

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Glue Wilkins,	:	
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Philadelphia County Judicial District	:	
(Office of Open Records),	:	No. 467 C.D. 2025
Respondent	:	Submitted: June 16, 2026

OPINION NOT REPORTED

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

FILED: September 1, 2026

Glue Wilkins (Wilkins), pro se, petitions this Court for review of the Office of Open Records’ (OOR) December 17, 2024 Final Determination (Final Determination) denying his appeal from the deemed denial of his Right-to-Know Law (RTKL)¹ request (Request). Essentially, the issue before this Court is whether the OOR properly dismissed Wilkins’ appeal for lack of jurisdiction.² After review, this Court affirms.

On November 25, 2024, Wilkins filed his Request with an agency Wilkins identified as the *Philadelphia County Office of Open Records* seeking “a copy of the response, docket, form - and/or memo that confirms/documents the processing of my civil complaint (*Glue Wilkins v. Michael Daley*) against Michael

¹ Act of February 14, 2008, P.L. 6, 65 P.S. §§ 67.101-67.3104.

² In his Statement of the Questions Involved, Wilkins presents one issue for this Court’s review: whether the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, pursuant to the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure, is required to commence a properly filed civil action. *See* Wilkins’ Br. at 1. Because the OOR dismissed Wilkins’ appeal for lack of jurisdiction and that is the order from which Wilkins appeals, this Court addresses whether the OOR properly dismissed Wilkins’ appeal.

Daley[.]”³ Certified Record (C.R.) at Ex. 1 (italics added). On December 5, 2024, Wilkins appealed from what Wilkins referenced as the Request’s *deemed denial* to the OOR. *See id.* On December 17, 2024, the OOR issued the Final Determination denying Wilkins’ appeal, explaining:

The OOR lacks jurisdiction. The record at issue is a docket sheet related to a specific civil complaint. Because docket sheets are judicially authorized, they constitute judicial records for which the OOR is not permitted to grant release. *See Wilkins v. Dauphin Cnty. Dist. Att[’y’s Off[.]*, OOR Dkt. AP 2024-0411, . . . (relying upon *Phila. Dist. Att[’y’s Off[.] v. Stover*, 176 A.3d 1024 (Pa. C[mwlth.] 2017)[,] to conclude that the OOR lacks jurisdiction over “judicial records,” including docket sheets); 65 P.S. §[] 67.503(a)-(b).

C.R. at 14. Wilkins appealed to this Court.⁴

Initially, this Court has explained:

The RTKL explicitly confers jurisdiction on appeals officers within [the] OOR to render determinations regarding records disputes involving Commonwealth and local agencies. Section 503(a) of the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.503(a). By contrast, appeals of disputes involving a judicial agency are appealed to an appeals officer so designated by that judicial agency. Sections 503(b) and 1101(a) of the RTKL, 65 P.S. §§ 67.503(b), 67.1101(a).

Faulk v. Phila. Clerk of Courts, 116 A.3d 1183, 1185-86 (Pa. Cmwlt. 2015).

This Court has repeatedly held that “[the] OOR does not have jurisdiction to hear an appeal from the denial of a record request by a judicial agency.” *Burda v. Pa. Jud. Conduct Bd.*, 175 A.3d 1138, 1139 (Pa. Cmwlt. 2017);

³ According to the OOR, “[a]lthough [Wilkins] listed ‘Philadelphia County Office of Open Records’ as the agency on the appeal form, the Request appears to have been submitted to Eric Feder, the director of the Philadelphia Office of Judicial Records, a judicial agency over which the OOR . . . lacks jurisdiction.” Certified Record at Ex. 2 n.1.

⁴ “[This Court] review[s] OOR’s statutory jurisdiction as a matter of law. Accordingly, [this Court’s] standard of review is plenary.” *Faulk v. Phila. Clerk of Courts*, 116 A.3d 1183, 1185 (Pa. Cmwlt. 2015) (citation omitted).

see also Faulk . . . , 116 A.3d [at] 1186 . . . (explaining that “judicial agencies[] . . . are not subject to OOR’s jurisdiction” (citing Section 503(b) of the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.503(b))). Rather, “appeals of disputes involving a judicial agency are [directed] to an appeals officer so designated by that judicial agency.” *Faulk*, 116 A.3d at 1185 (citing Sections 503(b) and 1101(a) of the RTKL, 65 P.S. §§ 67.503(b), 67.1101(a)). The RTKL defines “[j]udicial agency” as “[a] court of the Commonwealth or any other entity or office of the unified judicial system.” Section 102 of the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.102. The term encompasses entities such as a prothonotary’s office, a clerk of courts’ office, and offices acting as the custodian of criminal records. *See Faulk*, 116 A.3d at 1186 (holding that Philadelphia Clerk of Courts is [a] judicial agency); *Frazier v. Phila. Cnty. Off. of Prothonotary*, 58 A.3d 858, 859-60 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2012) (holding that Philadelphia County Office of Prothonotary is [a] judicial agency); *Smith v. Phila. Off. of Jud. Recs.* (Pa. Cmwlth.[] No. 945 C.D. 2019, filed Sept[.] 25, 2020), slip op. at 2 n.2, 4 (holding that Philadelphia Office of Judicial Records [(Judicial Records Office)], . . . is [a] judicial agency).

Henderson v. Allegheny Cnty. Dep’t of Ct. Recs. (Pa. Cmwlth. No. 411 C.D. 2020, filed Sept. 10, 2021), slip op. at 3-4.⁵

Wilkins’ Request sought records from what he identified as the *Philadelphia County Office of Open Records* rather than the Judicial Records Office. Nonetheless, this Court has clarified:

“In discerning whether records qualify as records ‘of’ a particular agency, [this Court] consider[s] the subject-matter of the records. **The location of the record or an agency’s possession does not guarantee that a record is accessible to the public; rather, the character of the record controls.**” *Grine [v. C[nty.] of Centre]*, 138 A.3d [88,] 94-95 [(Pa. Cmwlth. 2016) (*en banc*)] (citations omitted). “[A] record qualifies as ‘of’ an agency when that

⁵ This Court’s unreported memorandum opinions may be cited “for [their] persuasive value, but not as a binding precedent.” Section 414 of the Commonwealth Court’s Internal Operating Procedures, 210 Pa. Code § 69.414. The unreported opinions herein are cited for their persuasive value.

record documents a transaction or activity of the agency. ‘Documents’ means proves, supports [or] evidences.” *Id.* at 94 (citations and some internal quotation marks omitted).

Pursuant to the RTKL, a “judicial agency” is defined as “[a] court of the Commonwealth or any other entity or office of the unified judicial system.” Section 102 of the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.102. “[T]he RTKL offers limited access restricted by its terms to a defined type of records of judicial agencies. Thus, unlike records of Commonwealth or local agencies, where *all* records in their possession are presumed public, only ‘financial records’ of judicial agencies are accessible through the RTKL.” *Faulk*, 116 A.3d at 1187

. . . . The fact that [a local agency] may possess[] - or readily obtain - a copy of the [judicial agency record] in no way transforms the record of a judicial agency into a record of a local agency. Were this Court to conclude otherwise, “every record ever generated by a [c]ounty court [of common pleas], including the draft opinions and law clerk memorandums, would be accessible through the RTKL simply by submitting the request to the [c]ounty instead, an absurd result that would make [S]ection 304 of the RTKL[, 65 P.S. § 67.304,⁶] meaningless.” [*Ct. of Common Pleas of Lackawanna Cnty. v. Pa. Off. of Open Recs.*], 2 A.3d [810,] 813 [(Pa. Cmwlth. 2010)].

Stover, 176 A.3d at 1028-29 (emphasis added).

Here, the Request - “the response, docket, form - and/or memo that **confirms/documents the [judicial agency’s] processing** of [the] civil complaint” -

⁶ Section 304 of the RTKL provides:

(a) REQUIREMENT.--A judicial agency shall provide financial records in accordance with th[e RTKL] or any rule or order of court providing equal or greater access to the records.

(b) PROHIBITION.--A judicial agency may not deny a requester access to a financial record due to the intended use of the financial record by the requester.

clearly sought judicial agency records. C.R. at Ex. 1 (emphasis added). Accordingly, the OOR properly dismissed Wilkins' appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

For all of the above reasons, the OOR's Final Determination is affirmed.

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Glue Wilkins,	:	
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Philadelphia County Judicial District	:	
(Office of Open Records),	:	No. 467 C.D. 2025
Respondent	:	

PER CURIAM

ORDER

AND NOW, this 1st day of September, 2026, the Office of Open Records' December 17, 2024 Final Determination is affirmed.