



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 10, 2017

Ms. Kristi Godden  
Counsel for La Joya Independent School District  
O'Hanlon, McCollom, and Demerath  
808 West Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2017-15236

Dear Ms. Godden:

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# 665582 (ID# LJISD-034).

The La Joya Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of AT&T; Cogent Communications, Inc.; Dell Marketing, L.P.; Foremost Telecommunications; Insight Public Sector, Inc.; Insource Technology Direct, L.L.C.; Intech Southwest Services; Integrity Communications; Netsync Network Solutions; and Xtreme Technologies. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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) 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 any

of the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the third parties has protected proprietary interests 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.136 states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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> *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information.

We note some of the materials at issue 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 district must withhold the insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information, but may only release any copyrighted information 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ramsey A. Abarca", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/bw

Ref: ID# 665582

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

10 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)