



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 11, 2017

Ms. Stephanie Storm
City of Wylie
300 Country Club Drive, #100
Wylie, Texas 75098

OR2017-18226

Dear Ms. Storm:

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# 670568.

The City of Wylie (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified contract and specified invoices. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Connex Systems, Inc. ("Connex"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Connex 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 considered the submitted argument and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks only the last six invoices pursuant to the specified contract. Thus, the portions of the submitted information that do not consist of the last six invoices are not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the request.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Although the city argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the city's argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Connex explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Connex has a protected proprietary interest in the information at issue. *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 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 responsive information on the basis of any proprietary interest Connex may have in the information.

We note some of the responsive information may be subject to copyright law. 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. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the city must release the responsive 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 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 that reads "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/bw

Ref: ID# 670568

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)