



August 20, 2014

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Office of the Chief Clerk  
Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania Judicial Center  
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 4500  
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2575

RECEIVED & FILED  
COMMONWEALTH COURT  
OF PENNSYLVANIA  
20 AUG 2014 09 11

**RE: Submission of Record in:**  
*Pennsylvania State Police v. Michelle Grove,*  
**No. 1146 CD 2014**

Dear Clerk of Courts:

We hereby submit the record in the above-referenced matter. Section 1303 of the Right-to-Know Law, 65 P.S. §§ 67.101, *et seq.*, (“RTKL”), defines the Record on Appeal as “the record before a court shall consist of the request, the agency’s response, the appeal filed under section 1101, the hearing transcript, if any, and the final written determination of the appeals officer.” Pursuant to *DOT v. Office of Open Records*, 7 A.3d 329 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010), this record includes all “evidence and documents admitted into evidence by the appeals officer pursuant to Section 1102(a)(2).” The record in this matter consists of the following:

**Office of Open Records Docket No. 2014-0828:**


1. The appeal filed by Michelle Grove (“Requester”) to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), received May 22, 2014.
2. Acknowledgement letter dated May 23, 2014 sent to both parties by the OOR, advising them of the docket number and identifying the appeals officer for the matter.
3. Submission from the Governor’s Office of General Counsel dated May 30, 2014.
4. Submission from Requester dated May 30, 2014.
5. The Final Determination dated June 17, 2014 issued by the OOR.

Clerk of Courts  
Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania

August 20, 2014  
Page Two

The OOR has discretion to hold a hearing on appeals filed but chose not to do so in this matter. Therefore, there is no transcript to transmit. Certification of the record in this case is attached to this letter. Please feel free to contact us for any reason in connection with this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CRB', written in a cursive style.

Charles Rees Brown  
Chief Counsel

Attachments

cc: Michelle Grove (Requester)  
Jordan G. Spahr, Esq., Assistant Counsel, Pennsylvania State Police (Agency)









1



RECEIVED

MAY 22 2014

RIGHT TO KNOW LAW APPEAL  
DENIAL OR PARTIAL DENIAL

OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS

Office of Open Records  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225  
Fax: (717) 425-5343 E-mail: [openrecords@pa.gov](mailto:openrecords@pa.gov)

Today's date: 5-22-2014

Requester's name: Michelle Grove  
Address/City/State/Zip: Po # 253, Spring Mills, PA 16875  
Request submitted by:  Fax  Mail  E-mail  In-Person (Please check one)  
Date of Right to Know request: 3-24-2014 Date of Agency Response: 5-1-2014  
Telephone and fax number: 814 / 470-1132 E-mail: state college photographer@gmail.com  
Name and address of Agency: PSP RTK 1800 Elmerton Ave. Harrisburg, PA 17110  
E-mail Address of Agency: pa.psp@pa.gov Fax of Agency: 717-525-5795  
Name and title of person who denied my request: Lissa M. Ferguson, Deputy Agency Open Records Officer

I submitted a request for records to the agency named above. The agency either denied or partially denied my request. I am appealing that denial to the Office of Open Records (OOR), and I am providing the following information:

I was denied access to the following records (attach additional pages if necessary):  
Audio / Video of officers who responded.

The agency's denial of my request is flawed and the requested records are public records because (check all that apply) **(REQUIRED)**:

- the records document the receipt or use of agency funds.
- the records are in the possession, custody or control of the agency and are not protected by any exemptions under Section 708 of the Right-to-Know Law, are not protected by privilege, and are not exempted under any Federal or State law or regulation.
- Other Audio and video are public records  
(attach additional pages if necessary)

- I have attached a copy of my request for records. **(REQUIRED)**
- I have attached a copy of all responses from the agency regarding my request. **(REQUIRED)**
- I have attached any letters or notices extending the agency's time to respond to my request.
- I hereby agree to permit the OOR an additional thirty (30) days to issue a final order in this appeal.

Respectfully Submitted, [Signature] (must be signed)

**You should provide the agency with a copy of this form and any documents you submit to the OOR.**



**Pennsylvania State Police  
Bureau of Records & Identification  
RIGHT-TO-KNOW OFFICE  
1800 Elmerton Avenue  
Harrisburg, PA 17110**

Mailing Date: May 1, 2014

Michelle  
statecollegephotographer@gmail.com

*SENT VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION ONLY*

PSP/RTKL Request N° 2014-0178

Dear Michelle:

On March 25, 2014, the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) received your request for information pursuant to the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law (RTKL), 65 PA. STAT. ANN. §§ 67.101 – 67.3104, wherein you stated:

I would like to acquire a copy of the police report and any video/audio taken by the officers at Crash Sr 144 Potters Mills Incident #G07-1359421 (might be Go7-1359421). One of the officers was PA State Trooper Scott Thomas, Rockview Station. The first officer to respond left before we talked to him, so I do not know his name. He talked to the other man involved in the accident, so I need any video/audio from him of that conversation. The officer I named said that the other officer was in an accident after he left. What do I need to get a copy of these items?

A copy of your request is enclosed. By electronic response dated April 1, 2014, you were notified in accordance with RTKL section 67.902(b) and 1 PA. CONS. STAT. § 1908 that PSP required an additional thirty days to prepare this final response to your request.

Your request is granted in part and denied in part. Your request is granted insofar as the responsive two-page Public Information Release Report (marked for identification as PSP/RTK000001-PSP/RTK000002) and is enclosed with this letter.

However, the remainder of your request is respectfully denied because the record you seek is not available to the public. The Right-To-Know Law (RTKL) only requires Commonwealth agencies to provide documents that are public records. Tit. 65, § 67.301. It is well settled that the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) is a Commonwealth agency within the meaning of the RTKL. *See id.*, § 67.101; *Dekok v. PSP*, OOR Dkt. AP 2011-0086 at 4. A document is not a public record if: (1) it is specifically exempted from disclosure in section 67.708 of the RTKL; (2) it is not

otherwise exempt under other federal or state law; or (3) it is protected by a privilege. Tit. 65, § 67.102 (defining "Public Record").

Under the first limitation on the "public records" definition, PSP Crash Report G04-1359421 is exempt from public disclosure. Section 67.708(b)(16) limits records of criminal investigations from disclosure under the RTKL. More specifically, these include:

- i) Complaints of potential criminal conduct other than a private criminal complaint[;]
- ii) Investigative materials, notes, correspondence, videos and reports[;] . . .
- v) Victim information, including any information that would jeopardize the safety of the victim; [and] . . .
- vi) A record that, if disclosed, would do any of the following:
  - a) Reveal the institution, progress or result of a criminal investigation, except the filing of criminal charges.

65 PA. STAT. ANN. § 67.708(b)(16).

Following the second classification that limits the definition of public records, the Criminal History Record Information Act (CHRIA), 18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 9101 – 9183, prohibits PSP from disseminating its investigative information to any persons or entities, other than to criminal justice agents and agencies. 18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 9106(c)(4). "Investigative Information" is defined under CHRIA as "[i]nformation assembled as a result of the performance of any inquiry, formal or informal, into a criminal incident or an allegation of criminal wrongdoing . . ." *Id.* § 9102. Therefore, PSP is barred by statute from disclosing the requested records. A verification to this assertion accompanies this letter.

Furthermore, the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code strictly regulates dissemination of police crash reports and all related investigative materials. The Vehicle Code only authorizes disclosure of the crash report, under specific conditions, to persons involved in a crash, to their attorneys or insurers, and to government agencies. 75 PA. CONS. STAT. § 3751(b)(1). Title 67 PA. CODE section 95.2(e)(3) mandates that "accident reports" relating to reports by police shall be provided only to the following entities/persons:

- (A) Federal Government, including branches of military service, Commonwealth agencies and officials of political subdivisions and agencies of other States and nations and their political subdivisions[;]

(B) Persons who are determined by the Department to be involved in accident prevention or highway safety research programs[;]

(C) Persons involved in the accident, their attorney, or insurer if they furnish proof that the accident report is missing or lost, and therefore, unavailable from the reporting police department[;]

(D) Persons authorized by court order.

67 PA. CODE § 95.2(e)(3)(i).

Should you believe that you qualify as one of the individuals for which the Vehicle Code authorizes access to the requested reports, you may submit a request through the PSP website: [www.psp.state.pa.us](http://www.psp.state.pa.us). The applicable processing fee is \$22<sup>00</sup>. Please note, however, that qualification as an individual identified in 67 Pa. Code § 95.2(e) only entitles you to receive a copy of the crash report itself.

Please note also that section 3754(b) of the Vehicle Code asserts that reports of in-depth PSP vehicle accident investigations are confidential. 75 PA. CONS. STAT. § 3754. This has been reinforced with OOR determinations. See, e.g. *Aris v. Dep't of Transp.*, Dkt. AP 2009-0808 at 6.

Lastly, in response to your request for "any video/audio taken by the officers," the responsive *video/audio recordings* are exempt from public disclosure under RTKL section 67.708(b)(18)(i) as a "record or part of a record, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings." A supporting verification to this effect accompanies this letter.

To the extent your request seeks or may be construed to seek PSP records involving covert law enforcement investigations, including intelligence gathering and analysis, PSP can neither confirm, nor deny the existence of such records without risk of compromising investigations and imperiling individuals. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, therefore, should this response to your request be interpreted as indicating otherwise. In all events, should such records exist, they are entirely exempt from public disclosure under the provisions of RTKL and CHRIA.

You have a right to appeal this response by submitting an appeal in writing to, Terry Mutchler, Executive Director, Office of Open Records (OOR), Commonwealth Keystone Building, 400 North Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120. The appeal form is available at [www.dced.state.pa.us/public/oor/appealformgeneral.pdf](http://www.dced.state.pa.us/public/oor/appealformgeneral.pdf). Should you choose to file an appeal, you must do so within 15 business days of the mailing date of this response and send to the OOR:

- 1) this response;
- 2) your request; and

3) the reason why you think the agency is wrong in its reasons for saying that the record is not public (a statement that addresses any ground stated by the agency for the denial). If the agency gave several reasons why the record is not public, state which ones you think were wrong.

Sincerely yours,



Lissa M. Ferguson  
Deputy Agency Open Records Officer  
Pennsylvania State Police  
Bureau of Records & Identification  
Right-to-Know Office  
1800 Elmerton Avenue  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110  
1.877.785.7771 (Main); 717.525.5795 (Fax)

Enclosures: PSP/RTKL Request N° 2014-0178  
Granted "public record", PSP/RTK000001-PSP/RTK000002  
Ferguson Verification

Giannone Hurley, Christine A

2/11/14  
2014-078

**From:** State College Photographer <statecollegephotographer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 24, 2014 8:29 PM  
**To:** SP, PSP RIGHT TO KNOW  
**Subject:** Public Records Request

Hello,

I would like to acquire a copy of the police report and any video/audio taken by the officers at Crash Sr 144 Potters Mills Incident #G07-1359421 (might be G07-1359421). One of the officers was PA State Trooper Scott Thomas, Rockview Station. The first officer to respond left before we talked to him, so I do not know his name. He talked to the other man involved in the accident, so I need any video/audio from him of that conversation. The officer I named said that the other officer was in an accident after he left. What do I need to do to get a copy of these items?  
Michelle



**Pennsylvania Law Enforcement  
Crash - Public Information Release Report**

**Crash Involves:**

- DUI    
  Fatally    
  Hit and Run    
  Commercial Vehicle    
  State Police Vehicle    
  Local Police Vehicle  
 Other    
  Work Zone    
  ATV    
  Snowmobile    
  Commonwealth Vehicle    
  Local Gov Vehicle

**Agency Information:**

AGENCY PA STATE POLICE - ROCKVIEW	INVESTIGATOR THOMAS, SCOTT
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------

**Summary Information:**

INCIDENT NUMBER G07-1358421	CRASH DATE 03/22/2014	CRASH TIME 13:42 hrs.
COUNTY CENTRE	MUNICIPALITY POTTER TWP	
ROUTE # 0144	SEGMENT #	STREET OLD FORT
		STREET ENDING ROAD
Location ON OLD FORT RD 680 FEET SOUTH OF WAY LN		
EMS Agency NONE	Medical Facility NONE	

**People Involved:**

UNIT #	PERSON	FIRST NAME	MI	LAST NAME	SUFFIX	AGE	Gender
CITY					STATE	SAFETY EQUIPMENT	
EMS Transport		Injury Severity					

**Vehicles Involved:**

UNIT # 001	YEAR 2000	MAKE ACURA	MODEL INTEGRA
Driver Charged YES	Primary Violation PAVC3324 VEHICLE ENTERING/CROSSING ROAD		
UNIT # 002	YEAR 2009	MAKE DODGE	MODEL RAM 3500
Driver Charged YES	Primary Violation VC4561		

**Crash Synopsis:**

Unit #1 pulled out in front of Unit #2 from a driveway. Unit #2 could not get stopped and struck Unit #1 from behind.

On 03/22/14 on scene at 1412hrs I spoke to the driver of Unit #1 (Delgenis) stated that she was headed south on Sr 144 and was travelling slowly looking for an address. She realized she had gone past her destination so she pulled over to the right berm into a driveway. after traffic behind her passed by she stated that she looked down Sr 144 saw no traffic then backed onto the road. she stated that she saw Unit #2 just before he hit her. I asked Delgenis if she had her seat belt on and she said yes.

On 03/22/14 on scene at 1425hrs I spoke to the Driver of Unit #2 (KAUFFMAN) He stated that as he was driving North on SR 144 he saw Unit #1 sitting in a driveway off the West berm facing him. Just as he was approaching her she pulled across the South bound lane into his lane causing him to spike his brakes and swerve to the right but he still struck her in the left passenger's rear. I asked Kauffman if he had his seat belt on and he said

no.

On 3/22/14 on scene at 1435hrs I spoke to the Passenger of Unit #2 Samuel Swarey 5897 Brush Valley rd. Rebersburg, Pa. 16872 814-349-2221. Swarey stated that Unit #1 pulled out in front of them at the last second. I asked Swarey if he had his seat belt on He said no.

I interviewed three neighbors but nobody witnessed the crash.

Due to the long sight distance from the driveway and the short distance of the skid marks. I believe the driver of Unit #1 to be at fault.

Due to the evidence on scene the driver of Unit #1 was charged with VC3324 Vehicle entering or crossing roadway.

The driver of Unit #2 was cited for VC 4581 Restraint Systems due to his statements.



Pennsylvania State Police  
Bureau of Records & Identification  
RIGHT-TO-KNOW OFFICE  
1800 Elmerton Avenue  
Harrisburg, PA 17110

Mailing Date: April 1, 2014

Michelle  
[statecollegephotographer@gmail.com](mailto:statecollegephotographer@gmail.com)

**SENT VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION ONLY**

PSP/RTKL Request N° 2014-0178

Dear Requester:

On March 25, 2014, the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) received your request for information pursuant to the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law (RTKL), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101-3104, wherein you requested a copy of incident report number G07-1359421 and any video/audio taken by the officers at the scene. Under the RTKL, a written response to your request is due on or before April 1, 2014.

This is an interim response, not a final response, to your request. Under the provisions RTKL section § 67.902(b)(2), you are hereby notified that your request is being reviewed and the PSP will require up to an additional 30 days, i.e., until May 1, 2014, in which to respond to your request. Should your request be granted, the total for the estimated or actual fees owed, if any, will be included in our subsequent response. The reason for requiring additional time for a final response is checked below:


- Compliance with your request may require the redaction of certain information that is not subject to access under RTKL.
- Your request requires retrieval of one or more records that are stored at a remote location.
- A response by the mailing date of this letter could not be accomplished due to bona fide staffing limitations. In particular, \_\_\_\_\_.
- Your request is under legal review, which is necessary to determine whether a requested record is a "public record" for purposes of the RTKL.
- Your compliance with the following agency policies is required for access to the record(s): \_\_\_\_\_

You must pay the applicable fees authorized by the RTKL.

The extent or nature of the request precludes a response within the required time period.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely yours,



William A. Rozier, J.D.  
Pennsylvania State Police  
Agency Open Records Officer  
Bureau of Records and Identification  
Right to Know Law/Subpoena Unit  
1800 Elmerton Ave.  
Harrisburg, PA 17110  
Office: 717.425.5743 Fax: 717.525.5795  
wrozier@pa.gov

Enclosure: Request 2014-0178

**Henry, Faith**

---

**From:** statecollegephotographer@gmail.com on behalf of Redheaded Ninja  
<michelle@redheadedninja.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 22, 2014 2:58 PM  
**To:** DC, OpenRecords  
**Subject:** RTK Appeal  
**Attachments:** RTK Law Appeal.pdf; PSP FINAL RESPONSE 2014-0178.pdf; 201404010849.pdf;  
20140325RTK14-0178request.pdf

All documents are attached. To be clear, I am looking for any audio/video related to this accident. That includes dash cams and body recorders. Please call with any questions: 814-470-1132

Michelle Grove

2



**pennsylvania**  
OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS

May 23, 2014

**Via E-Mail only:**

Michelle Grove  
P O Box 253  
Spring Mills, PA 16875  
[statecollegephotographer@gmail.com](mailto:statecollegephotographer@gmail.com)  
[michelle@redheadedninja.com](mailto:michelle@redheadedninja.com)

**Via E-Mail only:**

William Rozier  
Agency Open Records Officer  
PA State Police  
1800 Elmerton Avenue  
Harrisburg, PA 17110  
[RA-psprighttoknow@pa.gov](mailto:RA-psprighttoknow@pa.gov)

RE: OFFICIAL NOTICE OF APPEAL - DOCKET # AP 2014-0828

Dear Parties:

Please review this information carefully as it affects your legal rights.

The Office of Open Records ("OOR") received this appeal under the Right-to-Know Law, 65 P.S. §§ 67.101, *et seq.* ("RTKL") on May 22, 2014. The process to follow in submitting information to the OOR is attached. A binding Final Determination will be issued in 30 calendar days as set forth in the RTKL.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has held that an agency is permitted to assert exemptions on appeal, even if the agency did not assert them when the request was originally denied. *Levy v. Senate of Pa.*, 65 A.3d 361 (Pa. 2013). Accordingly, the agency may supplement its response within the time frame set forth below.

**You may submit information and legal argument to support your position by 5:00 p.m. seven (7) business days from the date on this letter.** Please include the docket number above on all submissions.

The law requires that your position must be supported by sufficient facts and citation to all relevant sections of the RTKL, case law, and Final Determinations of the OOR. **Statements of fact must be supported by an affidavit made under penalty of perjury by a person with actual knowledge.** An affidavit is required to demonstrate nonexistence of records. Blank sample affidavits are available on our website.

The agency has the burden of proving that records are not subject to public access. Any written information you provide to OOR must be provided to all parties.

**Agency Must Notify Third Parties:** If records contain personal information of an employee of the agency; contain confidential, proprietary or trademarked records of a person or business entity; or are held by a contractor or vendor, **the agency must notify such parties of this appeal immediately and provide proof of that notice to the OOR within 7 business days.**


Such notice must be made by 1) providing a copy of all documents included with this letter; and 2) advising **that interested persons may request to participate in this appeal** (*see* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c)).

The Commonwealth Court has held that “the burden [is] on third-party contractors ... to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the [requested] records are exempt.” *See Allegheny County Dep’t of Admin. Servs. v. A Second Chance, Inc.*, 13 A.3d 1025, 1042 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011). **Failure to participate in an appeal before the OOR may be construed as a waiver of objections regarding release of the requested records.**

**Law Enforcement Records of Local Agencies:** District Attorneys are required to appoint appeals officers to hear appeals regarding access to criminal investigative records in possession of a local agency. If records were denied in part upon that basis, requester may consider filing a concurrent appeal with the District Attorney of the County where the agency is located if the records were denied, in part, because they are criminal investigative records of a local agency.

If you have questions, contact the assigned Appeals Officer in writing and copy the other party.

Respectfully,



Terry Mutchler  
Executive Director

Enclosures:

Assigned Appeals Officer contact information  
Entire appeal as filed with OOR

## REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE AS DIRECT INTEREST PARTY

Please accept this as a Request to participate as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party with a direct interest in a currently pending appeal before the Office of Open Records pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c). I hereby make the following statements under penalty of perjury as more fully set forth in 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904.

Today's date: \_\_\_\_\_

OOR Docket No: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Direct Interest Participant Information: \_\_\_\_\_

Address/City/State/Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone/Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Date you received actual notice of the appeal: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Requester: \_\_\_\_\_

Address/City/State/Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone/Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Address/City/State/Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone/Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Record at issue: \_\_\_\_\_

### Statement of Direct Interest:

I have a direct interest in the record(s) at issue as:


- employee of the agency
- containing confidential or proprietary information or trademarked records
- contractor or vendor
- Other: (attach additional pages if necessary) \_\_\_\_\_

Explain how the information you will submit in this appeal is probative to the final determination in support of the Requester's or Agency's position (attach additional pages if necessary) \_\_\_\_\_

I have attached a copy of my position statement to be included in the Office's final determination.

Respectfully submitted, \_\_\_\_\_ (must be signed)

**Please submit this form the Appeals Officer assigned to the appeal. Remember to copy all parties on this correspondence. The Office of Open Records will not consider direct interest filings submitted after a Final Determination has been issued in the appeal.**



# pennsylvania

OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS

**APPEALS OFFICER:**

**Joshua T. Young, Esquire**

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Office of Open Records  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225

**PHONE:**

**(717) 346-9903**

**FACSIMILE:**

**(717) 425-5343**

**E-MAIL:**

**joshyoung@pa.gov**

**Preferred method of contact  
and submission of information:**

**EMAIL**

**Please direct submissions and correspondence related to this appeal to the above Appeals Officer. Please include the case name and docket number on all submissions.**

**You must copy the other party on everything you submit to the OOR.**

The OOR website, <http://openrecords.state.pa.us>, is searchable and both parties are encouraged to review prior final determinations involving similar records and fees that may impact this appeal.

3

## Young, Joshua

---

**From:** Spahr, Jordan  
**Sent:** Friday, May 30, 2014 2:20 PM  
**To:** Young, Joshua  
**Cc:** Rozier, William A; 'statecollegephotographer@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** PSP Response Dkt. AP 2014-0828  
**Attachments:** PSP Response Dkt. AP 2014-0828.pdf

Appeals Officer Young,

Please find PSP's response to the subject docket attached to this message. No third party requires notification.

R/S  
Jordan Spahr

Jordan G. Spahr, Esq. | Assistant Counsel, Pennsylvania State Police  
Governor's Office of General Counsel  
1800 Elmerton Avenue | Hbg PA 17110  
Phone: 717-783-5568 | Fax: 717-772-2883  
[www.psp.state.pa.us](http://www.psp.state.pa.us)

**PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION  
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of this information other than by the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this message in error, please send a reply e-mail to the sender and delete the material from any and all computers. Unintended transmissions shall not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or any other privilege.



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

May 30, 2014

*Sent Only Via Electronic Transmission*

Joshua T. Young, Esquire  
Office of Open Records  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225

Re: *Michelle Grove v. Pennsylvania State Police*  
AP 2014-0828 (PSP/RTKL 2014-0178)  
Right-to-Know Law ("RTKL"), 65 PA. STAT. ANN. §§ 67.101-67.3104

Dear Appeals Officer Young:

I am responding on behalf of my client, the Pennsylvania State Police ("PSP"), to the May 22, 2014 appeal that Ms. Michelle Grove filed regarding the denial of her RTKL request (PSP/RTK No. 2014-0178, now the subject of OOR Appeal No. 2014-0828). Please accept this correspondence as my formal entry of appearance in the matter and kindly direct your future communications to me.

On March 25, 2014, Ms. Grove submitted a RTKL request to the PSP. The requester sought "a copy of the police report and any video/audio taken by the officers at Crash Sr 144 Potters Mills Incident #G07-1359421 . . . ." By letter dated April 1, 2014, Ms. Grove was notified in accordance with RTKL section 67.902(b) and 1 PA. CONS. STAT. section 1908 that PSP required an additional thirty (30) days to prepare the final response to her request. PSP's final response was sent on May 1, 2014, granting her request as to the public information release report of the incident, but denying the request under the records of criminal investigations and records of emergency dispatch exceptions of the RTKL, the Criminal History Records Information Act, and section 3754(b) of the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code. 65 PA. STAT. ANN. §§ 67.708(b)(16), (18)(i); 18 PA. CONS. STAT. §§ 9101-9183, *et seq.*; 75 PA. CONS. STAT. § 3754(b).

Ms. Grove appealed to the OOR on May 22, 2014 and has limited the issue on appeal to "Audio/Video of officers who responded." For the below reasons, PSP continues to rely on the positions set forth in its final response and respectfully requests that Ms. Grove's appeal be denied.

Argument

The Right-To-Know Law (RTKL) only requires Commonwealth agencies to provide documents that are public records. 65 PA. STAT. ANN. § 67.301 (2010). It is well settled that the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) is a Commonwealth agency within the meaning of the RTKL. *See*




*id.* § 67.101; *Dekok v. PSP*, Dkt. AP 2011-0086 at 4. A document is not a public record if: (1) it is specifically exempted from disclosure in section 67.708 of the RTKL; (2) it is not otherwise exempt under other federal or state law; or (3) it is protected by a privilege. Tit. 65, § 67.102 (defining "Public Record").

Section 708(b)(16) of the RTKL, or the records of criminal investigations exception, specifically bars from disclosure "record[s] of an agency relating to or resulting in a criminal investigation, including . . . [i]nvestigative materials, notes, correspondence, videos, and reports." *Id.* § 67.708(b)(16)(ii).

The case on point for this matter, *Keller v. Pa. State Police*, held that mobile vehicle recorders (MVR) are barred from disclosure under the records of criminal investigations exception. *Keller v. Pa. State Police*, Dkt. AP 2014-0241. The requester sought video footage, in electronic form, from a traffic citation dated in October 2013. *Id.* The OOR reasoned that, since a summary traffic citation is nonetheless a crime enumerated in Title 18, it falls within the "video" definition of the RTKL exception. *Id.* (citing *Otto v. Pa. State Police*, Dkt. AP 2013-2323). As such, the MVR is a non-disclosable record under section 708(b)(16) of the RTKL.

In conclusion, based upon the RTKL, case law, and the facts contained within the "Ferguson Verification," the Pennsylvania State Police respectfully requests that you deny Ms. Grove's appeal. If you have any doubt as to the merits of this case, PSP respectfully requests that you convene a hearing in this matter. Should you determine a hearing to be unnecessary, I thank you in advance for your thoughtful deliberations.

Sincerely,



Jordan G. Spahr  
Assistant Counsel - Pennsylvania State Police  
Governor's Office of General Counsel  
717.346.1718 / [jorspahr@pa.gov](mailto:jorspahr@pa.gov)

cc. Michelle Grove (w/ encl.) (*sent only via electronic transmission*)  
William A. Rozier (w/ encl.) (*sent only via electronic transmission*)

PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE  
BUREAU OF RECORDS & IDENTIFICATION  
RIGHT-TO-KNOW OFFICE


VERIFICATION OF  
LISSA M. FERGUSON  
DEPUTY AGENCY OPEN RECORDS OFFICER

I, Lissa M. Ferguson, Deputy Agency Open Records Officer of the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP or Department), am authorized to prepare this verification in response to PSP/RTK Request N° 2014-0178. Accordingly, on this 1st day of May, 2014, I verify the following facts to be true and correct, to the best of my knowledge or information and belief:

1. I am familiar with PSP/RTK Request N° 2014-0178, a copy of which accompanies this verification.
2. Utilizing the information contained in the request, I searched all Department databases to which I have access for evidence of any PSP records that may respond to the request. As a result of my searches, I located one responsive record designated G07-1359421, PSP Crash Report.
3. I am personally familiar with PSP Crash Report G07-1359421 and its attachments, which all relate to an investigation conducted by Trooper Scott Thomas.
4. PSP Crash Report G04-1359421 and its attachments are exempt from disclosure under the RTKL for the following reasons:
  - a. Section 3754(b) of the Vehicle Code asserts that reports of in-depth PSP vehicle accident investigations are confidential;
  - b. PSP Crash Report a G04-1359421 is exempt from public disclosure as criminal investigative records under RTKL section 67.708(b)(16); and

- c. The Criminal History Record Information Act (CHRIA), 18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 9101 – 9183, prohibits PSP from disseminating its investigative information to any persons or entities, other than to criminal justice agents and agencies.
5. Accordingly, I withheld this record from disclosure and provided the requestor with the Public Information Release Report pertaining to the incident.
6. Lastly, in response to request for "any video/audio taken by the officer," the responsive *audio/video recordings* are exempt from public disclosure under RTKL section 67.708(b)(18)(i) as a record or part of a record, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.

**I understand that false statements made in this verification are subject to penalties of 18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.**



---

Lissa M. Ferguson  
Deputy Agency Open Records Officer  
Pennsylvania State Police

4

## Young, Joshua

---

**From:** State College Photographer <statecollegephotographer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 30, 2014 3:23 PM  
**To:** Spahr, Jordan  
**Cc:** Young, Joshua; Rozier, William A  
**Subject:** Re: PSP Response Dkt. AP 2014-0828  
**Attachments:** IMG\_20140322\_140747\_570.jpg; IMG\_20140322\_150918\_662.jpg

Appeals Officer Young,

I arrived at the scene of the accident before the officers did and did not leave until the second officer left. Unless the officers have something to hide, I do not understand why they would try to keep these recordings from being released.

The first officer left after talking to the driver of Unit #2 for several minutes. The second officer decided that Unit #1 (the driver who was hit) was AT FAULT before ever speaking to her. The Crash - Public Information Police Report states that he spoke to the driver of Unit #1 at 1412 hours and the driver of Unit #2 at 1425 hours. That is incorrect, he spoke to the driver of Unit #1 after both officers talked to the other driver for several minutes. When the second officer finally did approach the driver of Unit #1, he did not ask her what happened. He instead told her what he "thought" happened and tried to convince her that she was at fault. The report also states that Unit #1 was struck in the left passenger's rear. She was struck on the right, NOT the left. Additionally, the report states that "Due to the long sight distance from the driveway and the short distance of the skid marks, I believe the driver of Unit #1 to be at fault." We requested that the officer measure the skid marks and he that said he would do so. There is no mention of this on the report. This whole thing stinks, and I want to know why. I am attaching photographs of the skid marks and point of impact. This accident took place in a 35 MPH zone. I will gladly attend ANY number of hearings to gain access to this audio/video. I have a "Right to Know."

Michelle Grove

On Fri, May 30, 2014 at 2:20 PM, Spahr, Jordan <jorspahr@pa.gov> wrote:

Appeals Officer Young,

Please find PSP's response to the subject docket attached to this message. No third party requires notification.

R/S

Jordan Spahr

Jordan G. Spahr, Esq. | Assistant Counsel, Pennsylvania State Police

Governor's Office of General Counsel

1800 Elmerton Avenue | Hbg PA 17110


Phone: 717-783-5568 | Fax: 717-772-2883

[www.psp.state.pa.us](http://www.psp.state.pa.us)

**PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION  
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of this information other than by the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this message in error, please send a reply e-mail to the sender and delete the material from any and all computers. Unintended transmissions shall not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or any other privilege.





5



from public disclosure under Section 708(b)(18)(i) of the RTKL. The PSP included a verification signed under penalty of perjury from its Deputy Agency Open Records Officer, who affirms that, with respect to the audio/video recordings:

the responsive *audio/video recordings* are exempt from public disclosure under RTKL section 67.708(b)(18)(i) as a record of part of a record, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.

On May 22, 2014, the Requester appealed to the OOR, challenging the partial denial of the Request as it related to the audio/video recordings and stating grounds for disclosure. The OOR invited the parties to supplement the record, and directed the PSP to notify any third parties of their ability to participate in the appeal pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On May 30, 2014, the PSP submitted a position statement, which, by reference, incorporated the statement made under penalty of perjury of Lissa Ferguson, PSP's Deputy Open Records Officer.<sup>1</sup> The PSP also alleged in an unsworn statement that the recordings are exempt as criminal investigative records under 65 P.S. 67.708(b)(16).<sup>2</sup> On the same day, the Requester submitted materials in support of her Request, including a position statement and two photographs of the incident scene.

### LEGAL ANALYSIS

“The objective of the Right to Know Law ... is to empower citizens by affording them access to information concerning the activities of their government.” *SWB Yankees L.L.C. v. Wintermantel*, 45 A.3d 1029, 1041 (Pa. 2012). Further, this important open-government law is “designed to promote access to official government information in order to prohibit secrets,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Ferguson's affidavit was provided to the Requester simultaneously with the PSP's final response to the Request.

<sup>2</sup> Although the PSP raised this additional reason for denying access for the first time on appeal to the OOR, it is permitted to do so in light of *Levy v. Senate of Pa.*, 65 A.3d 361 (Pa. 2013).

scrutinize the actions of public officials and make public officials accountable for their actions.” *Bowling v. Office of Open Records*, 990 A.2d 813, 824 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010), *aff’d* 75 A.3d 453 (Pa. 2013).

The OOR is authorized to hear appeals for all Commonwealth and local agencies. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.503(a). An appeals officer is required “to review all information filed relating to the request” and may consider testimony, evidence and documents that are reasonably probative and relevant to the matter at issue. 65 P.S. § 67.1102(a)(2). An appeals officer may conduct a hearing to resolve an appeal. The decision to hold a hearing is discretionary and non-appealable. *Id.*; *Giurintano v. Dep’t of Gen. Servs.*, 20 A.3d 613, 617 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011). Here, neither party requested a hearing; however, the OOR has the necessary, requisite information and evidence before it to properly adjudicate the matter.

The PSP is a Commonwealth agency subject to the RTKL that is required to disclose public records. 65 P.S. § 67.301. Records in the possession of a Commonwealth agency are presumed to be public, unless exempt under the RTKL or other law or protected by a privilege, judicial order or decree. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.305. Upon receipt of a request, an agency is required to assess whether a record requested is within its possession, custody or control and to respond within five business days. 65 P.S. § 67.901. An agency bears the burden of proving the applicability of any cited exemption(s). *See* 65 P.S. § 67.708(b).

Section 708 of the RTKL clearly places the burden of proof on the public body to demonstrate that a record is exempt. In pertinent part, Section 708(a) states: “(1) The burden of proving that a record of a Commonwealth agency or local agency is exempt from public access shall be on the Commonwealth agency or local agency receiving a request by a preponderance of the evidence.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(a). Preponderance of the evidence has been defined as “such

proof as leads the fact-finder ... to find that the existence of a contested fact is more probable than its nonexistence.” *Pa. State Troopers Ass’n v. Scolforo*, 18 A.3d 435, 439 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011) (quoting *Dep’t of Transp. v. Agric. Lands Condemnation Approval Bd.*, 5 A.3d 821, 827 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010)).

On appeal, the PSP asserts that the requested records are protected under Section 708(b)(18)(i) of the RTKL, which exempts from public disclosure “[r]ecords or parts of records, except time response logs, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i).

In support of its position, the PSP submitted the statement made under penalty of perjury of Lissa Ferguson, Deputy Agency Open Records Officer, which provides that:

[T]he responsive *audio/video recordings* are exempt from public disclosure under RTKL section 67.708(b)(18)(i) as a record of part of a record, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.

However, the OOR has held that conclusory affidavits or statements made under penalty of perjury are insufficient to meet an agency’s burden of proof. *See Office of the Governor v. Scolforo*, 65 A.3d 1095, 1103 (Pa Commw. Ct. 2013) (“[A] generic determination or conclusory statements are not sufficient to justify the exemption of public records”); *Marshall v. Neshaminy School District*, OOR Dkt. AP 2010-0015, 2010 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 67 (finding that an agency’s conclusory affidavit was insufficient). Here, the PSP’s conclusory statement fails to prove that the requested recordings were “received by emergency dispatch personnel” as required by Section 708(b)(18)(i).

To the extent the PSP argues in its unsworn position statement that the audio/video recordings are exempt from disclosure pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16), the OOR notes that

an unsworn statement may not be relied upon as competent evidence to withhold records under the RTKL. *See Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh v. Van Osdol*, 40 A.3d 209 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012) (holding that statements of counsel are not competent evidence); *City of Philadelphia v. Juzang*, July Term 2010, No. 2048 (Phila. Com. Pl. June 28, 2011) (“Because the letter written by City’s counsel is a legal brief, it cannot be ... evidence at all”). Based upon the evidence provided, the PSP has not met its burden of proving that the requested records are exempt from disclosure under 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16) or 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i). *See* 65 P.S. § 67.708(a)(1).

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Requester’s appeal is **granted** and the PSP is required to provide copies of all responsive records within thirty (30) days. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty (30) days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal to the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania. 65 P.S. § 67.1301(a). All parties must be served with notice of the appeal. The OOR also shall be served notice and have an opportunity to respond according to court rules as per Section 1303 of the RTKL. This Final Determination shall be placed on the OOR website at: <http://openrecords.state.pa.us>.

**FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: June 17, 2014**



---

APPEALS OFFICER  
JOSHUA T. YOUNG, ESQ.

Sent to: Michelle Grove (via e-mail only);  
William Rozier (via e-mail only);  
Jordan Spahr, Esq. (via e-mail only)