

contact details for a RTKL “Open Records Officer” and a RTKL “appeals officer” (both positions are referenced throughout the law and have mandatory statutory duties) on their internet websites.

AOPC refuses to recognize the validity of the RTKL in any way. One consequence of its refusal to recognize the RTKL in any way is that it refuses to identify an “Open Records Officer” or an “appeals officer” under the RTKL. One unfortunate by-product of AOPC’s defiance of law is that, upon information and belief, AOPC has trained all County Courts of Common Pleas in Pennsylvania to similarly defy the law. A google search reveals that practically no County Court of Common Pleas in Pennsylvania complies with Section 504(b) of the RTKL.

As our Supreme Court has held the substantive legal rights of Pennsylvania’s citizens are determined by laws not rules. *Commonwealth v. Olivo*, No. 127 MAP 2014 (November 18, 2015). We are a society founded upon the rule of law. Not the rule of rule. AOPC is in wanton disregard of law and has encouraged County Courts of Common Pleas to ignore the legal obligations that the RTKL imposes on them. This cannot stand for it tests the limits of our Constitutional Republic. Only the legislative branch is vested with the authority to create or change the substantive legal rights of Pennsylvania’s citizens.

This request for a mandamus enforcement action is related to, but distinct from, the Right to Know Law litigation I filed in Commonwealth Court today against AOPC today (Case No. 793 CD 2017). I am asking that you bring the mandamus action against AOPC for its failure to comply with Section 504(b) of the RTKL.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Scampbell", written in a cursive style.

Simon Campbell

cc: Thomas Darr, Court Administrator of Pennsylvania
cc: Tom Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania
cc: Joseph Scarnati, President, Pennsylvania State Senate
cc: Michael Turzai, Speaker, Pennsylvania House of Representatives