



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 17, 2019

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

OR2019-01559

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# 746533.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all drawings related to the construction of the requestor's home. The city does not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act. However, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Darling Homes of Texas, LLC ("Darling") and Post-Tension Solutions of Texas, Inc. ("Post-Tension") of the city's receipt of the request for information and their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 received comments from Darling. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Post-Tension explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Post-Tension 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 Post-Tension may have in the information.

Next, we address Darling's assertion that its information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002 of the Government Code defines "public information" as:

(a) [I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

(a-1) Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a), (a-1). Thus, virtually all the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess. Information that is written, produced,

collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns, has a right of access to, or spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information. Gov't Code § 552.002(a); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a-1).

Darling argues its information at issue is not "public information" subject to the Act. We note, however, the information at issue is in the possession of the city, and the city has submitted this information as being subject to the Act. Thus, we find the city collected, assembled, or maintains this information in connection with the transaction of official business. Therefore, we find the information at issue constitutes public information subject to the Act and may only be withheld if an exception to disclosure under the Act applies.

Darling generally asserts that its information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Darling has not directed our attention to any law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under that section.

Darling also argues its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects "[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[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Record Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1991) (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).

Darling contends its information at issue consists of commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the company under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Darling has demonstrated the release of the information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial harm to the

company's competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted information on behalf of Darling under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

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,



Lecelle Clarke  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

LC/eb

Ref: ID# 746533

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)