



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 20, 2017

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2017-13551

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 662940.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the blue prints and electrical plan for a specified location. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Eric L. Davis, Engineering Inc. ("Eric Davis") and Highland Homes ("Highland"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim this section applies to the information at issue. Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Although you raise section 552.110 of the Government Code, we note section 552.110 protects the interests of third parties that provide information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepting from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained”). Thus, we do not address your argument under section 552.110. 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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Eric Davis or Highland explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have 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 city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Eric Davis or Highland may have in the information.

We note some of the submitted 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. Accordingly, as no exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the city must release the submitted information; however, any information subject to 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/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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jahna Ward', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jahna Ward  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

JW/som

Ref: ID# 662940

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)