

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 identified 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 all 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).

On May 1, 2026, the PSP submitted the attestation, made subject to the penalties set forth in 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities, of William Rozier (“Rozier Attestation”), the PSP’s Open Records Officer (“AORO”), who attests that he was present in the meeting where the \$100 fee was set, but that no memorialization or recording of that decision occurred, and therefore no records responsive to the Request exist in the PSP’s possession, custody or control.¹ The Requester, in turn, has submitted neither argument nor evidence that such records

¹ Under the RTKL, a sworn affidavit or statement made under the 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. Office of Open Records*, 992 A.2d 907, 909 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010). In the absence of any evidence that the County has acted in bad faith or that the requested records exist, “the averments in [the Parkes Attestation] should be accepted as true.” *McGowan v. Pa. Dep’t of Env’tl Prot.*, 103 A.3d 374, 382-83 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014) (citing *Office of the Governor v. Scolforo*, 65 A.3d 1095, 1103 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013)).

do, in fact, exist. *See Pa. Dep't of Health v. Mahon*, 283 A.3d 929, 936 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2022) (finding that, in the absence of countervailing evidence establishing that the agency acted in bad faith or that the requested records exist, averments of nonexistence should be accepted as true). Based on the evidence provided, therefore, the PSP has met its burden of proving that the requested records do not exist within the PSP's possession, custody or control. *Hodges v. Pa. Dep't of Health*, 29 A.3d 1190, 1192 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011).

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **denied**, and the PSP is not required to take any further action. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal or petition for review to the Commonwealth Court. 65 P.S. § 67.1301(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 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 website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: May 22, 2026

/s/ Jordan Davis
Jordan C. Davis, Esq.
Deputy Chief Counsel

Delivered via e-file portal to: Daniel Pennock, William Rozier

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