

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF BEDFORD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CALVIN GODFREY,
and
138 PICTURES, INC.,
Petitioners,
v.
BEDFORD COUNTY,
Respondent.

No. _____

**PETITION FOR REVIEW OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2025 FINAL DETERMINATION
OF THE OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS**

Petitioners Calvin Godfrey and 138 Pictures, Inc. ("Requesters") hereby appeal from the decision of the Office of Open Records ("OOR") issued on October 9, 2025 and indexed as OOR Dkt. AP 2025-2109. A copy of the OOR decision is attached as **Exhibit A**.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

1. This Notice of Appeal is filed pursuant to Section 1302(a) of the Right to Know Law. 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a).

PARTIES

2. Petitioner Calvin Godfrey Petitioner Calvin Godfrey is a journalist and documentary producer employed by Connestoga Creek LLC, a Pennsylvania corporation headquartered at 501 Yorktown Rd. Lancaster PA 17603.

3. Petitioner 138 Pictures, Inc., is a full-service production company founded in 2018 with offices in New York, Los Angeles and Milwaukee and a primary business address of 2114 9th Ave, South Milwaukee, WI 53172.

4. Respondent is Bedford County, Pennsylvania, a governmental unit with a business address of 200 South Juliana Street, Bedford, PA 15522.

FILED
2025 NOV -7 AM 11:15
CLERK OF ORPHANS COURT

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5. On July 10, 2025, Calvin Godfrey and 138 Pictures (together the “Requesters”) submitted a request (“Request”) to Bedford County (the “County”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, seeking records related to a certain incident (the “Incident”) that occurred between August 24-25, 2025 at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA

15559:

Any radio dispatch recordings retained (and or CAD reports) generated or received by the agency and related to calls for service recorded between approximately 10PM on August 24, 2020 and noon on August 25, 2020 seeking assistance 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

Any and all 911 call recordings (or call transcripts) seeking emergency services at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

6. Renee Muza, a filmmaker employed by 138 Pictures, Inc., witnessed the underlying Incident, which occurred outdoors and on a public highway, and made audio and video recordings of impacted individuals calling 911 following the Incident. See generally, Joseph Darius Jaafari, *Civil rights marchers shot at while on trek from Milwaukee to Washington, D.C.*, Spotlight PA (August 25, 2020) <https://www.spotlightpa.org/news/2020/08/pa-civil-rights-marchers-shot-bedford-county-milwaukee-washington-dc/>

7. On July 28, 2025, the County provided the Requesters with some Computer-Aided Dispatch (“CAD”) reports with medical and personal identification information redacted, but also partially denied the Request and stated its reasoning was that 911 recordings and transcripts are exempt under the RTKL. 65 P.S. §§ 67.708(b)(5), (b)(6), and (b)(18)(i). The County asserted that the Emergency Services Law, 35 Pa.C.S.A. § 5399, prohibited it from releasing identifying information.

8. The Requesters immediately appealed to the OOR on July 29, 2025, challenging the denial of the 911 recording/transcript and explaining the motivation for seeking the requested records. The Requesters argued that public interest in the disclosure of the responsive records outweighed nondisclosure. Part of the public interest in disclosure stems from the Pennsylvania State Police's own statement at the time of the incident that:

In the interest of transparency, it is the policy of PSP to disseminate information regarding incidents which are likely to generate significant interest among the public and media in a timely manner.

A true and correct copy of the PSP's August 24, 2020 Public Information Release is attached as **Exhibit B**.

9. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the County to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in this appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

10. The County submitted a position statement on August 14, 2025, and argued that the responsive 911 call recordings and related call transcripts were exempt from disclosure because they are "records or parts of records, [...] pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings."² 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i). A true and correct copy of the position statement submitted by the County is attached as **Exhibit C**.

11. The County also argued that although an agency (or a court) has the discretion to release a recording of a 911 call if it determines that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the interest in nondisclosure, the OOR does not have jurisdiction to consider matters that are subject to an agency's discretion. 65 P.S. 67.708(b)(18)(ii).

12. The Requesters submitted a statement on August 24, 2025, arguing against this position, and once again asserting that the public interest warrants disclosure of the records in this case.

13. Additionally, on October 3, 2025, following a short extension, the Requesters submitted an attestation authored by Ms. Muza regarding her audio and video recordings of the 911 communications following the Incident. Ms. Muza advocated for the release of the 911 recording and transcript and asserted that maintaining the privacy of the 911 caller's identity is, therefore, not a valid reason to support nondisclosure.

14. On October 9, 2025, the OOR denied the Requesters' appeal and issued a final determination that "the County has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the requested 911 recording and transcript are exempt from disclosure under the RTKL." Ex. A at 5.

STANDARD AND SCOPE OF REVIEW

15. In adjudicating this matter, this Court may function as a fact finder and exercise plenary review and apply a *de novo* standard of review. *Bowling v. Office of Open Records*, 75 A.3d 453, 473 (Pa. 2013).

16. This Court may supplement the record to ensure "the broadest scope of review." *Bowling*, 75 A.3d at 477.

17. Section 708(b)(18)(ii) of the RTKL permits disclosure of a 911 recording or transcript of a 911 recording "if the agency or a court determines that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the interest in nondisclosure," 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(ii). (emphasis added)

18. Petitioners now seek this Court's review to perform the statutorily-provided balancing test to determine whether the public interest in access to the requested records outweighs the reasons for nondisclosure.

19. Petitioners reserve the right to supplement the record before the Court by briefing the question more fully in a later phase of this litigation and, should the Court wish, by appearing before the Court at a hearing on this matter.

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Calvin Godfrey and 138 Pictures, Inc. respectfully request that the Court perform the balancing test set forth in 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(ii) and enter a finding that the public interest in disclosure of the requested records outweighs the interest in nondisclosure; as well as award Requesters their reasonable costs and attorney's fees and grant any other relief the Court deems appropriate, including penalties pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.1305(a).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Paula Knudsen Burke

Attorney for Appellants



Dated: November 5, 2025

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Date: November 5, 2025

Submitted by: /s/Paula Knudsen Burke

Paula Knudsen Burke

PA Attorney ID: 87607

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paula KB", written over the printed name and ID.

VERIFICATION

I, CALVIN GODFREY, hereby state that the facts above set forth in the Petition for Review are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief and I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Signed:



Dated:

11-04-2025

VERIFICATION

I, Renee Muza, hereby state that the facts above set forth in the Petition for Review are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief and I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Signed: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Muza', written over a horizontal line.

Dated: _____

Nov. 5, 2025

EXHIBIT A

that the Emergency Services Law prohibits agencies from releasing the identifying information of an individual who contacted a 911 center. 35 Pa.C.S.A. § 5399.

On July 29, 2025, the Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging only the denial of the 911 recording/transcript and stating grounds for disclosure.¹ The Requester explained his motivation for seeking the requested records and argued that public interest in the disclosure of the responsive records outweighs nondisclosure. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the County to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in this appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On August 14, 2025, the County submitted a position statement, arguing the responsive 911 call recordings and related call transcripts are exempt from disclosure because they are “records or parts of records, [...] pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.”² 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i). Furthermore, the County asserts that, although an agency or court has the discretion to release a recording of a 911 call if it determines that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the interest in nondisclosure, the OOR does not have jurisdiction to consider matters that are subject to an agency’s discretion. 65 P.S. 67.708(b)(18)(ii). In support of its position, the County submitted an attestation made subject to the penalties of unsworn falsification to authorities, 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904, authored by the County’s Chief Clerk and Open Records Officer, Debra Brown (“Brown Attestation”).

¹ In the appeal, the Requester granted the OOR an additional thirty days to issue this Final Determination. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(b)(1).

² The County also asserts that it redacted medical information and personal identification information from the responsive CAD reports. 65 P.S. §§ 67.708(b)(5), (b)(6). Furthermore, the County asserts that Section 5399 of the Emergency Services Law prohibits identifying an individual who makes a 911 call. 35 Pa.C.S. § 5399(a).

On August 24, 2025, the Requester submitted a position statement, arguing again that public interest warrants disclosure of the responsive records and describing the details of the incident that underlies the Request.³ The Requester also submitted multiple additional documents including newspaper articles about the underlying incident and a Pennsylvania State Police Public Information Release Report.

On October 3, 2025, following a short extension, the Requester submitted an attestation authored by a filmmaker employed by 138 Pictures, Renee Muza, who witnessed the underlying incident and made audio and video recordings of the 911 communications following the incident. Ms. Musa advocates for the release of the 911 recording and transcript and asserts that maintaining the privacy of the 911 caller's identity is, therefore, not a valid reason to support nondisclosure.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The County is a local agency subject to the RTKL. 65 P.S. § 67.302. Records in the possession of a local 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 County 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 fact-finder ... 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)).

³ The Requester states that "Daneen Smith laid out the County's position in partially denying my [R]equest" However, Daneen Miller-Smith is the OOR Appeals Officer, and the attorney who authored the County's position statement is Jonathan Whalen, Esq.

The Request seeks 911 call recordings and/or transcripts. As noted by the County, Section 708(b)(18)(i) of the RTKL exempts from public disclosure “[r]ecords or parts of records, except time response logs, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i). While Section 708(b)(18)(ii) of the RTKL permits disclosure of a 911 recording or transcript of a 911 recording “if the agency or a court determines that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the interest in nondisclosure,” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(ii), the OOR cannot require an agency to disclose a 911 recording.

In support of the County’s position, the Brown Attestation states, in part, as follows:

8. The July 10, 2025 Request sought, in part, “any and all 911 call recordings (or call transcripts) seeking emergency services at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.”
9. On July 28, 2025, the County responded to the Request and denied the Request on multiple grounds, including on the ground that the Request expressly sought 911 recordings and 911 transcripts.
10. The 911 recordings/911 call transcripts sought in the Request and which are responsive to the Request do in fact constitute recordings of 911 calls and the transcripts thereof, and because such records are expressly exempt from disclosure under the RTKL, the County denied this portion of the Request.

Under the RTKL, an affidavit or statement made under penalty of perjury may serve as sufficient evidentiary support. *See Sherry v. Radnor Twp. Sch. Dist.*, 20 A.3d 515, 520-21 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011); *Moore v. Off. of Open Records*, 992 A.2d 907, 909 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010). In the absence of any evidence that the County has acted in bad faith, “the averments in the [affidavit] should be accepted as true.” *McGowan v. Pa. Dep’t of Env’t Prot.*, 103 A.3d 374, 382-83 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014) (citing *Off. of the Governor v. Scolforo*, 65 A.3d 1095, 1103 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013)).

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: October 9, 2025

/s/ Daneen L. Miller-Smith

Daneen L. Miller-Smith, Esq.
Appeals Officer

Sent via OOR portal to:

Calvin Godfrey
Debra Brown, AORO
Jonathan Whalen, Esq.
David Mitchell, Esq.

EXHIBIT B



PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE
PUBLIC INFORMATION RELEASE REPORT

STATION BEDFORD CRIME UNIT		CAD/CASE NO PA 2020-1181786
INVESTIGATING OFFICER ZINN,A,13042	DATE/TIME OF INCIDENT 08/24/2020 2318	
NATURE OF INCIDENT ATTEMPTED HOMICIDE		
LOCATION LINCOLN HWY		
MUNICIPALITY(COUNTY) JUNIATA TWP (BEDFORD)		

PERSON(S) INVOLVED (Age based off incident occurrence date):

VICTIM: 75, M, SCHELLSBURG, PA

VICTIM/ARRESTEE: 51, M, SCHELLSBURG, PA

VICTIM/ARRESTEE: 36, M, MILWAUKEE, WI

INCIDENT DETAILS:

In the interest of transparency, it is the policy of PSP to disseminate information regarding incidents which are likely to generate significant interest among the public and media in a timely manner. While we make every effort to ensure the information is accurate to the best of our knowledge and belief, incidents are often fluid and rapidly evolving. Information provided should be considered preliminary and subject to change as additional investigative details emerge.

Juniata Township, PA - One male was injured in a shooting in the 800 block of Lincoln Highway, Juniata Township, Bedford County.

The Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) Troop G Bedford station was contacted by a property owner on Monday, August 24 at 11:18 p.m. regarding a group of people in a private business parking lot. Troopers later learned the group was comprised of approximately 30 activists who are traveling on foot and in vehicles from Milwaukee, Wisconsin to Washington, D.C. At approximately 11:35 p.m. at the same location and before state police arrival, an incident occurred between the group and the property owners. The incident escalated and gun shots were exchanged between the property owners and the activists.

One of the activists was struck by birdshot from a shotgun. The man was treated and released from the Conemaugh Memorial Medical Center, 1086 Franklin Street Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

A shotgun, shotgun shells, a semi-automatic pistol and 9-mm casings were all recovered at the scene.

The Troop G Major Case Team is investigating the incident in collaboration with the Bedford County District Attorney's Office. The Pennsylvania State Police Heritage Affairs Section is also assisting. Investigators continue to gather and review evidence, and a prosecutorial determination is pending. No charges have been filed at this time.

Follow @PSPTroopGPIO on Twitter for further updates.

MEDIA CONTACT: Trooper Joseph Dunsmore (Troop G), 814-771-9983, Trooper Brent Miller or Ryan Tarkowski (Department Headquarters), 717-783-5556

In the interest of transparency, it is the policy of PSP to disseminate information regarding incidents which are likely to generate significant interest among the public and media in a timely manner. While we make every effort to ensure the information is accurate to the best of our knowledge and belief, incidents are often fluid and rapidly evolving. Information provided should be considered preliminary and subject to change as additional investigative details emerge.

EXHIBIT C

Jonathan F. Whalen
Attorney at Law
Campbell Durrant, P.C.
Direct Dial: (412) 395-1264
jwhalen@cdblaw.com

August 14, 2025

Delivered via E-File Portal

Daneen Miller-Smith, Esq., Appeals Officer
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Office of Open Records
333 Market Street, 16th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-2234

Re: Right to Know Law Appeal, Docket # AP 2025-2109

Dear Ms. Miller-Smith:

Please be advised that my law firm represents Bedford County (hereinafter referred to as the "County") in this matter. On behalf of the County and its Open Records Officer, Chief Clerk Debra Brown, please accept this submission, including the attached Affidavit, relative to the above-referenced appeal to the Pennsylvania Office of Open Records.

I. Factual & Procedural Background

On July 10, 2025, the County received a request under the Right-to-Know Law ("RTKL") from Calvin Godfrey (hereinafter "Requester") (**Exhibit A** hereto). The request was as follows:

"—Any radio dispatch recordings retained (and or CAD reports) generated or received by the agency and related to calls for service recorded between approximately 10PM on August 24, 2020 and noon on August 25, 2020 seeking assistance 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

—Any and all 911 call recordings (or call transcripts) seeking emergency services at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559."

The County subsequently undertook a search for responsive records. On July 28, 2025, the County granted the request in part and denied the request in part on various grounds. (**Exhibit B** hereto). To the extent the County denied the request, it did so by either withholding responsive records entirely or by providing redacted records. On July 29, 2025, the Requester filed the instant appeal. (**Exhibit C** hereto).

II. Legal Argument

The County properly denied the request insofar as it sought “911 call recordings” and related “call transcripts.” The RTKL protects from disclosure “records or parts of records, except time response logs, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i). As such, requests for “911 recordings” are “subject to the exemption set forth in 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i)” and such records are clearly exempt from disclosure under the RTKL. *In the Matter of Dylan Segelbaum and the Baltimore Banner v. Blair County*, 2025 WL 521726 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025).

Moreover, “transcripts” of 911 recordings are also exempt from disclosure as “records pertaining to 911 recordings.” *Id.* at FN1; *See also In the Matter of Dominic Mayle v. Franklin County*, 2024 WL 3691920 (Pa. Off. Open Rec. 2024) (explaining that “the Request explicitly seeks a transcript of a 911 call” and “the requested 911 transcript is exempt from disclosure under the RTKL”); *In the Matter of Mark Walters and the York Dispatch v. York County*, 2025 WL 1092237 (Pa. Off. Open Rec. 2025) (explaining that “**the requested 911 recording and transcript are exempt from disclosure under the RTKL and the OOR may not disturb the County's decision to withhold 911 call recordings and transcripts**”) (emphasis added).

The Requester, in his request, explicitly sought “911 recordings” and transcripts of such recordings, and the OOR has made clear that where a request “seeks 911 recordings,” the request “seeks records that are expressly exempt under...the RTKL.” *In the Matter of Reid Frazier and the Allegheny Front/StateImpact Pennsylvania v. Beaver County*, 2018 WL 5365780 (Pa. Off.Open Rec. 2018); *See also In the Matter of Greg Mantell and Investigative News Service v. Blair County*, 2025 WL 722131 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025) (explaining that “**any audio recordings or radio transmissions received by or sent among emergency dispatch are facially exempt from disclosure**” under the RTKL and thus “the OOR may not disturb an agency’s decision to withhold 911 call recordings”) (emphasis added).

Indeed, where, as here, a request explicitly seeks 911 recordings and 911 transcripts, the submission of additional evidence (such as an Affidavit) by the agency is “unnecessary” because the request “facially seek(s) 911 recordings” and accordingly the “exemption is clear from the face of the record.” *In the Matter of Terry Siford v. Franklin County District Attorney's Office*, 2021 WL 1625663 (Pa. Off. Open Rec. 2021); *See also In the Matter of Gabriel Medford and Ramsingh Legal v. Altoona City*, 2025 WL 927230 (Pa. Off. Open Rec. 2025) (explaining that “911 recordings” are “facially exempt from disclosure under...the RTKL” and thus “even if we were to conclude that the City’s evidence regarding its possession of 911 recordings is lacking, the records would be exempt from disclosure”). The County has nonetheless included the Affidavit of its Open Records Officer in support of its denial. (**Exhibit D** hereto).

In the appeal, the Requester, relying on Section 708 (b)(18)(ii) of the RTKL, argues that “the public interest in the disclosure of these records far outweighs any of the reasons the county has offered for declining to disclose them.” (**Exhibit C**). It is true that this provision of the RTKL allows for the disclosure of “a 911 recording” or “a transcript of a 911 recording, if the agency or a court determines that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the interest in nondisclosure.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(ii). However, the Requester has not pointed to any court determination in

support of his request. See *In the Matter of Robert G. Rauhauser v. York County*, 2009 WL 6503848 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2009) (explaining that “while the law allows for an exception where the agency or court determines that the public interest outweighs the interest in nondisclosure, the Requestor points to no such agency or court determination” and that “the discretion to release such a record for public policy reasons rests with the agency”).

Moreover, the OOR has repeatedly ruled that the “discretion” described in Section 708(b)(18)(ii) “rests with the agency.” *In the Matter of William Walls v. Pennsylvania State Police*, 2009 WL 6503841 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2009). Accordingly, as the OOR has consistently recognized, “the OOR is without the authority to compel” an agency to exercise its discretion to release 911 recordings, and further **“the RTKL does not compel the County to articulate an interest in the nondisclosure of a 911 recording.”** See *In the Matter of Reid Frazier and the Allegheny Front/StateImpact Pennsylvania v. Beaver County*, 2018 WL 5365780 (Pa. Off.Open Rec. 2018) (emphasis added); *In the Matter of David Ross v. Beaver County*, 2025 WL 1983660 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025) (“while the Requester argues that there is a public interest in releasing the recording of the 911 call,” the RTKL **“clearly vests the discretion to make this determination with the agency or the court system and does not permit the OOR to overrule that discretion”**) (emphasis added).

As the OOR explained in a very recent decision:

“Section 708(b)(18) clearly vests the discretion to make this determination whether to release 911 recordings with the agency and the court system; therefore, the OOR may not disturb the County’s decision to withhold 911 call recordings rather than exercising its discretion to release them consistent with Section 708(b)(18)(ii). As such, the OOR will not disturb the County’s decision to withhold the 911 recordings.”

In the Matter of Daniel Romanowski v. Lawrence County, 2025 WL 1756359 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025). For these reasons, the County properly denied the request, as it sought records that are expressly exempt from disclosure under the RTKL. The County may not be compelled to exercise any discretion reserved to the County to elect whether to release these exempt records.

Finally, the Requester’s appeal identified only the “911 calls and transcripts” as the “records at issue in this appeal.” (Exhibit C). The OOR has explained that “an appeal is necessarily limited to what is included in the ‘Records at Issue in this Appeal’ section of the appeal form.” *Megan Brock and Daily Caller News Foundation v. Pennsylvania Department of Health*, 2025 WL 1182133 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025). As such, the County does not interpret the Requester’s appeal as challenging its partial denial of the request for CAD reports. The County further argues that the Requester has waived any challenge to any portion of the County’s denial other than the “911 calls and transcripts” designated by the Requester as the “Records at Issue in this Appeal.” See *In the Matter of Ethan Kosmin v. City of Reading*, 2023 WL 3453665 (Pa. Off. Open Rec. 2023) (explaining that “the Requester’s appeal form” identified only certain records as the “Records at Issue in this Appeal” and therefore “the Requester...waived any challenge to the remaining portions of his Request”).

In any event, the County provided redacted CAD reports to the Requester in response to his request. **(Exhibit A; Exhibit B; Exhibit C)**. To the extent the Requester is challenging the County's provision of redacted records or to the extent it is determined that the Requester has not waived this portion of the request, the County reiterates the grounds for its redactions as set forth in its response to the request. **(Exhibit B)**. The County properly redacted individual identifying information from the CAD reports it produced pursuant to the Emergency Services Law and the constitutional right to privacy and properly redacted individually identifiable health information as well as certain investigative information from the CAD reports pursuant to the RTKL. *See, e.g., 35 Pa.C.S.A. § 5399; 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(5); In the Matter of Lenora Sapp v. Philadelphia Fire Department*, 2021 WL 4198155 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2021); *In the Matter of Andrew Perrong v. City of Philadelphia Police Department*, 2024 WL 1464445 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2024); *In the Matter of Charles Hoyer v. Pennsylvania Office of Administration*, Docket No. AP 2020-1375 (Pa.Off.Open.Rec. 2020); *Sapp Roofing Co. v. Sheet Metal Workers' International Assoc.*, 713 A.2d 627, 630 (Pa. 1998); *In the Matter of Jonathan Kriczky v. Exeter Township*, 2024 WL 1256366 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2024); *In the Matter of Jess Rohan and Bucks County Courier Times v. Central Bucks School District*, 2025 WL 1649482 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025); *Pennsylvania State Educ. Ass'n v. Commonwealth Dep't of Cmty. & Econ. Dev.*, 148 A.3d 142 (2016); *In the Matter of Ryan Murphy v. City of Philadelphia Police Department*, 2025 WL 1330302 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025).

III. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested on behalf of the Respondent, Bedford County, and its Open Records Officer, Chief Clerk Debra Brown, that the Pennsylvania Office of Open Records deny the within appeal.

Very truly yours,



Jonathan F. Whalen
Campbell Durrant, P.C.
PA ID 328789

IN REFERENCE TO: BEDCO-3245_0

Exhibit A



Pennsylvania Office of Open Records

Standard Right-to-Know Law Request Form

*Please read carefully. Complete this form and retain a copy of **both** pages; this copy may be required if an appeal is filed. You have 15 business days to appeal after a request is denied or deemed denied. More information about the RTKL is available at <https://www.openrecords.pa.gov>. In most cases, a completed RTKL request form is a public record.*

SUBMITTED TO AGENCY NAME: Bedford County-Department of Emergency Mangament Services (Attn: AORO)

Date Request Submitted: July 10, 2025 **Submitted via:** ☐ Email ☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fax ☐ In Person

PERSON MAKING REQUEST:

Full Name: Calvin Godfrey

Company (if applicable): 138 Pictures

Please send response via: ☒ Email ☐ U.S. Mail

If you wish to obtain records that only exist in hard copy, or must be provided on an electronic storage device, you may be required to provide a mailing address to the agency. See Section 703.

Email: calvintgodfrey@gmail.com

Mailing Address: 290 Eshelman Rd.

City: Lancaster **State:** PA **Zip:** 17601 **Telephone:** 323.528.1331

How do you prefer to be contacted if the agency has questions? ☐ Telephone ☒ Email ☐ U.S. Mail

☒ By checking this box, I affirm that my full name and contact information is true and correct, and that I am a legal resident of the United States. I understand that failure to check this box may result in the denial of my request and the dismissal of any appeal filed with the Office of Open Records.

RECORDS REQUESTED: *Provide as much detail as possible, including subject matter, time frame, and type of record sought. RTKL requests must seek records, not ask questions. Use additional pages if necessary.*

—Any radio dispatch recordings retained (and or CAD reports) generated or recieved by the agency and related to calls for service recorded between approximately 10PM on August 24, 2020 and noon on August 25, 2020 seeking assistance 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

—Any and all 911 call recordings (or call transcripts) seeking emergency services at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

Form continues on page 2. Retain a copy of **both pages.**

RECORDS REQUESTED (continued):

DO YOU WANT COPIES? ☐ Yes, printed ☐ Yes, electronic ☐ No, in-person inspection

Records shall be provided in the medium requested if they exist in that medium; otherwise, they shall be provided in the medium in which they exist. See Section 701. Your request may require payment or prepayment of fees. View the Official RTKL Fee Schedule for more details.

I understand that my request may incur fees. Notify me before further processing if fees will be more than ☐ **\$100 (or)** ☐ **\$_____.**

Do you want certified copies? ☐ Yes (may be subject to additional costs) ☐ No

ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

Tracking: _____ Date Received: _____ Response Due (5 bus. days): _____

30-Day Ext.? ☐ Yes ☐ No (If Yes, Final Due Date: _____) Actual Response Date: _____

Request was: ☐ Granted ☐ Partially Granted & Denied ☐ Denied Cost to Requester: \$_____

☐ Appropriate third parties notified and given an opportunity to object to the release of requested records.

Retain a copy of both pages of this Form.

Exhibit B

From: Sarah Lepley <slepley@bedfordcountypa.org>
Sent: July 28, 2025 2:00 PM
To: Calvin Godfrey
Cc: Debra Brown; David Mitchell; Jonathan Whalen
Subject: Bedford County - Right to Know
Attachments: Godfrey RTKL Response4929-1288-91751.docx; Redacted CAD Reports 24906-5664-80241_Redacted.pdf; Redacted CAD Report 1 14928-6363-81041 4923-7162-4280 v.1_Redacted.pdf

Good Afternoon:

Please see the attached regarding your Right to Know request for:

-Any radio dispatch recordings retained (and or CAD reports) generated or recieved by the agency and related to calls for service recorded between approximately 10PM on August 24, 2020 and noon on August 25, 2020 seeking assistance 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

-Any and all 911 call recordings (or call transcripts) seeking emergency services at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

Thank you for contacting our office.

Sarah M. Lepley
Administrative Technology Specialist
Email: slepley@bedfordcountypa.org
200 South Juliana Street Suite
Bedford, PA 15522
Phone: 814-623-4807 x2372
Fax: 814-623-0991

Right-To-Know Response

July 28, 2025

Calvin Godfrey
calvintgodfrey@gmail.com

Re: Right to Know Law Request

Mr. Godfrey:

Thank you for submitting a request for records under the Right to Know Law ("RTKL"), 65 P.S. § 67.101. Your request was dated July 10, 2025. The County timely invoked Section 902 of the RTKL to extend by thirty (30) days the time to respond to your request. Your request sought the following:

“—Any radio dispatch recordings retained (and or CAD reports) generated or received by the agency and related to calls for service recorded between approximately 10PM on August 24, 2020 and noon on August 25, 2020 seeking assistance 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.

—Any and all 911 call recordings (or call transcripts) seeking emergency services at 817 Lincoln Hwy, Schellsburg, PA 15559.”

Response: Your request is **granted in part and denied in part**. To the extent your request has been granted, redacted records are attached to this response. To the extent your request has been denied, this is because the recordings sought in your request are expressly exempt from disclosure under the RTKL. Additionally, though your request for “CAD reports” is partially granted, these records have been redacted to remove certain exempt medical and personal identifying information, as well as certain investigative information. Please note that under the RTKL, a redaction represents a partial denial of a request.

To begin, the RTKL protects from disclosure “records or parts of records, except time response logs, pertaining to audio recordings, telephone or radio transmissions received by emergency dispatch personnel, including 911 recordings.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(18)(i). Your request explicitly seeks 911 recordings and “radio dispatch recordings” related to calls for emergency services. Such records are facially exempt from disclosure under the RTKL, and this element of your request must therefore be denied. *In the Matter of Reid Frazier and the Allegheny Front/StateImpact Pennsylvania v. Beaver County*, 2018 WL 5365780 (Pa. Off.Open Rec. 2018) (explaining that where a request “seeks 911 recordings,” the request “seeks records that are expressly exempt under...the RTKL”); *See also In the Matter of Greg Mantell and Investigative News Service v. Blair County*, 2025 WL 722131 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025) (explaining that “**any audio recordings or radio transmissions received by or sent among emergency dispatch are facially exempt from disclosure**” under the RTKL and thus “the OOR may not disturb an agency's decision to withhold 911 call recordings”) (emphasis added).

To the extent, however, that your request seeks “CAD reports,” your request is granted in part and denied in part. Under the RTKL and applicable decisions from the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), CAD reports may contain both exempt and non-exempt information. The County is accordingly providing responsive CAD reports subject to various redactions. Specifically, the County has redacted exempt medical information as well as certain personal identifying information contained in the CAD reports.

The RTKL exempts from disclosure records/information “that would disclose individually identifiable health information,” including but not limited to “record(s) of an individual's medical...status” and records

regarding medical “evaluation, consultation, prescription, diagnosis or treatment,” or any other “related information that would disclose individually identifiable health information.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(5). The CAD reports which are responsive to your request contain such exempt medical information, which the County has redacted. *See In the Matter of Lenora Sapp v. Philadelphia Fire Department*, 2021 WL 4198155 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2021) (explaining that the responsive “CAD reports” contained “medical and health information for an individual being treated and transported by the EMS” and therefore ruling that “to the extent the CAD Reports contain information that would reveal individually identifiable medical information, the City may redact such information”).

Additionally, it is clear that “individual identifying information” contained in “CAD reports,” including “the name and telephone number of the individual calling to request services,” among other personal identifying information, such as addresses of private citizens, may be redacted under the RTKL and pursuant to constitutional privacy concerns. *Pennsylvania State Educ. Ass’n v. Commonwealth Dep’t of Cmty. & Econ. Dev.*, 148 A.3d 142 (2016); *In the Matter of Charles Hoyer v. Pennsylvania Office of Administration*, Docket No. AP 2020-1375 (Pa.Off.Open.Rec. 2020); *Sapp Roofing Co. v. Sheet Metal Workers’ International Assoc.*, 713 A.2d 627, 630 (Pa. 1998); *In the Matter of Jonathan Kriczky v. Exeter Township*, 2024 WL 1256366 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2024). Additionally, the Emergency Services Law provides that “in response to a request under...the Right-to-Know Law,” agencies “**may not release individual identifying information of an individual contacting a 911 center.**” 35 Pa.C.S.A. § 5399 (emphasis added); *See also In the Matter of Terry Wayne Siford v. Franklin County*, 2021 WL 2917699 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2021); (ruling that “the County...appropriately redacted” responsive “CAD reports” to remove “**the name, telephone number and address of the individual calling to report a need for services**” pursuant to the Emergency Services Law) (emphasis added). Accordingly, the County has redacted such personal identifying information of individuals calling for emergency services from the responsive records.

Finally, the OOR has consistently determined that “information pertaining to audio, telephone, or radio transmissions or communications received by emergency dispatch personnel” contained in CAD reports may be withheld under the RTKL. *In the Matter of Ryan Murphy v. City of Philadelphia Police Department*, 2025 WL 1330302 Docket No: AP 2025-0792 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2025). The OOR has also repeatedly determined that where “CAD reports...contain information” relating to investigations, including “descriptive notes pertaining to” such “investigations,” that such information may be exempt from disclosure under the RTKL. *In the Matter of Andrew Perrong v. City of Philadelphia Police Department*, 2024 WL 1464445 Docket No: AP 2024-0214 (Pa.Off.Open Rec. 2024). As such, the County has redacted investigative information, including descriptive notes and transmissions/communications regarding response investigations, from the responsive records.

For the reasons set forth above, your request is **granted in part and denied in part**. To the extent your request has been denied, should you wish to appeal this denial, you have the right to appeal the denial of information in writing to:

Liz Wagenseller, Executive Director
Office of Open Records
333 Market Street, 16th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-2234

You may also file an appeal online by following the instructions on the Office of Open Records’ website. Additional information regarding the filing of an appeal is available on the Office of Open Records’ website: openrecords.pa.gov. Should you wish to appeal this denial, you must do so within 15 business days of the mailing date of this response, as outlined in Section 1101 of the RTKL.

If you have any further questions, please contact me. This correspondence will serve to close this record with our office as permitted by law.

Respectfully,

Debra Brown, Open Records Officer
200 South Juliana Street
Bedford, PA 15522
814-623-4807

Call For Service Detail Report - CFS 5

Address	[REDACTED]				
Common Name	BD [REDACTED] GARAGE				
Custom Layer		Census Tract	Schellsburg 15559		
Beat	BD-BEDFORD PSP	Quadrant	BD-37_02	District	BD-U17_U11_QRS
Caller Name	[REDACTED]	Caller Phone	[REDACTED]	Call Taker	[REDACTED]
Create Date	12/28/2024 4:17:00 PM	Clear Date	12/28/2024 5:48:36 PM	Nature Of Call	

Call Details

Call Type	Status	Priority	Dispatcher	Created Date
[REDACTED]	In Progress	Low	[REDACTED]	12/28/2024 4:17:00 PM

Call Narrative

*** 12/28/2024 ***

Time	Description	User	Unit #	Machine
5:18:36 PM	Transporting to UPMC Bedford	[REDACTED]		SEN-1987147

EMD Narrative

*** 12/28/2024 ***

Time	Description	User
4:20:29 PM	ProQA Paramount Medical: [REDACTED] CC Text: [REDACTED] (Specific Diagnosis) Caller Statement: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
4:20:29 PM	ProQA Paramount Medical: Call had been completed in ProQA Paramount.	
4:19:09 PM	ProQA Paramount Medical: [REDACTED] CC Text: [REDACTED] (Specific Diagnosis) Caller Statement: [REDACTED] Dispatch Code: 26A07 [REDACTED] Response: Alpha	
	ANSWERS: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	

Call Persons

Name	Date of Birth	Contact Phone	Machine
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	SEN-1987147

Call Vehicles

Vehicle Type	Make	Model	Role	Year	License State	License Number
--------------	------	-------	------	------	---------------	----------------

Call Dispositions

Name	Count
Completed	1

Unit Dispositions

Name	Count	Unit Number	Disposition Date
------	-------	-------------	------------------

Call Log

*** 12/26/2024 ***

Time	Action	Description	Name	Machine
5:48:36 PM	Call Cleared	Close Call		SEN-1987147
5:48:36 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 Available		SEN-1987147
5:48:36 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BDMED11 Available		SEN-1987147
5:48:36 PM	Disposition Changed	Added: Completed Count: 1		SEN-1987147
5:32:16 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BDMED11 At Hospital		SEN-1987147
5:32:14 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 At Hospital		SEN-1987147
5:18:42 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BDMED11 Transport		SEN-1987147
5:18:36 PM	Unit Location	Unit BD1105 Secondary Location: UPMC Bedford		SEN-1987147
5:18:36 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 Transport		SEN-1987147
5:18:36 PM	Narrative Added	Transporting to UPMC Bedford		SEN-1987147
5:18:24 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 At Rendezvous Point		SEN-1987147
5:18:22 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BDMED11 At Rendezvous Point		SEN-1987147
4:58:49 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BDMED11 Enroute		SEN-1987147
4:58:46 PM	Paging Action	Attempting to page the following pagers: BD EMS11@centre.ealert911.com		SEN-1987147
4:58:46 PM	Unit Location	Unit BDMED11 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared		SEN-1987147
4:58:46 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BDMED11 Dispatched		SEN-1987147
4:58:40 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 Transport		SEN-1987147
4:42:21 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 On Scene		SEN-1987147
4:22:51 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1102 Available		SEN-1995441
4:22:46 PM	Paging Action	Attempting to page the following pagers: BD EMS11@centre.ealert911.com		SEN-1995441
4:22:46 PM	Unit Location	Unit BD1105 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared		SEN-1995441
4:22:46 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1105 Enroute		SEN-1995441
4:22:30 PM	Call Updated	Caller Updated: Name Changed from GARAG [REDACTED]		SEN-1987147
4:22:01 PM	Unit Recommendation	Recommendation viewed, no units i recommendation, using AMB (EMS)		SEN-1987147
4:20:29 PM	EMD Narrative Added	ProQA Paramount Medical: Call had been completed in ProQA Paramount.		SEN-1987147
4:20:29 PM	EMD Narrative Added	ProQA Paramount Medical: [REDACTED]		SEN-1987147

CC Text: [REDACTED] (Specific Diagnosis)

Caller Statement: [REDACTED]

4:20:04 PM	Paging Action	Attempting to page the following pagers: BD-EMS11@centre.ealert911.com	SEN-1995441
4:20:04 PM	Unit Recommendation	Recommendation completed for units: BD1102 using AMB (EMS).	SEN-1995441
4:20:04 PM	Unit Location	Unit BD1102 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared	SEN-1995441
4:20:04 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit BD1102 Dispatched	SEN-1995441
4:20:04 PM	Call Ready for Dispatch	Call marked ready for dispatch	SEN-1995441
4:20:04 PM	Unit Recommendation	Recommendation accepted for units: BD1102 using AMB (EMS).	SEN-1995441
4:19:25 PM	Unit Recommendation	Recommendation viewed for units : BD1102 using AMB (EMS)	SEN-1995441
4:19:10 PM	Call Updated	EMD Code Changed To 26A07	SEN-1987147
4:19:09 PM	Call Type	EMS Call Type Changed From 1 Medical To Call Type: (A), Status: In Progress, Priority: Low	SEN-1987147
4:19:09 PM	EMD Narrative Added	ProQA Paramount Medical: CC Text: (Specific Diagnosis) Caller Statement: Dispatch Code: 26A07 Response: Alpha	SEN-1987147
ANSWERS:			
4:19:09 PM	Call Updated	EMS Primary Context	SEN-1987147
4:19:09 PM	Interface Action	EMS EMD Case Number Added 2609487	SEN-1987147
4:17:06 PM	Call Assigned	Added EMS Area Position BEDFORD	SEN-1987147
4:17:06 PM	Call Assigned	EMS Dispatch Position Changed From BD POSITION 1 To BEDFORD	SEN-1987147
4:17:06 PM	Call Assigned	Added EMS Dispatch Position BD-POSITION 1	SEN-1987147
4:17:06 PM	Agency Context Added	EMS Call Type Added. Call Type: 1 Medical Status: Just Occurred, Priority: Low	SEN-1987147
4:17:02 PM	Location	Cross streets updated, LOYA LN / HELIXVILLE RD	SEN-1987147
4:17:00 PM	Alerts Retrieval	Alerts Were Successfully Gathered For Location At Address	NWCADPRD
4:17:00 PM	Call Updated	Caller Added: Last Name - First Name Role - Caller;	SEN-1987147
4:17:00 PM	Incident Created	Added Incident Number, ORI: 05002 , Number 2024-00003141	
4:17:00 PM	Call Created	New call created. Call Type: <<Choose Call Type>>, Location: Caller Phone: Source: E911 (01/09/2024 14:37:15)	SEN-1987147

Unit Log

*** 12/28/2024 ***

Time	Action	Description	Unit	Status	Name	Machine
5:48:36 PM	Unit Status Change	Available	BD1105	Available		SEN-1987147
5:48:36 PM	Unit Cleared	Unit Cleared From Call	BD1105	Available		SEN-1987147
5:48:36 PM	Unit Status Change	Available	BDMED1	Available		SEN-1987147
			1			
5:48:36 PM	Unit Cleared	Unit Cleared From Call	BDMED1	Available		SEN-1987147
			1			
5:32:16 PM	Unit Status Change	At Hospital	BDMED1	At Hospital		SEN-1987147
			1			
5:32:14 PM	Unit Status Change	At Hospital	BD1105	At Hospital		SEN-1987147
5:18:42 PM	Unit Status Change	Transport	BDMED1	Transport		SEN-1987147
			1			
5:18:36 PM	Unit Location	UPMC Bedford	BD1105	Transport		SEN-1987147
5:18:36 PM	User Entry	Transporting to UPMC Bedford	BD1105	Transport		SEN-1987147
5:18:36 PM	Unit Status Change	Transport	BD1105	Transport		SEN-1987147
5:18:24 PM	Unit Status Change	At Rendezvous Point	BD1105	At Rendezvous Point		SEN-1987147
5:18:22 PM	Unit Status Change	At Rendezvous Point	BDMED1	At Rendezvous Point		SEN-1987147
			1			
4:58:49 PM	Unit Status Change	Enroute	BDMED1	Enroute		SEN-1987147
			1			
4:58:46 PM	Unit Location	Secondary Location Cleared	BDMED1	Dispatched		SEN-1987147
			1			
4:58:46 PM	Unit Status Change	Dispatched Call Number: 5, Assigned Location: [REDACTED]	BDMED1	Dispatched		SEN-1987147
		Call Type: [REDACTED]				
4:58:40 PM	Unit Status Change	Transport	BD1105	Transport		SEN-1987147
4:42:21 PM	Unit Status Change	On Scene	BD1105	On Scene		SEN-1987147
4:22:51 PM	Unit Status Change	Available	BD1102	Available		SEN-1995441
4:22:51 PM	Unit Cleared	Unit Cleared From Call	BD1102	Available		SEN-1995441
4:22:46 PM	Unit Location	Secondary Location Cleared	BD1105	Enroute		SEN-1995441
4:22:46 PM	Unit Status Change	Enroute	BD1105	Enroute		SEN-1995441
4:22:46 PM	Unit Status Change	Dispatched Call Number: 5, Assigned Location: [REDACTED]	BD1105	Enroute		SEN-1995441
		Call Type: [REDACTED]				
4:20:04 PM	Unit Location	Secondary Location Cleared	BD1102	Dispatched		SEN-1995441
4:20:04 PM	Unit Status Change	Dispatched Call Number: 5, Assigned Location: [REDACTED]	BD1102	Dispatched		SEN-1995441
		Call Type: [REDACTED]				

Incidents

Incident Number	Jurisdiction	Type
2024-00003141	05002: U11 BEDFORD AREA AMBULANCE	[REDACTED]

Units

Unit	Radio Number	Personnel	Jurisdiction
BD1102 (Primary)	1102		05002: U11 BEDFORD AREA AMBULANCE
BD1105	1105		05002: U11 BEDFORD AREA AMBULANCE
BDMED11	MED11		05002: U11 BEDFORD AREA AMBULANCE

Attachments**File Name****File Description****Attached By**

Call For Service Detail Report - CFS 93

Address	[REDACTED]				
Common Name	[REDACTED] GARAGE				
Custom Layer		Census Tract			
Beat		Quadrant		District	
Caller Name	[REDACTED]	Caller Phone	[REDACTED]	Call Taker	nws_conversion
Create Date	8/24/2020 11:34:15 PM	Clear Date	8/25/2020 12:20:21 AM	Nature Of Call	

Call Details

Call Type	Status	Priority	Dispatcher	Created Date
Miscellaneous	In Progress	High	nws_conversion	8/24/2020 11:34:15 PM

Call Narrative

*** 8/24/2020 ***				
Time	Description	User	Unit #	Machine
11:43:55 PM	had several calls from this area	[REDACTED]		CONVERSION
11:41:34 PM	[REDACTED]	nws_conversion,		CONVERSION
11:37:34 PM	[REDACTED]	nws_conversion,		CONVERSION
11:37:03 PM	OTHER CALLERS: [REDACTED] MALE CALLER - FEMALE CALLER.	nws_conversion,		CONVERSION
11:35:45 PM	[REDACTED] NEAR [REDACTED] GARAGE.	nws_conversion,		CONVERSION
11:34:59 PM	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		CONVERSION
11:34:15 PM	[REDACTED]	nws_conversion,		CONVERSION
	UnitNumber: PSP2 ORI: PAPSP0400 BEDPSP PA State Police			
11:34:15 PM	Create User: GLD	nws_conversion,		CONVERSION

EMD Narrative

Time	Description	User
------	-------------	------

Call Persons

Name	Date of Birth	Contact Phone	Machine
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	CONVERSION

Call Vehicles

Vehicle Type	Make	Model	Role	Year	License State	License Number
--------------	------	-------	------	------	---------------	----------------

Call Dispositions

Name	Count
------	-------

Unit Dispositions

Name	Count	Unit Number	Disposition Date
------	-------	-------------	------------------

Call Log

*** 8/25/2020 ***

Time	Action	Description	Name	Machine
12:20:21 AM	Call Cleared	Close Call	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:20 AM	Disposition Changed	Added: Closed Call Count 1	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:15 AM	Unit Status Action	Unit PSP2 Available	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:11 AM	Unit Status Action	Unit PSP2 Dispatched	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:11 AM	Unit Location	Unit PSP2 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:11 AM	Call Ready for Dispatch	Call marked ready for dispatch	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441

*** 8/24/2020 ***

11:43:55 PM	Narrative Added	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SEN-1987147
11:42:25 PM	Location	Cross streets updated, LOYA LN / HELIXVILLE RD	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:42:25 PM	Alerts Retrieval	Alerts Were Successfully Gathered For Location At Address [REDACTED]	nws_conversion	CADPROD
11:42:25 PM	Location	Call Location Changed from [REDACTED] GARAGE to [REDACTED] GARAGE)	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:42:25 PM	Address Verified	Call Location Changed from Unverified To Verified	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:42:25 PM	Location	Call Location Changed from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:41:34 PM	Narrative Added	[REDACTED]	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:37:34 PM	Narrative Added	[REDACTED]	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:37:03 PM	Narrative Added	OTHER CALLERS: [REDACTED] MALE CALLER - FEMALE CALLER.	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:35:45 PM	Narrative Added	[REDACTED]	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
11:34:59 PM	Narrative Added	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SEN-1987147
11:34:15 PM	Contact Created	Name: [REDACTED] Contact Phone: [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SEN-1987147
11:34:15 PM	Person Added	Name: [REDACTED] Contact Phone: [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SEN-1987147
11:34:15 PM	Incident Created	Added Incident Number, ORI: PAPSP0400, Number: 2020-00001929	nws_conversion	
11:34:15 PM	Call Created	New call created. Call Type: >New Call<, Location: [REDACTED] Caller Phone: [REDACTED] Source: E911 (08/24/2020 23:33:36)	[REDACTED]	SEN-1987147

Unit Log

*** 8/25/2020 ***

Time	Action	Description	Unit	Status	Name	Machine
12:20:15 AM	Unit Status Change	Available	BDPSP2	Available	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441

12:20:15 AM	Unit Cleared	Unit Cleared From Call	BDPSP2	Available	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:11 AM	Unit Location	Secondary Location Cleared	BDPSP2	Dispatched	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
12:20:11 AM	Unit Status Change	Dispatched Call Number: 93,	BDPSP2	Dispatched	nws_conversion	SEN-1995441
		Assigned Location: [REDACTED]				
		[REDACTED]				
		Call Type: Miscellaneous Police				

Incidents

Incident Number	Jurisdiction	Type
2020-00001929	PAPSP0400: PSP BEDFORD	Police Services

Units

Unit	Radio Number	Personnel	Jurisdiction
------	--------------	-----------	--------------

Attachments

File Name	File Description	Attached By
-----------	------------------	-------------

Exhibit C

From: no-reply@openrecordspennsylvania.com
To: calvintgodfrey@gmail.com
Subject: [External] PA Office of Open Records - Appeal Confirmation
Date: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 10:37:56 AM
Attachments: oor_logo_email.png

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown senders. To report suspicious email, use the [Report Phishing button in Outlook](#).



pennsylvania
OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS

You have filed an appeal of an agency's response to a request for records under the Right-to-Know Law.

Name:	Calvin Godfrey
Company:	138 Pictures
Address 1:	290 Eshelman Rd
Address 2:	
City:	Lancaster
State:	Pennsylvania
Zip:	17601
Phone:	323-528-1331
Email:	calvintgodfrey@gmail.com
Email2:	
Agency (typed):	Emergency Services Management
Agency Address 1:	200 South Juliana Street Suite
Agency Address 2:	
Agency City:	Bedford
Agency State:	Pennsylvania

Agency Zip:	15522
Agency Phone:	814-623-4807
Agency Email:	slepley@bedfordcountypa.org
Records at Issue in this Appeal:	-911 calls and transcripts from August 2020 concerning the shooting of Ursino Von Thurman. See Attached Request and Response.
Request Submitted to Agency Via:	e-mail
Request Date:	06/10/2025
Response Date:	07/28/2025
Deemed Denied:	No
Agency Open Records Officer:	Debra Brown, Open Records Officer
Attached a copy of my request for records:	Yes
Attached a copy of all responses from the Agency regarding my request:	Yes
Attached any letters or notices extending the Agency's time to respond to my request:	Yes
Agree to permit the OOR additional time to issue a final determination:	30 Days
Interested in resolving this issue through OOR mediation:	Yes
Attachments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTK Request Bedford County 6.10.25.pdf • RTK Appeal 7.29.25 Bedford CTY EMS.pdf • Redacted CAD Report 1 14928-6363-81041 4923-7162-4280 v.1_Redacted.pdf • Redacted CAD Reports 24906-5664-80241_Redacted.pdf • Godfrey RTKL Response4929-1288-91751.docx • Gmail - Bedford County - Right to Know.pdf

I requested the listed records from the Agency named above. By submitting this form, I am appealing the Agency's denial, partial denial, or deemed denial because the requested records are public records in the possession, custody or control of the Agency; the records do not qualify for any exemptions under § 708 of the RTKL, are not protected by a privilege, and are not exempt under any Federal or State law or regulation; and the request was sufficiently specific.

333 Market Street, 16th Floor | Harrisburg, PA 17101-2234 | 717.346.9903 | F 717.425.5343 | openrecords.pa.gov