

WES MOORE
GOVERNOR

ARUNA MILLER
LT. GOVERNOR



MICHELE L. COHEN, ESQ.
SAMUEL G. ENCARNACION
DEBRA LYNN GARDNER
NIVEK M. JOHNSON
DEBORAH MOORE-CARTER

STATE OF MARYLAND
PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT COMPLIANCE BOARD

PIACB 24-27

March 6, 2024

Office of the State's Attorney for Baltimore City, Custodian
James Alford, Complainant

In August of 2023, complainant James Alford sent three Public Information Act ("PIA") requests to the Office of the State's Attorney for Baltimore City ("BCSAO") seeking numerous records related to criminal domestic violence matters that were then pending in the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore City. The BCSAO ultimately responded by advising that it did not have records responsive to the complainant's requests. The complainant challenges those responses, alleging that the BCSAO does in fact have responsive records and has wrongfully denied inspection of those records. The BCSAO defends its responses to the complainant's PIA requests, maintaining that it searched thoroughly and found no responsive records to provide. As explained below, we find no violation of the PIA.

Background

The complainant's PIA requests to the BCSAO were detailed and very specific. Thus, we have included them here in full, with emphases on certain portions that more explicitly indicate the precise records that the complainant sought. First, on Saturday, August 12, 2023, at 1:16 p.m., the complainant wrote:

My name is James Alford and I would like to make a public information act request for the following records and information.

The first record/information I would like to request relates to case 4B02440449, the Maryland vs Louis Leibowitz. ASA Kathleen Copsey indicated that on 10/4/2022, an attorney [sic] from the domestic violence unit made an entry into the domestic violence unit's files that indicated that I, James Alford, had called up the unit and indicated that I did not want to proceed with this case.

This information is false, and *I would like the records pertaining to this entry, and the name of the attorney that made this entry.*

Additionally, I would like information related to several application [sic] for statement of charges that were passed up from the commissioner's office to the Baltimore City State's Attorney's office. These were applications that I filed that have gone "missing."

I would like to know what the Baltimore City State's Attorney's Office made as a charging recommendation to the commissioners, and what the commissioners' charging decisions were, as there is no case number for any of these cases. Timothy Haven, the Director of Commissioners, indicated your office would have access to this information.

The application [sic] of statement of charges were filed on the following dates:

10/20/2022
12/30/2022
4/25/2023
6/30/2023
7/22/2023

Please let me know if you need anymore specific details for this [sic] records and information. I can include photocopies of the statement of charges filed upon request, if that would help you locate the records and information.

I would like to note that I am a "person of interest" for all the above information and records, as I am either motioned in the records, I was the victim, or somehow involved.

Very respectfully,

-James Alford

On August 15, 2023, the BCSAO sent the complainant a ten-day letter¹ advising that it had started to search for the file associated with case number 4B02440449, and that once the file was located the BCSAO would provide an estimate as to how long it would take to produce any responsive records and an estimate of any anticipated fees.

¹ See Md. Code Ann., Gen. Provisions § 4-203(b)(2), which provides that "[i]f the custodian reasonably believes that it will take more than 10 working days to produce the public record, the custodian shall indicate in writing or by electronic mail within 10 working days after receipt of the request: (i) the amount of time that the custodian anticipates it will take to produce the public record; (ii) an estimate of the range of fees that may be charged to comply with the request for public records; and (iii) the reason for the delay."

Before the BCSAO sent that ten-day letter, however, the complainant sent two more PIA requests. On August 14, 2023, at 8:18 p.m., the complainant wrote:

First, I would like to state that I appreciate the quick and transparent response pertaining my previous request.

In addition to my previous request, *I would like to request all the information that the Baltimore City State's Attorney's Office has in its possession pertaining the attached Maryland Subpoenas, and the Maryland subpoenas that were filed and domesticated in the State of California, and any other subpoenas that may have been related to me, James Alford. This includes any subpoena, return of service, entry in a court record, or document or record of any kind related to these subpoenas.* The individuals issuing them indicated that they issued them on behalf of the State of Maryland for case 4B02440449 and case 0B02440417.

I am a person of interest as I was involved in the related cases, the individuals issuing them issued them in violation of my rights and consumer protection laws, and the individuals issuing them were seeking to illegally obtain information and documents related to me.

The prosecutor that was associated with the related cases (4B02440449 and 0B02440417) for which the subpoenas were issued was ASA Kathleen Copsey.

Thank you very much for your timely and transparent responses,

-James

The complainant attached copies of completed California and Maryland subpoena forms with highlighting applied to various information in the subpoenas, e.g., the parties' names, the dates the subpoenas were issued, and the cases to which they related. Approximately twenty minutes later, on August 14, 2023, at 8:36 p.m., the complainant wrote:

Please provide *all information related to any plea bargain or deferred prosecution discussion* that ASA Kathleen Copsey (see attached) arranged with with [sic] Mr. Louis Leibowitz and his counsel as it pertains to case 4B02440449 and for him to avoid and delay prosecution. Please also provide *all information and legal justification as it pertains to ASA Kathleen Copsey and her ability to inhibit my civil rights to file a statement of charges and or report a crime to a law enforcement agency.*

I am a person of interest, as I was the victim/complainant, and per Maryland rights, I have a right to know what the details of this arrangement were, which was apparently made off the records [sic] and without my knowledge.

Very Respectfully,

-James

On August 17, 2023, the BCSAO sent a letter in response to the PIA request sent first in time on August 14, 2023—i.e., the request for records related to the California and Maryland subpoenas. The BCSAO advised that “[a]fter a thorough review of your request, the accompanying attachments, and a search of our records, we have concluded that the subpoenas you provided were not directed to or served on the Office of the State’s Attorney for Baltimore City.” Thus, the BCSAO had no responsive records to provide. The BCSAO suggested that the records were “most likely the records of the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore City and/or Google LLC,” and that if the complainant “wish[ed] to obtain the records,” then he may want to file a request with District Court of Maryland for Baltimore City or contact Google LLC. The BCSAO provided a link to information about the district court’s PIA process.

The BCSAO issued final responses to the two remaining PIA requests on September 16, 2023.² As to the request sent on August 12, for records of (1) the “entry into the domestic violence unit’s files” that indicated that the complainant did not want to proceed with the case, (2) the “charging recommendation to the commissioners” made by the BCSAO, and (3) “what the commissioners’ charging decisions were,” the BCSAO advised that it was “unable to locate any notes indicating that James Alford stated to the Domestic Violence Unit that he did not wish to proceed with Case No. 4B02440449.” Nor was the BCSAO able to locate any records responsive to the complainant’s request for records of charging recommendations or decisions. The BCSAO explained that this was “most likely because the criminal justice process in Maryland does not usually function or occur in the sequence of events [the complainant] described in [his] request.” The BCSAO provided the complainant with links to more information about Maryland’s criminal justice process, including links to the Maryland Courts website.

² Between the complainant’s August 12 PIA request and the BCSAO’s September 16 responses, the BCSAO received 32 additional PIA requests for records related to James Alford, Louis Leibowitz, and the various criminal matters set in the district court. Most of these requests contained the same level of detail and specificity as the complainant’s initial three PIA requests. One, sent on September 3, 2023, was from the complainant. The rest of the requests came from twelve purportedly different individuals. These individuals began to send their requests on August 15, 2023, the day that the BCSAO issued the ten-day letter in response to the complainant’s first PIA request. In fact, four PIA requests were sent between 9:01 p.m. and 11:39 p.m. on August 15.

Regarding the complainant's August 14 request for records of "any plea bargain or deferred prosecution discussion" that the Assistant State's Attorney ("ASA") "arranged with Mr. Louis Leibowitz and his counsel as it pertains to case 4B02440449 and for him to avoid and delay prosecution," the BCSAO advised that it was not able to locate records indicating that such a discussion took place. As to the request for records related to the ASA's "ability to inhibit [the complainant's] civil rights to file a statement of charges or report a crime," the BCSAO advised that it had no records showing that the ASA prevented him from filing charges or reporting a crime.

Dissatisfied with the BCSAO's responses, the complainant sought dispute resolution through the Public Access Ombudsman, who, on November 7, 2023, ultimately issued a final determination stating that the disputes were not resolved. The complainant then filed this complaint with our Board.

In his complaint, the complainant alleges that the BCSAO improperly denied him inspection of public records and "pretend[ed] they don't exist." The complainant contends that the "almost certainly counterfeit Maryland subpoenas" were "in the BCSAO's possession as early as December 2022," because he "literally provided a copy to several BCSAO staff in email on several occasions." In addition, the complainant states that it is his "understanding that several other individuals also provided documents to the BCSAO," and that "[t]he attorney who 'manufactured' the subpoenas indicated" to the complainant that the attorney was "issuing them on behalf of the BCSAO for a BCSAO case to aid the BCSAO." The complainant claims that the BCSAO is "in possession of some of these communications," as well as "correspondences in which the clerk of the court indicate[d] she didn't actually sign the subpoena forms."

Turning to his request for "records pertaining to" the "entry into the domestic violence unit's files that indicated that [the complainant] had called up the unit and indicated that [he] did not want to proceed with this case," the complainant alleges that he had a "live discussion with the BCSAO about [the] matter in Nov 2022 in which the document was made known." Further, the complainant alleges that when he "first spoke to the MPIA officer on the phone," the MPIA officer "informed [the complainant] he had found the exact document [the complainant] wished to inspect almost immediately, but expressed he wasn't sure if he was able to release it." Thus, the complainant argues, the BCSAO's representation in its September 16 letter that it had no responsive records was false.

Finally, the complaint alleges that the BCSAO has improperly withheld records related a prosecutor who "indicated she was going to prevent [the complainant's] ability to file a statement of charges to report a crime or pursue it in court" without her permission.³

³ The complaint does not allege violations with regard to the complainant's August 12 PIA request for "what the Baltimore City State's Attorney's Office made as a charging recommendation to

The complainant contends that “[t]his document is in writing.” The complainant further alleges that “[t]he commissioners at the Maryland Judiciary confirmed they passed up the documents and records, but somehow the BCSAO ‘could not find them,’” and suggests that someone from the BCSAO “corruptly disappeared them to obstruct the administration of Justice per her corrupt behind the scenes deal that is beyond the scope of her responsibilities and authority.”

More broadly, the complainant accuses the BCSAO of “trying to retaliate against [him] and target [him] in particular,” and “trying to attribute every problem under the sun in their office to [him], while at the same time subjecting [him] to their abuse, harassment, and intentional violation of basic civil rights, to include even access to information.”

In response to the complaint, the BCSAO first addresses the August 12 PIA request for records of the “entry into the domestic violence unit’s files that indicated that [the complainant] had called up the unit and indicated that [he] did not want to proceed with the case.” The BCSAO explains that “[a] thorough review of the case file for Case No. 4B02440449 revealed no record of any phone calls or any other communications in which [the complainant] stated he did not wish to proceed with the case.”

Similarly, the BCSAO maintains that it conducted “thorough review” of the complainant’s August 14 request for information related to the subpoenas the complainant provided to the BCSAO, and that it “determined the subpoenas were directed to Google, LLC, in reference to a civil suit involving Louis Leibowitz and [the complainant].” The BCSAO points out that the complainant did not request copies of the subpoenas he provided, but rather “‘information’ that was not in the BCSAO’s possession because the subpoenas were neither issued by nor served upon the agency.”

As to the complainant’s request for “all information and legal justification as it pertains to ASA Kathleen Copsey and her ability to inhibit [his] civil rights to file a statement of charges and or report a crime to a law enforcement agency,” the BCSAO states that “[a]fter a thorough review of the case file for Case No. 4B02440449,” it could not locate any records of or “any evidence that an ASA prevented [the complainant] from filing a statement of charges or report[ing] any crimes to any law enforcement agencies.”

The BCSAO also states that, since August 12, 2023, it has received “nearly 75 requests for records involving cases associated with [the complainant],” and that many are “requests for the same records that are either nonexistent or have been previously provided

the commissioners, and what the commissioners’ charging decisions were” or his August 14 request for “all information related to any plea bargain or deferred prosecution discussion” that an ASA “arranged” with “Mr. Louis Leibowitz and his counsel as it pertains to case 4B02440449.” We therefore do not address the BCSAO’s responses to these PIA requests in our decision here.

through the MPIA process.” The BCSAO contends that these requests are “all originating from [the complainant],” noting that they “tend to use the same language and contain the same grammatical errors.” Moreover, the BCSAO explains, when it has requested clarification, many of the requesters “have produced the very record they originally requested, thus demonstrating that their requests were made in bad faith.”⁴

The complainant’s reply argues that the BCSAO’s response “essentially reveal[s] that [the BCSAO] intentionally withheld the documents [he] requested [from him] in particular, but provided them to everyone else.”⁵ He elaborates on the allegations in his complaint, alleging that the BCSAO “wrongfully withheld an entire years worth of subpoena related documents, strictly because they did not want [him] to have access to them or knowledge of them,” and “denied [him] access to the 10/4/2022 document” in which an ASA allegedly “falsely entered into a casefile that [he] didn’t want to proceed with the case,” suggesting that this is “clearly demonstrated by the Deputy State’s Attorney literally having a meeting, and [the BCSAO’s PIA officer] finding it.” The complainant asserts that “[t]he documents they provide even chronicle” the BCSAO’s “attempt to obstruct and compromise the ongoing matter that was related to this case, and for a related matter in California, which only proves the intentional withholding of information, wrongful denial to information, and the actual obstruction of justice that they are attempting to deny, namely the corrupt agreement” an ASA made to “obstruct [his] ability to report their criminal activity by intercepting charging documents, preventing cases from being screened, and destroying evidence.”⁶

To support his claims and accusations, the complainant attaches numerous documents to his reply, many of them email communications. The complainant appears to contend that some of these communications are responsive to his PIA requests and, because they are communications that include BCSAO employees, they prove that the BCSAO wrongfully withheld records. In addition, the complainant attaches emails sent to him by

⁴ The BCSAO has filed a separate complaint alleging that all of these requests, including the complainant’s, are “frivolous, vexatious, [and] in bad faith.” § 4-1A-04(b)(1); *see* PIACB 24-29. In light of that complaint and our conclusion here, we do not address the BCSAO’s broader contentions about the complainant’s requests.

⁵ The BCSAO attached exhibits containing all of the PIA requests that it has received since August 12, 2023, for records related to James Alford, Louis Leibowitz, and their criminal matters, as well as the responses that the BCSAO issued. Some of those responses disclosed various records, e.g., charging documents. As the BCSAO notes in its response, none of the PIA requests at issue here asked for charging documents.

⁶ The complainant’s reply contains a host of additional allegations and accusations of misconduct, including (but not limited to) “issues about the BCSAO falsifying and back dating exhibits,” and “backdating and falsifying a nolle pros form for a case that never exists and charges that the individual was never charged with.” We lack jurisdiction to review these allegations and accusations and therefore do not address them.

other BCSAO PIA requesters, *see supra*, notes 2, 4, and 5, that profess to document the requesters’ provision of purportedly responsive records to the BCSAO prior to August 2023, when the complainant sent his PIA requests. Other attached documents appear to be communications between the complainant and the BCSAO, many of which relate substantively to the criminal matters he was involved in. While we have reviewed all of the material the complainant has submitted, we do not recount it in detail here. We will refer to any relevant documents or communications as necessary in the analysis below.⁷

Analysis

The PIA directs us to review and resolve complaints that allege certain violations of its provisions, including that a custodian wrongfully denied inspection of a public record.” § 4-1A-04(a)(1)(i).⁸ We have interpreted this provision to include instances in which a custodian searches for records but then asserts that no responsive records exist. *See, e.g.*, PIACB 24-28 (Jan. 5, 2024). We have explained that, if a custodian conducts an insufficient search that fails to locate all responsive records, this is “tantamount to a constructive denial of access to records.” PIACB 23-03, at 3-4 (Nov. 2, 2022). When we determine that the alleged violation of the PIA has occurred, we must issue a written decision and order the remedy provided by the statute.⁹ § 4-1A-04(a)(2) and (3). If we find that a custodian has improperly withheld records or information, we must to order the custodian to “produce the public record for inspection.” § 4-1A-04(a)(3)(i).

Unless the law provides otherwise, a custodian must allow inspection of a public record “at any reasonable time,” § 4-201(a), and provide copies if the requester asks for them, § 4-205(b). A custodian who receives a PIA request, then, must “conduct a search in good faith that is reasonably designed to capture all responsive records,” and that uses “methods that can be reasonably expected to produce the information requested.” *Glass v. Anne Arundel County*, 453 Md. 201, 232 (2017) (citing *Oglesby v. Dep’t of the Army*, 920 F.2d 57, 68 (D.C. Cir. 1990)) (internal quotation marks omitted). Importantly, however, this does not mean that the custodian “must robotically examine every record in its possession, running up an extravagant fee and diverting public resources in furtherance of a futile effort,” but rather that “the search should be focused on where responsive records are likely to be found.” *Id.*

⁷ We note that a number of the communications the complainant attaches contain allegations—e.g., fraud or professional misconduct—that are beyond our jurisdiction. To the extent that these communications relate only to such allegations, we do not consider them.

⁸ Statutory citations are to the General Provisions Article of Maryland’s Annotated Code unless otherwise stated.

⁹ Before filing a complaint, a complainant must attempt to resolve the dispute through the Ombudsman and receive a final determination that the dispute was not resolved. § 4-1A-05(a).

The PIA does not command “a perfect search that leaves no stone unturned.” *Id.* at 233. Instead, the adequacy of a search is “measured against the specificity of the request and the willingness of the requestor to focus a request and improve the efficiency of the search,” *id.*, and “by how the agency designed the effort to find responsive records,” *id.* at 232-33. A custodian’s search for records is not judged “retrospectively by its success in locating every responsive record.” *Id.* Indeed, “[a] search may be reasonable and adequate without being perfect.” *Id.* at 232 (citing *Ethyl Corp. v. EPA*, 25 F.3d 1241, 1246 (4th Cir. 1994)); *see also, e.g., Iturralde v. Comptroller*, 315 F.3d 311, 315 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (“[T]he adequacy of a FOIA¹⁰ search is generally determined not by the fruits of the search, but by the appropriateness of the methods used to carry out the search.”).

With these guiding principles in mind, we conclude that the BCSAO conducted reasonable and adequate searches for records responsive to the complainant’s PIA requests. We begin by stressing, as stated *supra*, note 3, that we are concerned with the BCSAO’s responses to the complainant’s requests for: (1) the records of “an entry into the domestic violence unit’s files” that indicated that the complainant “did not want to proceed with the case”; (2) “all the information” in the BCSAO’s possession related to specific subpoenas that the complainant attached to his request; and (3) “all information and legal justification as it pertains” to an ASA’s “ability to inhibit [the complainant’s] civil rights to file a statement of charges and or report a crime to a law enforcement agency.”

The complainant sent his request for the records of the file entry indicating that he did not want to proceed with a case on August 12, 2023. On August 15, 2023, the BCSAO sent its timely ten-day letter explaining that it was searching for the files associated with case number 4B02440449. Given that the complainant specifically stated that the “record/information” he requested “relat[ed] to case 4B024402249,” it was reasonable for the BCSAO to direct its search to those files. *See Glass*, 453 Md. at 232 (“[T]he search should be focused on where responsive records are likely to be found.”). When, as the BCSAO’s September 16, 2023, response letter states, the BCSAO’s search did not return any “notes indicating that James Alford stated to the Domestic Violence Unit that he did not wish to proceed with Case No. 4B02440449,” the BCSAO notified the complainant of that fact in a manner consistent with § 4-202(d).

Though in his reply the complainant insists that the record of this entry “has been well-documented to exist” and “was subject to a disciplinary case review with the former Deputy State’s Attorney,” none of the documents the complainant attaches supports these contentions. For example, the complainant attaches a Google calendar notification for a “case meeting” on November 28, 2022, with his attorney, the former Deputy State’s Attorney, and the ASA at the center of his many misconduct allegations, but there is nothing to indicate what this meeting was about, much less that there exists the record of

¹⁰ The Freedom of Information Act, or FOIA, is the PIA’s federal counterpart. *See* 5 U.S.C.A. § 552.

the specific case “entry” the complainant requested. The complainant also attaches a lengthy email he wrote to the Deputy, apparently following that November 28 meeting, but that email does not even mention the case entry at all. And, while there is an earlier email (also written by the complainant) that does refer to “the wrongful dismissal” of a case and the complainant’s attempt to “get the information of the prosecutor who falsely dismissed the case under the lie that [he] ‘did not want to proceed [sic] with the case’ in order to properly file a grievance,” nothing in this email suggests that there is an actual record of such an “entry.” In fact, the email states that “the ASA who dismissed the case told [the complainant] that it was dismissed because ‘the commissioner had filed in incorrectly’ and that [the complainant] ‘had indicated that [he] did not want to proceed with the case.’” That the ASA may have said such things does not mean that there is a *record* reflecting those precise statements. Based on the information before us, we cannot find that the BCSAO constructively denied inspection of this record.

Turning next to the complainant’s August 14 request for “all the information that the Baltimore City State’s Attorney’s Office has in its possession pertaining to the attached Maryland Subpoenas,” here too we find that the BCSAO conducted a reasonable and adequate search for responsive records and did not constructively deny the PIA request. As with his first request, the complainant referred to specific cases—“case 4B02440449 and case 0B02440417”—and the BCSAO’s ten-day letter, sent on August 17, indicated that it was searching for files associated with case 0B02440417, which had not been identified as related to the complainant’s first PIA request. By searching those files for responsive records, the BCSAO “conduct[ed] a search in good faith that [was] reasonably designed to capture all responsive records,” and used “methods that can be reasonably expected to produce the information requested.” *Glass*, 453 Md. at 232.

The BCSAO’s final response letter explained that it reviewed both the complainant’s request and the subpoenas that he attached. After this review, and after searching its files, the BCSAO determined that the subpoenas had not been directed to or served on the BCSAO, and thus it had no responsive records to provide. When a PIA request is submitted to the incorrect custodian, the PIA requires that custodian to provide the requester with “notice of that fact” and “the name of the custodian” and “the location or possible location of the public record,” if either are known. § 4-202(c). This is precisely what the BCSAO did when it informed the complainant that the records were “most likely the records of the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore City and/or Google LLC,” and provided a link to information about the district court’s process for requesting records.

The complainant attaches emails that he sent to various BCSAO accounts concerning the subpoenas, as well as emails sent by some of the PIA requesters mentioned *supra*, note 2.¹¹ Many of those emails, which were sent before the complainant’s PIA

¹¹ It appears that some of these emails were recently forwarded to the complainant by those requesters; it is not entirely clear to us, however, how the complainant obtained others.

requests, appear to attach the same Maryland and California subpoenas, and contain commentary similar to commentary in the complainant's PIA request—i.e., that the attorney issuing the subpoenas was attempting to “illegally obtain information,” and that the subpoenas contained “forged” signatures and constituted “fraudulent activity.” On balance, we think that these emails do not undermine the BCSAO's search so as to render it inadequate or unreasonable.

First, it was reasonable for the BCSAO to believe that, by attaching the subpoenas in question to his PIA request, the complainant was not asking the BCSAO to provide those same subpoenas in response. Similarly, it was reasonable to believe that the complainant was not seeking his own prior emails exchanged with the BCSAO on the topic, especially given that the PIA request referred broadly to “information” about those subpoenas and did not specifically refer to email communications. Second, while the bodies of the handful of emails that were not sent by the complainant are arguably responsive to the complainant's request for documents or records “of any kind related to these subpoenas,” the BCSAO's failure to provide these emails does not mean that its search was inadequate. *See Iturralde*, 315 F.3d at 315 (“[T]he failure of an agency to turn up one specific document in its search does not alone render a search inadequate.”). This is especially so in light of the fact that the general phrase “document or record of any kind” followed a more specific list of record types—i.e., “any subpoena, return of service, entry in a court record”—that would be held by a court, and not necessarily the BCSAO. *Cf. Giant of Md. v. State's Attorney*, 274 Md. 158, 167 (1975) (“[W]hen general words in a statute follow the designation of particular things or classes of subjects or persons, the general words will usually be construed to include only those things or persons of the same class or general nature as those specifically mentioned.”).

Finally, regarding the complainant's August 14 PIA request for “all information and legal justification” for an ASA's “ability to inhibit” the complainant's right to file charges or report a crime, we find no constructive denial of inspection of records. In its response letter, issued on September 16, 2023, the BCSAO referred again to case number 4B02440449. The BCSAO advised that it was unable to locate any records “showing that [the ASA] prevented [the complainant] from filing a statement of charges or report[ing] a crime to any law enforcement agency.” Given nature of the request, which did not seek records that are necessarily commonly kept and, in essence, asked the BCSAO to do research, it is not all that surprising that no responsive records were found. *Cf. PIACB 23-23*, at 5 & n.5 (June 20, 2023) (explaining that “[t]o the extent that the complainant seeks answers to the many questions he pose[d],” the custodian's “only obligation under the PIA is to search for and provide any existing public records that may respond to those questions”).

Conclusion

After review and consideration of the many submissions in this matter, we conclude that the BCSAO has not violated the PIA. Rather, it conducted reasonable and adequate searches for records in response to the complainant's three PIA requests, and issued PIA-conforming responses.

Public Information Act Compliance Board*

Michele L. Cohen, Esq.
Samuel G. Encarnacion
Debra Lynn Gardner
Nivek M. Johnson

* Board Member Deborah Moore-Carter did not participate in the deliberation, preparation, or issuing of this decision.