

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth Public Records Division

Rebecca S. Murray Supervisor of Records

December 1, 2020 **SPR20/2222**

Joanne M. Roomey Paralegal/Records Access Officer City of Salem Legal Department 93 Washington Street Salem, MA 01970

Dear Ms. Roomey:

I have received the petition of Rachel Hazelton Davis appealing the response of the City of Salem Legal Department (City) to a request for public records. G. L. c. 66, § 10A; see also 950 C.M.R. 32.08(1). Specifically, Ms. Hazelton Davis requested all records pertaining to an incident at an identified business establishment and involving a certain police officer. The request involved thirteen (13) enumerated and itemized requests for records. In addition, Ms. Hazelton Davis requested from the City's Legal Department and Mayor's Office three categories of records pertaining to the identified police officer.

Prior appeal

In an October 19, 2020 response, the City provided Ms. Hazelton Davis with records responsive to her Requests Numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Unsatisfied with the Department's response, Ms. Hazelton Davis appealed and the prior appeal, SPR20/2027, was opened. In my November 3, 2020 determination, I found that whereas the City intended to provide a subsequent response, I closed SPR20/2027. Ms. Hazelton Davis now appeals the City's November 13, 2020 response pertaining to its redactions under the first clause of Exemption (c) of the Public Records Law.

Active litigation

A review of this matter reveals that the responsive records requested by Ms. Hazelton Davis are related to pending litigation in Essex County Superior Court, stemming from an appeal of a Civil Service Commission decision. <u>See Ryan Davis v. City of Salem Police Department</u>, Docket No. 2077CV00219A (Superior Court, Essex County).

Joanne M. Roomey Page 2 December 1, 2020

950 C.M.R. 32.08(2)(b) provides in pertinent part:

the Supervisor may deny an appeal for, among other reasons if, in the opinion of the Supervisor: 1. the public records in question are the subjects of disputes in active litigation, administrative hearings or mediation.

Conclusion

In light of the pending litigation in the Essex County Superior Court, I decline to opine any further on the responsive records at this time. $\underline{\text{See}}$ 950 C.M.R. 32.08(2)(b). I consider this administrative appeal closed.

Sincerely,

Rebecca S. Murray Supervisor of Records

Rebecca Murray

cc: Rachel Hazelton Davis Victoria B. Caldwell, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor