Mili Gosar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MG/akg

Ref: ID# 580017

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Julia Galan
Quality Print Solutions
220 North Getty Street
Uvalde, Texas 78801
(w/o enclosures)

Aissa Acevedo
Ricoh USA
1400 North McColl, Suite 103
McAllen, Texas 78501
(w/o enclosures)