

County for the Park. The Request stated that the Requester sought certified copies of the records. On June 7, 2016, the County invoked a thirty-day extension to respond to the Request. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.902. On July 12, 2016, the County granted the Request and provided responsive records to the Requester.

On July 18, 2016, the Requester appealed to the OOR, arguing that the County did not provide a certified copy of the lease and that the lease was unsigned and not dated. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the County to notify any third parties of their ability to participate in this appeal. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On July 28, 2016, the County submitted a position statement and a certification of the documents provided to the Requester. The County also claims that a signed or dated copy of the lease provided does not exist in the County's possession, custody or control. In support of its position, the County submitted a verification and a certification signed by its First Assistant County Solicitor, Joshua Stein. The Requester did not submit any evidence to challenge the Department's verification.

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, 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 law also states that an appeals officer may admit into evidence testimony, evidence and documents that the appeals officer believes to be reasonably probative and relevant to an issue in dispute. *Id.* The decision to hold a hearing is discretionary and non-appealable. *Id.*; *Giurintano v. Pa. Dep’t of Gen. Servs.*, 20 A.3d 613, 617 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011). Here, the parties did not request a hearing; however, the OOR has the necessary, requisite information and evidence before it to properly adjudicate the matter.

The County is a local agency subject to the RTKL that is required to disclose public records. 65 P.S. § 67.302. Records in possession of a local agency are presumed 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 respond within five business days. 65 P.S. § 67.901. An agency bears the burden of proving the applicability of any cited exemptions. *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)(1). 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 *Pa. Dep’t of Transp. v. Agric. Lands Condemnation Approval Bd.*, 5 A.3d 821, 827 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010)). Likewise, “[t]he burden of proving a record does not exist ... is placed on the agency responding to the right-to-know request.” *Hodges v. Pa. Dep’t of Health*, 29 A.3d 1190, 1192 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011).

The Requester claims that although he received the copy of the lease he requested, the document was not dated, signed or certified as specified in the Request. In his certification, Attorney Stein certifies that the records provided to the Requester “are a complete and true copy of the ... responsive records.” Under the RTKL, an attestation made under made under the penalty of perjury may serve as sufficient evidentiary support. *See Sherry v. Radnor Twp. Sch. Dist.*, 20 A.3d 515, 520-21 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011); *Moore v. Office of Open Records*, 992 A.2d 907, 909 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010). Therefore, because the County has provided the requested certification, the Requester’s appeal regarding certification of the records is dismissed as moot.

With respect to the lease, Attorney Stein verified that upon a good faith search, he is “unable to locate any copy of the lease which is signed and dated.” In the absence of any competent evidence that the County acted in bad faith or that the record exists, “the averments in [the verification] should be accepted as true.” *McGowan v. Pa. Dep’t of Env’tl. Prot.*, 103 A.3d 374, 382-83 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014) (citing *Office of the Governor v. Scolforo*, 65 A.3d 1095, 1103 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013)). Based on the evidence provided, the Department has met its burden of proving that a signed or dated lease does not exist in the Department’s possession, custody or control.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Requester's appeal is **denied in part** and **dismissed as moot in part**, and the County is not required to take any further action. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal to the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas. 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a). All parties must be served with notice of the appeal. The OOR also shall be served notice and have an opportunity to respond as per Section 1303 of the RTKL. However, as the quasi-judicial tribunal adjudicating this matter, the OOR is not a proper party to any appeal and should not be named as a party.¹ This Final Determination shall be placed on the OOR website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: August 9, 2016

/s/ Kelly C. Isenberg

APPEALS OFFICER
KELLY C. ISENBERG, ESQ.

Sent to: Mike Howell (via U.S. Mail);
Joshua Stein, Esq. (via e-mail only);
Francis Dean (via e-mail only)

¹ See *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).