



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2017

Ms. Dawn Roberts  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Arlington  
P.O. Box 1065  
Arlington, Texas 76004-1065

OR2017-14437

Dear Ms. Roberts:

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# 664031 (ORR# 36722).

The City of Arlington (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to mobile forensic tools. 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 Cellebrite USA Corp. ("Cellebrite").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Cellebrite of the request for information and of its 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 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) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code

---


<sup>1</sup>Regardless of whether the city complied with section 552.301(b) of the Government Code in requesting this decision, because the interest of a third party can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider third party interests for the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .301(b), .302, .352.

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Cellebrite explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Cellebrite 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 Cellebrite may have in the information. As no exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the city must release the submitted information.

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,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MHT/bw

Ref: ID# 664031

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)