

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

Court of Common Pleas

Civil Cover Sheet

LANCASTER

County

Lancaster County Prothonotary E-Filed - 3 Jan 2024 12:09:57 PM

Case Number: CI-24-00035

For Prothonotary Use Only:

Docket No:

TIME STAMP

The information collected on this form is used solely for court administration purposes. This form does not supplement or replace the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law or rules of court.

SECTION A

Commencement of Action:

- ☐ Complaint ☐ Writ of Summons ☒ Petition
☐ Transfer from Another Jurisdiction ☐ Declaration of Taking

Lead Plaintiff's Name:

Lancaster County

Lead Defendant's Name:

Jack Panyard

Are money damages requested? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Dollar Amount Requested: ☐ within arbitration limits
(check one) ☐ outside arbitration limits

Is this a *Class Action Suit*? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Is this an *MDJ Appeal*? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Name of Plaintiff/Appellant's Attorney: Kevin J. McKeon

☐ Check here if you have no attorney (are a Self-Represented [Pro Se] Litigant)

SECTION B

Nature of the Case: Place an "X" to the left of the ONE case category that most accurately describes your **PRIMARY CASE**. If you are making more than one type of claim, check the one that you consider most important.

TORT (do not include Mass Tort)

- ☐ Intentional
☐ Malicious Prosecution
☐ Motor Vehicle
☐ Nuisance
☐ Premises Liability
☐ Product Liability (does not include mass tort)
☐ Slander/Libel/ Defamation
☐ Other:

MASS TORT

- ☐ Asbestos
☐ Tobacco
☐ Toxic Tort - DES
☐ Toxic Tort - Implant
☐ Toxic Waste
☐ Other:

PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY

- ☐ Dental
☐ Legal
☐ Medical
☐ Other Professional:

CONTRACT (do not include Judgments)

- ☐ Buyer Plaintiff
☐ Debt Collection: Credit Card
☐ Debt Collection: Other

☐ Employment Dispute:
Discrimination
☐ Employment Dispute: Other

☐ Other:

REAL PROPERTY

- ☐ Ejectment
☐ Eminent Domain/Condemnation
☐ Ground Rent
☐ Landlord/Tenant Dispute
☐ Mortgage Foreclosure: Residential
☐ Mortgage Foreclosure: Commercial
☐ Partition
☐ Quiet Title
☐ Other:

CIVIL APPEALS

- Administrative Agencies
☐ Board of Assessment
☐ Board of Elections
☐ Dept. of Transportation
☒ Statutory Appeal: Other
Right to Know Law

☐ Zoning Board
☐ Other:

MISCELLANEOUS

- ☐ Common Law/Statutory Arbitration
☐ Declaratory Judgment
☐ Mandamus
☐ Non-Domestic Relations
Restraining Order
☐ Quo Warranto
☐ Replevin
☐ Other:

**PROTHONOTARY
CIVIL COVER SHEET**Lancaster County Prothonotary E-Filed - 3 Jan 2024 12:09:57 PM
Case Number: CI-24-00035

PLEASE LIST NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF ADDITIONAL PARTIES ON A SEPARATE SHEET.

ALL PARTY INFORMATION IS REQUIRED INCLUDING ZIP CODES. ALL PARTY INFORMATION MUST MATCH THE PLEADING. PLEASE DO NOT STAPLE THE COVER SHEET TO THE PLEADING. IF AN EVENT NEEDS TO BE SCHEDULED, A CAO SCHEDULING COVER SHEET MUST ALSO BE ATTACHED.

TYPE OF ACTION: Statutory Appeal - Right to Know Law**For Prothonotary Use Only:****DOCKET No: CI -****PARTY INFORMATION**PLAINTIFF'S NAME: Lancaster CountyDEFENDANT'S NAME: Jack Panyard and LancasterOnline-LNP

ADDRESS: 150 N. Queen Street
If confidential,
use 2nd sheet
Lancaster, PA 17603

ADDRESS: 101 N. Queen Street, Floor 2
Lancaster, PA 17603

MUNICIPALITY: Lancaster CityMUNICIPALITY: Lancaster City

TWP/BOROUGH: _____

TWP/BOROUGH: _____

DOB: _____ TELEPHONE #: (717) 299-8000
 (mm/dd/yyyy) (#####)

DOB: _____ TELEPHONE #: (717) 847-3993
 (mm/dd/yyyy) (#####)

FILING ATTORNEY / FILING PARTY INFORMATIONFIRM/OFFICE: Hawke McKeon & Sniscak, LLPFILING ATTORNEY/PARTY: Kevin J. McKeonAOPC: (Attorney ID) #: 30428ADDRESS: 100 N. 10th StreetCITY: HarrisburgSTATE: PAZIP CODE: 17101TELEPHONE #: (717) 236-1300

(#####)

EMAIL: kjmckeon@hmslegal.com**TAX LIEN INFORMATION**

MUNICIPALITY: _____

MAP REFERENCE: _____

DEED BOOK: _____

DEED PAGE: _____

DEED DATE: _____

SALE PRICE: _____

TAX YEAR: _____

TAX LIEN AMOUNT: _____

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION: _____

PFA/SVPO/PFI INFORMATION

HEARING DATE: _____

SOCIAL SECURITY #: (Defendant – Last 4 digits) _____

POLICE DEPARTMENT: _____

PREVIOUS PETITIONS: YES ☐ NO ☐

If 'YES', File Date: _____

Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. PA ID No. 30428
Melissa A. Chapaska, Esq. PA ID No. 319449
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP
100 North Tenth Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
Tel: (717) 236-1300
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com
machapaska@hmslegal.com

Attorneys for Lancaster County

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF
LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

LANCASTER COUNTY,

Petitioner,

vs.

JACK PANYARD and
LANCASTERONLINE - LNP,

Respondents.

:
: Docket No. **24-00035**
:
:
: Petition for Review of the Final
: Determination of the Office of Open
: Records at Docket No. AP 2023-2662
:
:
:
:

PETITION FOR REVIEW

(In the nature of a statutory appeal from the Office of Open Records)

I. Statement of Jurisdiction

1. This is an appeal from the Office of Open Records (OOR)'s Final Determination as to which the Court exercises appellate jurisdiction pursuant to 42 Pa. C.S. 933(a)(3) and Section 1302(a) of the Right to Know Law (RTKL), 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a).

1-3-2024 \$211.00 RMD FP 24 000116 receipt 174592

2. The determination for which review is sought is *Jack Panyard and LancasterOnline – LNP v. Lancaster County*, OOR Docket No. AP 2023-2662, Final Determination dated December 4, 2023 (Final Determination). A copy of OOR’s Final Determination is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.¹

II. Parties

3. Petitioner Lancaster County (“County”) is a “Local Agency” as defined by the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.102.

4. Respondents Jack Panyard and LancasterOnline – LNP (collectively, the “Requester”) is the “Requester” as defined by the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.102.

5. The government unit that made the determination for which review is sought is OOR.

III. Procedural and Factual History

6. On October 23, 2023, the Requester submitted a request to the County seeking “the name of the 3-year-old who died of a gunshot wound to the head at 8:07 pm [on] [October] 20, 2023 at [address omitted] from the [C]ounty [C]oroner’s office” (the Request). Final Determination at 1.

7. On October 30, 2023, the County denied the Request on the bases that the Request was not sufficiently specific, 65 P.S. § 67.703, would identify the name of a minor, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30), sought records relating to a criminal investigation, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16)(ii), and

¹ All documents referenced herein are part of the OOR record on appeal. In accordance with OOR’s procedure, the County will request that OOR forward the official record to the court following the docketing of the instant appeal.

sought records relating to a noncriminal investigation, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(17). Final Determination at 1.

8. On November 3, 2023, the Requester appealed to OOR challenging the County's denial of the Request, arguing that the name of a deceased individual is subject to disclosure without consideration of age. Final Determination at 2.

9. On November 16, 2023 the County submitted a position statement and attestation of Stephen Diamantoni, M.D. ("Diamantoni Attestation"), the County Coroner. The Diamantoni Attestation states, in relevant part, that:

3. In my capacity as the Coroner, I am aware of the various types of investigations and reports completed by the Lancaster County Coroner's Office, as well as the Office's record retention policies.

4. The Coroner's Office is tasked with providing medical examinations and other investigations into the cause of death of an individual and then preparing reports on those examinations and investigations.

[...]

11. The Lancaster County Coroner's Office conducted an investigation into the cause of death of a three-year old minor child which occurred on approximately October 20, 2023.

[...]

14. At the time of the October 23, 2023 request, the Lancaster County Coroner's Office's investigation into the cause of death of this minor had not yet been completed and there were no responsive records to the request.

10. On November 29, 2023, in response to a request for clarification made by OOR, the County submitted a second attestation of Stephen Diamantoni, M.D. ("Diamantoni Supplemental

Attestation”) stating that “At the time of the October 23, 2023 request, the County Coroner Office did not have any records that contained the requested information.”²

11. On December 4, 2023, OOR issued a Final Determination that directs the County “to provide the requested name” to the Requester based on OOR’s conclusion that “the RTKL is clear that the name of a deceased individual is public, without consideration to the type of record the information may be contained within, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(20).” Final Determination at 7. In so finding, OOR rejected the County’s assertion that the name of a deceased minor is exempt under 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30), reasoning that “such an interpretation is inconsistent with the Coroner’s Act, which mandates disclosure of coroner records without consideration of the decedent’s age.” Final Determination at 7. OOR did not address the County’s argument that records sought by the request relate to the Coroner’s investigation into the death of a minor and therefore are records related to a non-criminal investigation exempt from disclosure under RTKL Section 708(b)(17).

IV. Issues on Appeal

12. OOR erred in directing the County to disclose the name of the three year old deceased minor. Release of the minor’s name is not required by 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(20), is not required under the Coroner’s Act, and is exempt from release under 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30) and 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(17).

² The County does not dispute that as of the date of the request it possessed the name of the deceased minor. The Diamantoni Supplemental Attestation’s statement that the Coroner’s Office “did not have any records that contained the requested information” can only be understood to mean that at that early stage of the investigation no formal report of any kind had been prepared, and that the information requested existed only in the form of non-criminal investigative records exempt from disclosure under RTKL Section 708(b)(17). *See, e.g., Walbert v. Chester County*, OOR Dkt. AP-2021-1308 (holding that records in possession of the county coroner related to the coroner’s investigation into the cause of death of the individual are non-criminal investigative records exempt from disclosure under RTKL Section 708(b)(17)).

13. OOR erred in concluding that, under the RTKL, “the name of a deceased individual is public, without consideration to the type of record the information may be contained within, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(20),” Final Determination at 7, in that:

- a. Section 708(b)(20), 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(20) exempts from disclosure certain “autopsy record[s] of a coroner or medical examiner,” but also provides that “the name of the deceased individual and the cause and manner of death,” as set forth in the autopsy records, are not exempt from disclosure;
- b. Here, as of the time of the request, no such completed autopsy reports or records as contemplated in Section 708(b)(20) were in existence;
- c. OOR thus misapplied RTKL Section 708(b)(20)’s proviso concerning the release of the deceased minor’s name, where no autopsy reports and similar records that are the focus of Section 708(b)(20) were yet in existence;
- d. OOR’s conclusion that the proviso to the exemption of certain coroner reports set forth in RTKL Section 708(b)(20) provides an independent basis to make the name of a deceased individual public without consideration of whether such information is otherwise exempt under any other of the thirty exemptions available under RTKL Section 708(b) is contrary to law and policy. *See, e.g.*, 65 P.S. § 67.708(e) (“Construction.-In determining whether a record is exempt from access under this section, an agency shall **consider and apply each exemption separately.**”)(emphasis added).

14. OOR erred in concluding that the RTKL’s exemption of “[a] record identifying the name, home address or date of birth of a child 17 years of age or younger,” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30), does not apply to the County Coroner’s records identifying the name of a three year old deceased

minor, and that such application is inconsistent with the Coroner's Act. Final Determination at 7 n. 2. The Coroner's Act specifies fees to be charged for completed reports, 16 P.S. § 1252-B, which are not at issue here because they were not in existence at the time of the request, and thus does not apply.

15. OOR erred in failing to find that, as of the time of the request, which was prior to the County Coroner's preparation of formal autopsy reports, information including the name of a deceased minor is exempt from disclosure because it is a record of "an agency relating to a noncriminal investigation." RTKL Section 708(b)(17), 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(17).

16. For these reasons, the County requests that this Court reverse OOR's Final Determination.

V. Relief Sought

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, Lancaster County respectfully requests an order of this Court reversing OOR's Final Determination and ordering that no further action must be taken by the County in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kevin J. McKeon

Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. PA ID No. 30428

Melissa A. Chapaska, Esq. PA ID No. 319449

Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP

100 North Tenth Street

Harrisburg, PA 17101

Tel: (717) 236-1300

kjmckeon@hmslegal.com

machapaska@hmslegal.com

Attorneys for Lancaster County

DATED: January 3, 2024

Exhibit

A



FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**JACK PANYARD AND
LANCASTERONLINE - LNP,
Requester**

v.

**LANCASTER COUNTY,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No: AP 2023-2662

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On October 23, 2023, Jack Panyard and LancasterOnline - LNP (collectively “Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to Lancaster County (“County”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, seeking:

[T]he name of the 3-year-old who died of a gunshot wound to the head at 8:07 pm [on] [October] 20, 2023 at [address omitted] from the [C]ounty [C]oroner’s office.

On October 30, 2023, the County denied the Request, arguing that the Request was not sufficiently specific, 65 P.S. § 67.703, would identify the name of a minor, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30), sought records relating to a criminal investigation, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16)(ii), and sought records relating to a noncriminal investigation, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(17).

On November 3, 2023, the Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging the denial and stating grounds for disclosure. Specifically, the Requester argues that the name, cause and manner of death are subject to release without consideration of age. The Requester further argues that the County is acting in bad faith. 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. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On November 16, 2023, the County submitted a position statement, reiterating its claims. Additionally, the County argues the Request does not identify records, but instead, asks a question requiring an answer and responsive records do not exist. In further support of its position, the County submitted an attestation made subject to the penalties of 28 U.S.C. § 1756, authored by Stephen Diamantoni, M.D. (“Diamantoni Attestation”), the County Coroner. At the request of the OOR, a second attestation that was also made subject to the penalties of 28 U.S.C. § 1756, and authored by Stephen Diamantoni, M.D. (“Diamantoni Supplemental Attestation”), was submitted on November 29, 2023.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The County is a local agency subject to the RTKL. 65 P.S. § 67.302. Records in the possession of a local 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. As an agency subject to the RTKL, the County is required to demonstrate, “by a preponderance of the evidence,” that records are exempt from public access. 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).

1. The Request is a request for records under the RTKL

The County initially and unreasonably argues that the Request seeks an answer to a question rather than records. In order to comply with the requirements of Section 703 of the RTKL, a request must seek records, rather than answers to questions. 65 P.S. § 67.703; *see also Walker v. Pa. Ins. Dep’t*, No. 1485 C.D. 2011, 2012 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 425 at *16 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012) (“The RTKL is not a forum for the public to demand answers to specifically posed questions to either a Commonwealth or local agency. In fact, there is no provision in the RTKL that requires an agency to respond to questions posed in a request”); *Gingrich v. Pa. Game Comm’n*, No. 1254 C.D. 2011, 2012 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 38 at *14 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012) (noting that the portion of a request “set forth as a question” did not “trigger a response”). The RTKL defines a “record” as “[i]nformation, regardless of physical form or characteristics, that documents a transaction or activity of an agency and that is created, received or retained pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the agency.” 65 P.S. § 67.102.

In *Gingrich, supra*, the Commonwealth Court held, among other things, that requests for specific pieces of information constitute requests for records under the RTKL. *Id.* at *13. (“[H]ow [can] any request that seeks information ... not [be] one that seeks records[?]”). Here, the Request seeks the “name” of a minor who died on a specific date. The OOR has previously found that a request for the name or identity of an individual is a request for a record under the RTKL. *See Bartholomew v. West Manchester Twp.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2020-0777, 2020 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 975 (finding that a request seeking the name of the individual that has procurement authority seeks a

record under the RTKL); *Eiland v. Dauphin County*, OOR Dkt. AP 2020-0293, 2020 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 718 (finding that a request seeking the names of officers who signed out or observed the return of an inmate to implicitly seek a record showing the information sought); *Melchiondo v. Pa. Game Comm'n*, OOR Dkt. AP 2016-2081, 2017 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 90 (finding a request seeking the names and addresses of property owners who have a license to hunt on their own properties is a request for records). Accordingly, the request for the name of an individual clearly seeks “information” and therefore, constitutes a valid request for a record under the RTKL.

2. The County has not demonstrated that a responsive record does not exist in its possession, custody or control

The County argues that a responsive record sought by the Request, i.e. the name of the minor, did not exist at the time of the Request. 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. While the RTKL does not define the term “good faith effort,” in *Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Pa. Dep’t of Corr.*, the Commonwealth Court stated:

As part of a good faith search, the open records officer has a duty to advise all custodians of potentially responsive records about the request, and to obtain all potentially responsive records from those in possession... When records are not in an agency’s physical possession, an open records officer has a duty to contact agents within its control, including third-party contractors ... After obtaining potentially responsive records, an agency has the duty to review the records and assess their public nature under ... the RTKL.

185 A.3d 1161, 1171-72 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2018) (citations omitted), *aff’d*, 243 A.3d 19 (Pa. 2020). An agency must show, through detailed evidence submitted in good faith from individuals with knowledge of the agency’s records, that it has conducted a search reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents. *See Burr v. Pa. Dep’t of Health*, OOR Dkt. AP 2021-0747, 2021 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 750; *see also Mollick v. Twp. of Worcester*, 32 A.3d 859, 875 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011).

In support of its position, the Diamantoni Attestation indicates, in relevant part, the following:

2. In my capacity as the Coroner, I am familiar with the County's past and current practices regarding the release of documents in response to [RTKL] [r]equests such as the one at issue in this matter.

3. In my capacity as the Coroner, I am aware of the various types of investigations and reports completed by the [County] Coroner's Office [("Office")], as well as the Office's record retention policies.

4. The Coroner's Office is tasked with providing medical examinations and other investigations into the cause of death of an individual and then preparing reports on those examinations and investigations.

...

10. Since February 2022, the [County] Coroner's office policy on providing autopsy reports has been to provide autopsy reports to next of kin, or authorized representatives of next of kin, insurance companies and law enforcement agencies.

11. The [County] Coroner's Office conducted an investigation into the cause of death of a three-year old minor child[,] which occurred on approximately October 20, 2023.

...

13. Based upon the [R]equest provided, I was unable to determine what report, and therefore, what fee was to be assessed.

14. At the time of the October 23, 2023 [R]equest, the [County] [Office's] investigation in to the cause of death of this minor had not yet been completed and there were no responsive records to the [R]equest.

In further support of the County's, the Diamantoni Supplemental Attestation indicates the following:

15. At the time of the October 23, 2023 [R]equest, the [County] [Office] did not have any records that contained the requested information.

Under the RTKL, an affidavit or statement made under 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. Off. of Open Records*, 992 A.2d 907, 909 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010). However, the OOR is not required to accept statements made in an affidavit or an attestation as the truth when there are countervailing factors to consider; indeed, “experienced OOR appeals officers” necessarily possess the “competency to assess the adequacy and probity of an agency affiant's characterization of the record or the credibility of its effects assessment.” *ACLU of Pa. v. Pa. State Police*, 232 A.3d 654 (Pa. 2020).

The Diamantoni Supplemental Attestation states that the Coroner’s Office “did not have any records that contained the requested information” at the time of the Request. However, there are multiple reasons to question the credibility of this statement. First, the County has unreasonably argued that the Request asks a question, thus calling into question its interpretation of the Request. *See, e.g., Mack v. Dep’t of Corr.*, No. 699 C.D. 2022, 2023 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 393 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2023). The Diamantoni Attestation appears to set forth an interpretation that the Request was seeking a formal report, as opposed to *any* record containing the information. Although the Diamantoni Supplemental Attestation states that the Coroner’s Office did not have “any records,” there is reason to believe that the County is treating “record” as synonymous with a “report” based upon the Diamantoni Attestation. Finally, upon view of a body, a coroner is required to “investigate the facts and circumstances concerning a death” that “occur[s] as a result of violence or trauma,” 16 P.S. § 1218-B, and is specifically required to investigate the unexplained deaths of children not more than three (3) years old, 16 P.S. § 1220-B. It strains credulity to believe that the Coroner’s Office did not possess the name of the decedent, under these circumstances, prior to the submission of the Request. Notably, there is nothing in the record indicating that the decedent was unidentified during this timeframe. For these reasons, the

evidence submitted by the County does not prove that no responsive records existed at the time of the Request.¹

Finally, the OOR would be remiss if it did not acknowledge the tragic and heartbreaking nature of this situation. However, as sad as this case is, the Legislature considered situations like this into when it declared that certain coroner records are public and are to be released. The name of the decedent is one such piece of information. Because the RTKL is clear that the name of a deceased individual is public, without consideration to the type of record the information may be contained within, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(20), the County is directed to provide the requested name.²

3. The OOR declines to make a finding of bad faith

The Requester presents a claim concerning the County's actions in regard to the instant Request and appeal, as well as general concerns about the denial of what the Requester feels is a public record. While the OOR may make findings of bad faith, only the courts have the authority to impose sanctions on agencies. *See generally* 65 P.S. § 67.1304(a). Under the RTKL, a finding of bad faith is appropriate where an agency refuses to comply with its statutory duties under the RTKL. *Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Pa. Dep't of Corr.*, 243 A.3d 19, 28-29 (Pa. 2020); *California Univ. of Pa. v. Bradshaw*, 210 A.3d 1134 (Pa. Commw. Unpub. 2021) *appeal denied* 2019 PA LEXIS (Pa. 2019); *Office of the Dist. Atty. of Phila. v. Bagwell*, 155 A.3d 1119 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2017).

In the instant matter, we respectfully decline to make a finding of bad faith. This is not to say that we are finding that the County has acted in good faith; instead, we defer to the judgment

¹ Notwithstanding the above, we note the County had the option to simply provide the information at any time during the appeal.

² To the extent that the County argues that the name of a deceased minor is exempt under 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30), we note that such an interpretation is inconsistent with the Coroner's Act, which mandates disclosure of coroner records without consideration of the decedent's age.

of a reviewing court in this instance to determine whether the facts before us, or after further development of the record, warrant a finding of bad faith. We note that the County engaged in a timely response to the Request, provided a detailed final response and fully participated on appeal, and a finding of bad faith is typically reserved only for an egregious or blatant violation of the RTKL.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **granted**, and the County is required to provide the requested information 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 Lancaster 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.³ 65 P.S. § 67.1303. All documents or communications following the issuance of this Final Determination shall be sent to oor-postfd@pa.gov. This Final Determination shall be placed on the OOR website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: December 4, 2023

/s/ Bandy L. Jarosz

BANDY L. JAROSZ, ESQ.
APPEALS OFFICER

Sent to: Jack Panyard (via portal only)
Jacquelyn E. Pfursich, Esq. (via portal only)
Tammy Bender (via portal only)

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

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC ACCESS POLICY

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

/s/ Kevin J. McKeon

Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. PA ID No. 30428

Melissa A. Chapaska, Esq. PA ID No. 319449

Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP

100 North Tenth Street

Harrisburg, PA 17101

Tel: (717) 236-1300

kjmckeon@hmslegal.com

machapaska@hmslegal.com

Attorneys for Lancaster County

DATED: January 3, 2024

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am on this day serving the foregoing document upon the persons and in the manner indicated below:

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL

Office of Open Records
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Plaza Level
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Jack Panyard
LancasterOnline - LNP
101 N. Queen Street, Floor 2
Lancaster, PA 17603
Respondents

/s/ Kevin J. McKeon

Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. PA ID No. 30428
Melissa A. Chapaska, Esq. PA ID No. 319449
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP
100 North Tenth Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
Tel: (717) 236-1300
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com
machapaska@hmslegal.com

Attorneys for Lancaster County

DATED: January 3, 2024