



pennsylvania

OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS

FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

:

**REBECCA WRIGHT,
Requester**

:

:

:

:

v.

:

Docket No.: AP 2026-1601

:

**ROYERSFORD BOROUGH
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Respondent**

:

:

:

:

On April 15, 2026, Rebecca Wright (“Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to the Royersford Borough Police Department (“Department”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, seeking a citation from and video and body cam footage of a specified traffic stop. On April 21, 2026, the Department denied the Request, stating the records are exempt from disclosure under the RTKL’s criminal investigative records exemption. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16) and Act 22 of 2017. On April 21, 2026, the Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”).

The Department is a local law enforcement agency, and the Request seeks records concerning an alleged criminal matter in the possession of the Department. The OOR does not have jurisdiction to hear appeals related to criminal investigative records held by local law

enforcement agencies. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.503(d)(2).¹ Instead, appeals involving records alleged to be criminal investigative records held by a local law enforcement agency are to be heard by an appeals officer designated by the local district attorney. *See id.* Accordingly, the appeal is hereby transferred to the Appeals Officer for the Montgomery County District Attorney’s Office (“District Attorney’s Office”) to determine whether the record relates to a criminal investigation.² A copy of this final order and the appeal filed by the Requester will be sent to the Appeals Officer for the District Attorney’s Office.

For the foregoing reasons, the Requester’s appeal is **dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in part and transferred in part** to the Appeals Officer for the District Attorney’s Office. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, either 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.³ 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 website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

¹ Insofar as the appeal seeks body camera and other similar footage of Department police officers, the RTKL does not apply to audio and video recordings made by a law enforcement agency; rather, there is a separate procedure governing access to these records. *See* 42 Pa.C.S. §§ 67A03-67A05. Therefore, the appeal as it relates to body camera and dash cam footage is dismissed.

² The Commonwealth Court has noted that the OOR has the authority to transfer an appeal to “where [a requester] should have initially appealed.” *See Phila. Dist. Attorney’s Office v. Williams*, 204 A.3d 1062, *4 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2019) (“... [A]lthough the onus for appealing from an RTKL denial to the proper appeals officer is on the requester, the OOR did not violate the law or any procedure in redirecting the appeal in this case”).

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

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: April 23, 2026

/s/ Joshua T. Young

SENIOR DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL
JOSHUA T. YOUNG, ESQ.

Sent via e-file portal to: Requester; Agency Open Records Officer; Sent via email to the Appeals Officer for the Montgomery County District Attorney's Office