



On August 15, 2016, the Municipality denied the Request, claiming that Councilman Gresock does not possess any responsive records.

On August 17, 2016, the Requester appealed to the OOR, challenging the denial and stating grounds for disclosure. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the Municipality to notify any third parties of their ability to participate in this appeal. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On August 24, 2016, the Municipality's Open Records Officer, Joseph Sedlak ("Mr. Sedlak"), submitted an affidavit from Nicholas Gresock ("Councilman Gresock"). The Requester did not submit any additional evidence on appeal.

#### **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 requisite information and evidence before it to properly adjudicate the matter.

The Municipality 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, based upon comments made by Councilman Gresock at a public meeting, the Municipality did not conduct a complete search of its files for responsive records. In response to a request for records, “an agency shall make a good faith effort to determine if ... the agency has possession, custody or control of the record[.]” 65 P.S. § 67.901. The RTKL does not define the term “good faith effort” as used in Section 901 of the RTKL. In *Rowles v. Rice Township*, however, the OOR stated:

[I]n order for an agency to meet its burden that a good faith search was conducted in response to a FOIA request an agency must show that it has conducted a search reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents as established by relatively detailed and non-conclusory affidavits submitted in good faith by responsible officials.

OOR Dkt. AP 2014-0729, 2014 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 602 (citing *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. United States Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 129, 138-139 (D.D.C. 2012)) (citations omitted). Additionally, the Commonwealth Court has held that an open-records officer’s inquiry of agency members may constitute a “good faith effort” to locate records, stating that open-records officers have:

a duty to inquire of [agency personnel] as to whether he or she was in the possession, custody, or control of any of the ... requested emails that could be deemed public and, if so, whether the emails were, in fact, public and subject to disclosure or exemption from access by Requestor.

*Mollick v. Twp. of Worcester*, 32 A.3d 859, 875 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011); *see also In Re Silberstein*, 11 A.3d 629, 634 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011) (holding that it is “the open-records officer’s duty and responsibility” to both send an inquiry to agency personnel concerning a request and to determine whether to deny access).

Here, the Municipality’s submission includes the affidavit of Councilman Gresock, who attests that he is not in possession of any emails, memos, letters or other communication regarding Police Department staffing, testing or hiring. However, the Municipality has not

submitted evidence demonstrating that Mr. Sedlak, as the Open Record Officer, or any other Municipality personnel searched the Municipality's files for records responsive to the Request. Based upon the evidence provided, therefore, the Municipality cannot be said to have conducted a good faith search reasonably calculated to identify the requested records.

The OOR is mindful that an agency cannot produce records that do not exist within its "possession, custody or control" and, accordingly, is not ordering the creation of any records sought in the Request. Absent the Municipality providing a sufficient evidentiary basis that no records exist, the OOR will order disclosure of responsive public records. *See generally Sindaco v. City of Pittston*, OOR Dkt. AP 2010-0778, 2010 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 755; *Schell v. Delaware County*, OOR Dkt. AP 2012-0598, 2012 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 641.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Requester's appeal is **granted**, and the Municipality is required to conduct a good faith search of the Municipality's records and to provide records responsive to the Request within thirty days. 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 Allegheny 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.<sup>1</sup> This Final Determination shall be placed on the OOR website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

---

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

**FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: September 12, 2016**

*/s/ Kelly C. Isenberg*

---

APPEALS OFFICER  
KELLY C. ISENBERG, ESQ.

Sent to: John Yakim (via e-mail only);  
Joseph Sedlak , AORO (via e-mail only)