

FINAL DETERMINATION

DATE ISSUED AND MAILED: May 25, 2023

IN RE: *Kimmy Wong v. Unknown Agency*, OOR Dkt. AP 2023-1165

Upon review of the appeal filed with the Office of Open Records (“OOR”) to the above-referenced docket number, it is determined that the appeal is **DISMISSED** because:

The appeal is insufficient. The appeal does not meet the requirements of 65 P.S. § 67.1101(a)(1). The Requester neither identifies the Agency that denied the Request, nor did the Requester include copies of the Request or the Agency’s response. The appeal may be refiled pursuant to the requirements of 65 P.S. § 67.1101(a)(1).

For this reason, the Agency is not required to take any further action. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, you may appeal or petition for review with the appropriate court of jurisdiction. 65 P.S. §§ 67.1301-1302(a). All parties must be served with notice of the appeal. The OOR also shall be served notice and have an opportunity to respond according to court rules as per 65 P.S. § 67.1303. 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

Issued by:

/s/ Joshua Young

Joshua Young, Esq.
Senior Deputy Chief Counsel

Sent to: Requester (via first class mail)

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