



pennsylvania
OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS

FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF	:	
	:	
EDWARD EVANS,	:	
Requester	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No.: AP 2026-1083
	:	(Consolidated appeal of OOR Dkt. Nos.
LANSFORD BOROUGH,	:	2026-1084, 2026-1085, 2026-1086, 2026-
Respondent	:	1087)

The Office of Open Records (“OOR”) received the above-captioned appeals under the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.* For the following reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

On March 12, 2026, Edward Evans (“Requester”) submitted five requests (“Request” or “Requests”) to Lansford Borough (“Borough”) pursuant to the RTKL, seeking correspondence including the words “Evans,” “constable,” “uniforms,” “weapons,” “firearms,” and/or “guns” for the past six months; any ordinances concerning recording video/audio on Borough property; and any policies regarding body worn cameras, dash cameras, or the Borough security camera system.

As the Requester did not receive the Borough’s responses within five business days of the Requests, the Requester claimed that the Requests were deemed denied. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.901.

On March 20, 2026, the Requester filed an appeal with the OOR, challenging the Borough’s deemed denial. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.901. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the

record and directed the Borough to notify any third parties of their ability to participate in this appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On April 2, 2026, the Borough submitted copies of e-mails sent to Requester on March 18, 2026, in which responses to his Requests were sent. Upon review of the e-mails, it was established that Requester never received the responses because the Borough inadvertently misspelled Requester's e-mail address. The Borough was asked to resend the responses to all five of the Requests to the correct e-mail address, and Requester was asked to review the responses and identify if any issues remained on appeal by April 8, 2026. The Borough confirmed through submission of new e-mails dated April 7, 2026, that it sent each of the final responses to the correct e-mail address. After not receiving any response from Requester regarding any remaining outstanding issues, on April 9, 2026, the OOR consolidated the five appeals and asked Requester to indicate whether he wished to continue with his appeals by April 13, 2026, or the appeals would be considered satisfied. To date, no response has been received.¹ Therefore, because the Borough has now provided responsive records to the Requester and Requester has failed to raise any challenges to the responses, the appeal is **dismissed as moot**. See *Chester Water Auth. v. Pa. Dep't of Cmty. & Econ. Dev.*, 249 A.3d 1106, 1114 (Pa. 2021) (finding that a matter was settled by provision of records and, thus, "the controversy has been mooted").

The file is now closed and no further action will be taken. This Final Determination is binding on the parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, either party may appeal to the Carbon 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 according to court rules as per 65 P.S. § 67.1303, but as the quasi-judicial

¹ Requester accessed the E-File Portal on April 9, 2026, indicating he reviewed the OOR's correspondence.

tribunal adjudicating this matter, the OOR is not a proper party to any appeal and should not be named as a party.² 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: April 16, 2026

/s/ Julie Sodl

APPEALS OFFICER
JULIE SODL

Sent via E-File Portal to: Edward Evans
Maria Ahner, AORO

² See *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).