



FINAL DETERMINATION

DATE ISSUED AND MAILED: September 30, 2026

IN RE: *Kasumi Eto v. Armstrong School District*, OOR Dkt. AP 2026-4163

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** because:

The OOR lacks jurisdiction to consider this appeal. The appeal filing indicates that the records request and appeal were transmitted from, and Kasumi Eto resides, outside the United States.¹ There is no evidence that the individual is a “person that is a legal resident of the United States” who is capable of being a requester under the RTKL. 65 P.S. § 67.102; *see also John Doe v. Pa. Dep’t of Comm. and Econ. Dev.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2024-0543, 2024 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 506. As such, the OOR finds that Kasumi Eto does not meet the definition of a “requester” under the RTKL. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(a)(1) (authorizing “the requester” to file an appeal). Accordingly, the OOR lacks jurisdiction over this matter.

For this reason, the School District is not required to take any further action. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, you may appeal or petition for review with the Armstrong 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. 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.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>.

Issued by:

/s/ *Joshua T. Young*

Senior Deputy Chief Counsel
Joshua T. Young, Esq.

Sent to: Kasumi Eto; Agency Open Records Officer, Armstrong School District

¹ More specifically, in the appeal filing, Kasumi Eto states that access to the OOR’s e-file portal system and international mail were not possible due to safety concerns. Furthermore, Kasumi Eto incorrectly states that a requester need not verify their residency when filing a RTKL request; however, as further explained above, a requester must be a legal resident of the United States. Additionally, the Requester failed to provide a copy of the School District’s final response; therefore, the appeal is also insufficient. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(a)(1).

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