



FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**ATILLO BARREDA,
Requester**

v.

**PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN
RELATIONS COMMISSION,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No.: AP 2026-2883

On May 19, 2026, Atillo Barreda (“Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission (“Commission” or “PHRC”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, stating:

For the date range April 18, 2026 through May 19, 2026, I request copies of existing PHRC records concerning the public allegation that PHRC employee Alana M. Burman sent an unsolicited insulting text message to Dr. Sadaf Jaffer on or about May 18, 2026 at approximately 6:34 AM. The public post is <https://x.com/sadafjaffer/status/2056391023010492810?s=46>. The screenshotted text message reads: “I love how poorly your hate is aging you :)”

Please include records in the possession, custody, or control of PHRC, including emails, email attachments, memoranda, letters, meeting notes, calendar entries, Teams/Slack/chat messages, text messages or phone logs if maintained as agency records, case-management notes, complaint/referral records, investigation records, disciplinary records, policy-review records, and records of external referrals, to the extent such records are public and not exempt.

Search terms and subjects

Please search for records containing or concerning any of the following: Alana Burman; Alana M. Burman; aburman@pa.gov; Sadaf Jaffer; Dr. Sadaf Jaffer;

@sadafjaffer; Muslim; Arab; Palestinian; Palestine; text message; personal cell; hate is aging you; the X post URL above; PHRC public response; employee misconduct; harassment; discrimination; ethics; discipline; investigation; referral; recusal; mediation; policy; intergovernmental affairs.

Specific categories requested

1. Communications among PHRC staff, leadership, commissioners, counsel, human resources, communications staff, or Commonwealth officials concerning the allegation, the X post, Dr. Sadaf Jaffer, or Alana M. Burman;
2. Records reflecting PHRC receipt, review, handling, investigation, referral, or disposition of any complaint, inquiry, report, or concern about the alleged text message or related public conduct;
3. Records reflecting any PHRC public statement, internal talking points, press response, social media response, constituent-response language, or communications plan concerning the allegation;
4. Records reflecting any ethics, employee-conduct, harassment, discrimination, use-of-position, social media, public communications, mediation-conflict, or use-of-personal-contact-information review concerning the allegation;
5. Current PHRC or Commonwealth policies, manuals, guidance, training materials, or codes of conduct governing employee harassment, discriminatory conduct, social-media conduct, use of personal contact information, use of public position, conflicts/recusal, mediation impartiality, and reporting or investigating employee misconduct; and
6. Records identifying the office, officer, or process responsible for investigating alleged misconduct by PHRC employees, including routing instructions for complaints involving senior PHRC staff....

On July 9, 2026,¹ following a thirty-day extension, 65 P.S. § 67.902(b), the Commission partially denied the Request,² stating that certain records were withheld or redacted as exempt noncriminal investigative records, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(17), records related to internal,

¹ Because the response was not issued within the thirty-day period and there is no indication in the appeal record that an additional extension of time was agreed to by the Requester, the Request was deemed denied on June 26, 2026. See 65 P.S. § 67.902. However, the appeal is timely because it was filed before the July 20, 2026 deadline. See 65 P.S. § 67.1101(a)(1).

² The Department provided responsive records, as well as an exemption log.

predecisional deliberations, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(10)(i)(A), or protected by the attorney-client privilege.

On July 16, 2026, the Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging the partial denial and stating grounds for disclosure.³ The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the Commission to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in the appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On July 28, 2026, the Commission submitted a position statement reiterating its grounds for the partial denial. In support of its position, the Commission submitted the attestations of its Deputy Director, Desiree Chang (“Chang Attestation”), its Director of Human Resources, Warren Bubb (“Bubb Attestation”), its Open Records Officer and Administrative Officer 2, Debbie Walters (“Walter Attestation”), and its Director of Communications, Amanda Brothman Jumper (“Jumper Attestation”). Each of the Commission’s attestations describe its search for records responsive to the Request. Additionally, the Chang and Bubb Attestations address the records withheld as related to a noncriminal investigation. The Walter Attestation explains the Commission’s authority to investigate complaints filed regarding discriminatory practices. Finally, the Jumper Attestation addresses the records withheld as related to the Commission’s internal, predecisional deliberations.

On that same day, the Requester provided a submission in support of the appeal. The Requester seeks *in camera* review of the records identified as Bates Number 20260056030 and Bates Number 20260056036-37.

³ The Requester granted the OOR a thirty-day extension to issue a final determination. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(b)(1) (“Unless the requester agrees otherwise, the appeals officer shall make a final determination which shall be mailed to the requester and the agency within 30 days of receipt of the appeal filed under subsection (a).”)

On September 11, 2026, in response to the OOR's request for clarification, the Commission provided the attestation of Commission council, Melissa Lovett, Esq. ("Lovett Attestation"), and the supplemental attestation of Debbie Walters ("Walter Supplemental Attestation"). The Walters Supplemental Attestation addresses the record identified as Bates number 20260056030 and addresses whether it contains any severable, factual information. The Lovett Attestation addresses the Commission's basis for withholding the record identified as Bates Number 20260056036-37 as privileged attorney-client communications.

On that same day, the Requester provided a supplemental submission in support of the appeal and reiterated the request for *in camera* review of Bates number 20260056030.

On September 22, 2026, the OOR sought an extension of time to conduct *in camera* review of Bates No 20260056030. To date, the Requester has not responded to the OOR or granted the requested extension.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Commission is a Commonwealth agency subject to the RTKL. 65 P.S. § 67.301. Records in the possession of a Commonwealth agency are presumed to be public, unless exempt under the RTKL or other law or protected by a privilege, judicial order or decree. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.305. As an agency subject to the RTKL, the Commission is required to demonstrate, "by a preponderance of the evidence," that records are exempt from public access. 65 P.S. § 67.708(a)(1). Preponderance of the evidence has been defined as "such proof as leads the factfinder...to find that the existence of a contested fact is more probable than its nonexistence." *Pa. State Troopers Ass'n v. Scolforo*, 18 A.3d 435, 439 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011) (quoting *Pa. Dep't of Transp. v. Agric. Lands Condemnation Approval Bd.*, 5 A.3d 821, 827 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010)). Likewise, "[t]he burden of proving a record does not exist...is placed on the agency responding to

the right-to-know request.” *Hodges v. Pa. Dep’t of Health*, 29 A.3d 1190, 1192 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011). While the Requester sought *in camera* review of the withheld records Bates numbered 20260056030 and Bates numbered 20260056036-37, the PHRC has presented a sufficient factual record to enable the OOR to adjudicate the matter concerning Bates Number 20260056036-37 on the merits. Therefore, the request for *in camera* review concerning Bates Number 20260056036-37 is denied. Additionally, regarding Bates No 20260056030, because there is no mechanism to extend or toll the OOR’s time period to issue its final determination absent the Requester’s agreement and because the Requester did not consent to an extension of time in this matter, the OOR could not conduct *in camera* review of Bates No 20260056030 or further supplement the record in any way.⁴

1. The appeal is moot in part

During the appeal, the Commission provided additional records or additional unredacted portions of records responsive to the Request. *See* Commission Exhibits 5-7, 12-13. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed as moot as to the records provided. *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”); *Kutztown Univ. of Pa. v. Bollinger*, 217 A.3d 931 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2019).

2. The Commission demonstrated that it properly withheld exempt noncriminal investigative records

The Commission argues that it properly withheld certain records related to a noncriminal investigation it conducted. *See* 65 P.S. §§ 67.708(b)(17).

Section 708(b)(17) of the RTKL exempts from disclosure records of an agency “relating to a noncriminal investigation,” including “[c]omplaints submitted to an agency,” “[i]nvestigative

⁴ *Id.*

materials, notes, correspondence and reports,” and “[a] record that, if disclosed, would ... [r]eveal the institution, progress or result of an agency investigation....” 65 P.S. §§ 67.708(b)(17)(i)-(ii), (vi)(A). For this exemption to apply, an agency must demonstrate that “a systematic or searching inquiry, a detailed examination, or an official probe” was conducted regarding a noncriminal matter. *See Pa. Dep’t of Health v. Office of Open Records*, 4 A.3d 803, 810-11 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010). Further, the inquiry, examination, or probe must be “conducted as part of an agency’s official duties.” *Id.* at 814. An official probe only applies to noncriminal investigations conducted by agencies acting within their legislatively granted factfinding and investigative powers. *See Pa. Dep’t of Pub. Welfare v. Chawaga*, 91 A.3d 257 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014). To hold otherwise would “craft a gaping exemption under which any governmental information-gathering could be shielded from disclosure.” *Id.* at 259.

Here, the Walters Attestation explains the Commission’s authority to investigate complaints filed regarding discriminatory practices, stating that the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act (“PHRA”) gives the Commission the legislative authority to investigate complaints filed regarding discriminatory practices. *See* 43 P.S. §§ 957(f), 959(a)-(b); Walters Attestation, ¶¶ 2-3. In further support of the Commission’s position, the attestations show that the Commission received a complaint about employee conduct and that the Commission’s Deputy Director and Director of Human Resources investigated the complaint. *See* Chang Attestation, ¶ 2; Bubb Attestation, ¶ 2; Walters Attestation, ¶ 4; Jumper Attestation, ¶ 2. More specifically, the Chang Attestation states that Director Chang, along with the Director Bubb, ...[investigated the] allegations against Director Alana Burman regarding an alleged text message she sent to a non-Commonwealth employed individual.” *See* Chang Attestation, ¶ 2; *see also* Bubb Attestation, ¶ 2. The Chang Attestation also affirms that the withheld records relate to the investigation of the

discrimination complaint and to the “messages provided to the Capitol Police to investigate threats made toward Director Burman.” *See id.*, ¶ 3.

Additionally, the Walter Attestation identifies the withheld records as the discrimination complaint submitted the Commission[,], along with investigative materials, notes, correspondence, and reports[;]” and the Chang Attestation identifies the withheld records as “witness statements, Director Burman’s telephone records, and written complaints against Director Burman.” *See* Walter Attestation, ¶ 6; Chang Attestation, ¶ 3; *see also* Bubb Attestation, ¶ 3. Finally, both the Chang Attestation and the Bubb Attestation state that release of the withheld records “would disclose the identity of confidential sources who submitted complaints to the Commission[,] disclose the result of this discrimination investigation[,]” and “disclose the identities of [the] individuals who made threats toward Director Burman and were referred for investigation.” *See* Chang Attestation, ¶ 4; Bubb Attestation, ¶ 4.

Therefore, based on the evidence presented, the Commission demonstrated that the records, including attachments, Bates numbered 20260056020, 20260056050, 20260056058, 20260056004, and 20260056027 were properly withheld or redacted as noncriminal investigative records. *See* 65 P.S. §§ 67.708(b)(17)(i)-(ii), (vi)(A); *see also* *Glenn v. Pa. Human Relations Comm’n*, OOR Dkt. AP 2025-0426, 2025 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 622.

3. The Commission demonstrated that it withheld certain records as reflecting its internal predecisional deliberations but did not show that one record is wholly exempt

The Commission argues that it properly withheld certain records as reflecting its internal predecisional deliberations. The Requester’s argument focuses primarily on the email and its attachment, identified as Bates Number 20260056030 and “Staff Impersonation.docx[.]” The Requester argues that the Commission has not demonstrated that the attachment is deliberative and

that the Commission failed to show that the attachment does not contain severable, factual information.

Section 708(b)(10)(i)(A) of the RTKL, which exempts from public disclosure a record that reflects:

The internal, predecisional deliberations of an agency, its members, employees or officials or predecisional deliberations between agency members, employees or officials and members, employees or officials of another agency, including predecisional deliberations relating to a budget recommendation, legislative proposal, legislative amendment, contemplated or proposed policy or course of action or any research, memos or other documents used in the predecisional deliberations.

65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(10)(i)(A). To withhold a record under Section 708(b)(10)(i)(A), an agency must show: 1) “[t]he records must...be ‘internal’ to a governmental agency”; 2) the deliberations reflected must be predecisional, i.e., before a decision on an action; and 3) the contents must be deliberative in character, i.e., pertaining to proposed action. *See Kaplin v. Lower Merion Twp.*, 19 A.3d 1209, 1214 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011). Additionally, to prove that a record is exempt under this section, an agency must explain how the information withheld reflects or shows the deliberative process in which an agency engages during its decision-making. *See Twp. of Worcester v. Office of Open Records*, 129 A.3d 44, 61 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2016). Further, factual material contained in otherwise deliberative documents is required to be disclosed if it is severable from its context. *McGowan v. Pa. Dep’t of Env’t Prot.*, 103 A.3d 374, 382-83 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014). However, factual material can still qualify as deliberative information when its disclosure “‘would be tantamount to the publication of the [agency’s] evaluation and analysis.’” *McGowan*, 103 A.3d at 387 (quoting *Trentadue v. Integrity Communication*, 501 F.3d 1215, 1228-29 (10th Cir. 2007)).

In support of the Commission’s position, the Jumper Attestation identifies the redacted records, identified by Bates numbers 20260056038-39, 20260056030, 20260056028-29, 20260056040-42, and 20260056044, as emails where she is either the sender or recipient. *See* Jumper Attestation, ¶ 3. Therefore, based on the Commission’s evidence, the Commission has established that the redacted emails are internal. The Jumper Attestation also states that the “responsive records contain content that is deliberative in nature and comprise recommendations, advice, and opinions intended to assist the Commission in its decision-making process prior to any final action being taken” related to “the Commission’s public response to complaints against Director Alana Burman.” *See* Jumper Attestation, ¶¶ 2, 4. In further support of the Commission’s position concerning Bates Number 20260056030, the Walters Supplemental Attestation identifies the record as “an email from Commission Communications Director Amanda Brothman-Jumper to the following Commission employees: Alana Burman-Director of Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and Mediation; and Deputy Director Desiree Chang dated May 18, 2026, labeled First Draft of Statement[,]” containing “one attachment labeled Staff Impersonation.” *See* Walters Supplemental Attestation, ¶ 2. The Walters Supplemental Attestation explains that the responsive transmittal email “contains five sentences all of which specifically relate to...[its attached] draft document[,]” entitled “Staff Impersonation[.]”⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 5. Additionally, the Walters Supplemental Attestation reiterates that the email contains “recommendations, advice, and opinions intended to assist the Commission in its decision-making process prior to any final action being taken.” *Id.*, ¶

⁵ The Walters Supplemental Attestation states that the Commission “did not provide Requester with the email.” *See id.*, ¶ 4. The Requester argues that the Walters Supplemental Attestation misstates the production of the email because the Commission provided the record with the five sentences redacted and, thus, the OOR should not rely on the attestation because it is inaccurate. However, it is clear from the entirety of the appeal record that the email was provided with redactions made to the body.

3. Finally, the Walters Supplemental Attestation confirms that body of the email “does not contain any severable or factual information.” *Id.*, ¶ 5.

Turning to the attached draft document, “Staff Impersonation[,]” it is clear from the appeal record, the Jumper Attestation, and the Walters Supplemental Attestation that this document is a draft of the Commission’s public response to complaints against Director Burman that was circulated between the Commission executive staff identified in the Walters Attestation for or review and, possibly, comment or edits prior to issuing. Thus, the attachment is predecisional and deliberative. *See Hatziefstathiou v. Chester County*, OOR Dkt. AP 2024-0172, 2024 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 931 (finding the circulation and consideration of proposed language for press releases and draft responses to press inquiries are predecisional and deliberative in nature). Nevertheless, neither the Jumper Attestation nor the Walters Attestation address whether the attachment contains severable, factual information. Therefore, based on the evidence presented and the plain language of the Request, the Commission demonstrated that the records Bates numbered 20260056038-39, 20260056030, 20260056028-29, 20260056040-42, and 20260056044 were properly redacted or withheld because each reflects the Commission’s internal, predecisional deliberation concerning the Commission’s public response to complaints against Director Burman. However, because the Commission did not show that the attachment to Bates Number 20260056030 does not contain severable, factual information, the Commission must either provide the document with redactions or provide an attestation affirming that any factual information contained therein is inextricably entwined with the deliberative information.

4. The Commission demonstrated that it properly withheld privileged attorney client communications

The Commission argues that it properly withheld one record, identified as Bates Number 20260056036-37, as a privileged attorney-client communication. The Requester argues that the Commission did not meet its burden of proving that the record was properly withheld.

Although the RTKL excludes records subject to a privilege from the definition of “public record,”⁶ an agency may not rely on a bald assertion that the attorney-client privilege applies. *See Mezzacappa v. Northampton Cnty.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2022-2617, 2023 PA O.O.R.D. 240. Rather, an agency must demonstrate that: 1) the asserted holder of the privilege is or sought to become a client; 2) the person to whom the communication was made is a member of the bar of a court, or his subordinate; 3) the communication relates to a fact of which the attorney was informed by his client, without the presence of strangers, for the purpose of securing either an opinion of law, legal services or assistance in a legal matter, and not for the purpose of committing a crime or tort; and 4) the privilege has been claimed and is not waived by the client. *See Bousamra v. Excelsa Health*, 210 A.3d 967, 983 (Pa. 2019) (internal citations omitted). “[A]fter an agency establishes the privilege was properly invoked under the first three prongs, the party challenging invocation of the privilege must prove waiver under the fourth prong.” *Office of the Governor v. Davis*, 122 A.3d 1185, 1192 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014) (citing *id.*). The attorney-client privilege protects only those disclosures necessary to obtain informed legal advice, where the disclosure might not have occurred absent the privilege, and where the client’s goal is to obtain legal advice. *See Joe v. Prison Health Services, Inc.*, 782 A.2d 24 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2001).

In support of the Commission’s position, the Lovett Attestation identifies Bates Number 20260056036-37 as an email communication “sent by Commission Interim Chief Counsel Stephanie Chapman to Commission Communications Director Amanda Brothman-Jumper and

⁶ See 65 P.S. § 67.102.

Commission Deputy Director Desiree Chang” and states that the email “contains legal advice...regarding a staff email to be sent to Commission employees.” *See* Lovett Attestation, ¶ 4. Additionally, the Lovett Attestation verifies that Attorney Chapman is a member of the Pennsylvania Bar, that Attorney Chapman, as Interim Chief Counsel, is the Commission’s attorney, and “that the communications were made between a Commission attorney and their client without the presence of third parties.” *Id.*, ¶ 5. The Lovett Attestation further confirms that “the privilege has not been waived by the Commission” and the Requester has not provided any evidence to the contrary. Accordingly, based on the evidence presented, the Commission demonstrated that it properly withheld Bates Number 20260056036-37 as containing privileged attorney-client communication. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.305(a)(2).

5. The Commission demonstrated that it conducted a good faith search for records responsive to the Request

The Commission argues that it conducted a good faith search for records responsive to the Request and that all nonexempt records located were provided to the Requester either in response to the Request or on appeal. The Requester argues that Commission has not demonstrated that it conducted a good faith search because the Commission’s “production [of records] identifies communications and attachments involving custodians and systems not covered by the submitted attestations.”

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 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 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).

In support of the Commission's position, the Chang, Bubbs, Walters, and Jumper Attestations each describe the search for records responsive to the Request, affirm that each affiant personally conducted the search for the records for which he or she has been identified as the custodian, and identify the records located. *See* Chang Attestation; Bubbs Attestation, ¶ 2; Walters Attestation, ¶ 2; Jumper Attestation, ¶ 2. Furthermore, the Requester has not provided evidence to contradict the Commission's Attestations. The Requester argues that "[n]o [Commission] attestation establishes a search of Alana Burman's account, Chad Lassiter's account, Sherwood Goodenough's account, Stephanie Chapman's account, Khara Bowman's account, Microsoft Teams, official text messages, calendars, shared drives, website/CMS records, Commonwealth-issued devices, or other repositories reasonably likely to contain the requested communications and final public-response records." However, the Requester does not show that any of those other individuals possess additional responsive records, that responsive records likely exist at the other locations, and the record provides no concrete reason to believe that any other custodians of such records exist. Therefore, the Requester's unsworn statements are insufficient to call into question the agency's attestations. Moreover, an agency's evidence does not need to detail every part of

the search conducted as long as the agency provides enough evidence to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that it conducted a search reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents.⁷ *See Burr*, 2021 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 750; *Mollick*, 32 A.3d at 875; *see also, e.g., Prickett and Ivy Mill, LLC. v. Ivyland Borough*, OOR Dkt. AP 2025-3876, 2026 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 749.

Accordingly, based on the evidence presented, the Commission demonstrated that it conducted a good faith search for records responsive to the Request and that the nonexempt records were provided to the Requester. *See Hodges*, 29 A.3d at 1192; *see also Campbell v. Pa. Interscholastic Athletic Ass’n*, 268 A.3d 502 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2021) (noting that an agency need only prove the nonexistence of records by a preponderance of the evidence, the lowest evidentiary standard, and is tantamount to a “more likely than not” inquiry); *Pa. Dep’t of Health v. Mahon*, 283 A.3d 929 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2022) (concluding that, in the absence of countervailing evidence, an agency may satisfy its burden of proving a record does not exist by submitting “either an unsworn attestation by the person who searched for the record or a sworn affidavit of nonexistence of the record”).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **granted in part, denied in part and dismissed as moot in part**, and, within thirty days, the Commission is required to either provide a copy of the attachment, “Staff Impersonation.docx[,]” included in Bates Number 20260056030, with any several, factual information unredacted, or an attestation affirming the absence of severable factual information. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing

⁷ Notably, the OOR makes no determinations as to whether records should exist, as our inquiry is limited to whether records are “in existence and in possession of the...agency at the time of the right-to-know request.” *Moore*, 992 A.2d at 909; *see also* 65 P.S. § 67.705.

date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal 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.⁸ 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>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: September 30, 2026

/s/ Erika Similo

ERIKA SIMILO
APPEALS OFFICER

Sent via portal to: Atillo Barreda
 Melissa A. Lovett, Esq.
 Debbie L. Walters

⁸ *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).