



FINAL DETERMINATION

DATE ISSUED AND MAILED: September 14, 2026

IN RE: *David Oris v. Pennsylvania State Police*, OOR Dkt. AP 2026-3536

Upon review of the appeal filed with the Office of Open Records (“OOR”) to the above-referenced docket number, it is determined that the appeal is **DISMISSED**:

On August 27, 2026, the OOR issued an Order notifying David Oris (“Requester”) that the appeal was deficient because it failed to include a copy of the Request. The OOR informed the Requester that the document was required to cure the deficiency and directed the Requester to file a copy of the Request by September 10, 2026, pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.1303(b). However, to date, the Requester has failed to comply with the OOR’s Order and, without this document, the OOR lacks sufficient clarity to allow the OOR to adjudicate the matter.¹ Additionally, the OOR would be unable to present a complete record on appeal to an appellate court as required by Section 1303(b) of the RTKL. As the Requester has failed to comply with the OOR’s Order, this matter is **dismissed**.

For this reason, the PSP is not required to take any further action. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, either party may appeal or petition for review with 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. 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>.²

Issued by:

/s/ Joshua T. Young

JOSHUA T. YOUNG
SENIOR DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL

Sent to: David Oris (via USPS);
William Rozier, AORO (via E-File Portal)

¹ On September 10, 2026, the Requester submitted correspondence objecting to the PSP’s extension notice. However, the Requester did not provide a copy of the Request; therefore, the Requester did not satisfy the Deficiency Order. Without the Request, it is unclear what records were requested and would be at issue in the appeal, particularly when the Requester only generally describes the Request on his appeal statement.

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

