

pennsylvania
OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS
FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**HAYES HUNT,
Requester**

v.

**OXFORD BOROUGH,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No: AP 2026-3291

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

On July 23, 2026, Hayes Hunt, Esq. (“Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to Oxford Borough (“Borough”) pursuant to the RTKL, 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, seeking “[a]ny and all records relating to, investigating, or stemming from the July 3, 2025 notice of Street or Sidewalk Repair E-ALERT by April Placchetti pertaining to the sidewalk located at or near [address omitted] including but not limited to any communications, incident reports, investigative files, notices, work orders, or invoices.” On July 24, 2026, the Borough denied the Request, arguing that it does not have any responsive records in its possession, custody or control.

On August 11, 2026, the Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging the denial and stating grounds for disclosure. The OOR invited both parties to

supplement the record and directed the Borough to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in the appeal. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On August 20, 2026, the Borough notified the OOR that it provided the Requester with responsive records. That same day, noting that the Borough provided responsive records to the Requester, the OOR asked the Requester whether his Request has been satisfied and whether he will be seeking to withdraw the instant appeal or, in the alternative, to identify the remaining issues to be decided on appeal. To date, the Requester has not responded to this correspondence. Therefore, because there is no longer any case or controversy for the OOR to adjudicate, and the Borough has provided records responsive to the Request, 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 Chester 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 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.¹ 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>.

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

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: August 27, 2026

/s/ Lyle Hartranft

APPEALS OFFICER
LYLE HARTRANFT, ESQ.

Sent via e-file portal to: Hayes Hunt, Esq.; Agency AORO; Stacey Fuller, Esq.