

[Cite as *DeCrane v. Cleveland*, 2018-Ohio-4363.]

SEAN P. DECRANE

Requester

v.

CITY OF CLEVELAND

Respondent

Case No. 2018-00358PQ

Judge Patrick M. McGrath

ENTRY ADOPTING  
RECOMMENDATION OF  
SPECIAL MASTER

{¶1} On February 16, 2018, attorney Subodh Chandra sent a letter to respondent City of Cleveland on behalf of requester Sean DeCrane making a public records request to inspect “[a]ll records generated while processing public-records request 15-2220.” (Complaint at 2-3.) The Cleveland Department of Law Public Records Section (PRS) acknowledged receipt, stating that the request was being processed for a response. (*Id.* at 4.) On March 2, 2018, the PRS responded to the request on March 2, 2018, stating:

We are unable to fulfill your request as the request is vague, ambiguous, and overly broad under Ohio R.C. 149.43(B)(2). We are unable to determine what records you seek based on the wording of the request “all records generated while processing...15-2220.” If you wish, please resubmit your request and provide clarification and specificity as to what records you seek related to PR# 15-2220’s fulfillment.

If you have any questions, or wish to discuss this further, you may contact our office at [publicrecords@city.cleveland.oh.us](mailto:publicrecords@city.cleveland.oh.us) or 216-664-2772.

(Response, Amos Aff. at ¶ 4.)

{¶2} On March 6, 2018, DeCrane filed a complaint under R.C. 2743.75 alleging denial of access to public records in violation of R.C. 149.43(B). Following unsuccessful mediation, the City filed an answer (Response) asserting that it had properly denied the request as ambiguous and overly broad, and on June 26, 2018 filed a supplemental pleading ordered by the court. On August 8, 2018, DeCrane filed a reply with copies

of the records that he had previously received related to request 15-2220. On August 27, 2018, Special Master Jeffery Clark issued a report finding that the request was moot as to records DeCrane had previously received, and that the City had otherwise properly denied the request as ambiguous and overly broad. The special master recommended the court deny DeCrane's claim for production of records.

{¶3} R.C. 2743.75(F)(2) states, in part: "Either party may object to the report and recommendation within seven business days after receiving the report and recommendation by filing a written objection with the clerk \* \* \* ." No objections were filed by either party. The court determines that there is no error of law or other defect evident on the face of the special master's decision. Therefore, the court adopts the special master's report and recommendation as its own, including findings of fact and conclusions of law contained therein.

{¶4} Court costs are assessed against the requester. The clerk shall serve upon all parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal.

---

PATRICK M. MCGRATH  
Judge