GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  

Mayor’s Office of Legal Counsel  

September 12, 2017  

VIA U.S. MAIL  

Mr. Charles Awusin Inko-Tariah  

RE: FOIA Appeal 2017-135  

Dear Mr. Inko-Tariah:  

This letter responds to the administrative appeal you submitted to the Mayor under the District of Columbia Freedom of Information Act, D.C. Official Code § 2-537 (“DC FOIA”). In your appeal, you assert that the Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) improperly withheld records you requested under the DC FOIA.  

Background  

On February 22, 2017, this Office referred to MPD a records request that you originally submitted to the Open Government Office seeking incident reports from 1994 and 1998. On February 27, 2017, MPD denied your request, stating that its documents retention schedule for incident reports is 10 years and the most recent incident report you requested was from 19 years ago; therefore, it no longer maintained the records you seek.  

On appeal you challenge MPD’s denial, asserting that you previously requested the incident reports from MPD approximately 15 years ago. You claim that at that time you were told that the incident reports would be provided to you; however, you never received them. MPD provided this Office with a response to your appeal on August 30, 2017. In its response, MPD reasserted its position that the incident reports you seek were purged in accordance with MPD’s document retention schedule. MPD’s response also included a copy of the relevant portion of its document retention schedule.  

Discussion  

It is the public policy of the District of Columbia that “all persons are entitled to full and complete information regarding the affairs of government and the official acts of those who represent them as public officials and employees.” D.C. Official Code § 2-531. In aid of that policy, DC FOIA creates the right “to inspect . . . and . . . copy any public record of a public

1 A copy of MPD’s response is attached for your reference.
body . . .” D.C. Official Code § 2-532(a). The right created under the DC FOIA to inspect public records is subject to various exemptions that may form the basis for denial of a request. See D.C. Official Code § 2-534. Under the DC FOIA, an agency is required to disclose materials only if they were “retained by a public body.” D.C. Official Code § 2-502(18).


The primary issue in this appeal is your belief that responsive records exist; therefore, we consider whether or not MPD conducted an adequate search. DC FOIA requires only that, under the circumstances, a search is reasonably calculated to produce the relevant documents. The test is not whether any additional documents might conceivably exist, but whether the government’s search for responsive documents was adequate. Weisberg v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 705 F.2d 1344, 1351 (D.C. Cir. 1983). Speculation, unsupported by any factual evidence that records exist is not enough to support a finding that full disclosure has not been made. Marks v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 578 F.2d 261 (9th Cir. 1978).

In order to establish the adequacy of a search,

‘the agency must show that it made a good faith effort to conduct a search for the requested records, using methods which can be reasonably expected to produce the information requested.’ [Oglesby v. United States Dep't of the Army, 920 F.2d 57, 68 (D.C. Cir. 1990)]. . . The court applies a ‘reasonableness test to determine the ‘adequacy’ of a search methodology, Weisberg v. United States Dep't of Justice, 227 U.S. App. D.C. 253, 705 F.2d 1344, 1351 (D.C. Cir. 1983) . . .

Campbell v. United States DOJ, 164 F.3d 20, 27 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

To conduct a reasonable and adequate search, an agency must: (1) make a reasonable determination as to the locations of records requested; and (2) search for the records in those locations. Doe v. D.C. Metro. Police Dep't, 948 A.2d 1210, 1220-21 (D.C. 2008) (citing Oglesby, 920 F.2d at 68). This first step includes determining the likely electronic databases where such records are to be located, such as email accounts and word processing files, and the relevant paper-based files that the agency maintains. Id. Second, the agency must affirm that the relevant locations were in fact searched. Id. Generalized and conclusory allegations cannot suffice to establish an adequate search. See In Def. of Animals v. NIH, 527 F. Supp. 2d 23, 32 (D.D.C. 2007).

MPD asserts here that the latest retention period for the records you seek ended in 2008, and the responsive records have been purged. Although you contend that MPD indicated to you approximately 15 years ago that you could receive a copy of the records, this representation has no bearing on whether the records exist now. We accept MPD’s representation that responsive
records no longer exist, based on MPD’s adherence to its retention policy for the incident reports at issue.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, we affirm the MPD’s decision and hereby dismiss your appeal. This constitutes the final decision of this Office.

If you are dissatisfied with this decision, you may commence a civil action against the District of Columbia government in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia in accordance with the DC FOIA.

Respectfully,

Mayor’s Office of Legal Counsel

cc: Ronald B. Harris, Deputy General Counsel, MPD (via email)