



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 14, 2022

Mr. Matthew Shovlin  
Assistant District Attorney  
Denton County Criminal District Attorney's Office  
P.O. Box 2344  
Denton, Texas 76202

OR2022-35374

Dear Mr. Shovlin:

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# 985305 (PIR# 22-506).

The Denton County Purchasing Office (the "county") received a request for information pertaining to a specified proposal. You state the county has released some information. 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 KNOW iNK, LLC; Konnech, Inc. ("Konnech"); Tenex Software Solutions, Inc.; and VR Systems, Inc. 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 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 received comments from Konnech. We have considered the submitted arguments and 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 remaining third party explaining why the submitted information should not be

released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any remaining third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the county may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any remaining third party may have in the information.

Although Konnech objects to the release of its submitted information, we note Konnech has not raised any specific exceptions to disclosure or otherwise adequately explained why its information should not be released. *See id.* § 552.305(b) (interested party may submit reasons why information pertaining to that party should be withheld). Accordingly, we have no basis for finding Konnech 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. Thus, the county may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Konnech 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.” 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 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, county must withhold the insurance policy numbers 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Kelly McWethy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KM/pt

Ref: ID# 985305

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)