

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIDDLE DISTRICT**

PENNSYLVANIA INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION, INC.,	:	No. 677 MAL 2021
	:	
Petitioner	:	Petition for Allowance of Appeal
	:	from the Order of the
v.	:	Commonwealth Court
	:	
	:	
SIMON CAMPBELL (OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS),	:	
	:	
Respondent	:	
	:	
	:	
PENNSYLVANIA INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION, INC.,	:	No. 678 MAL 2021
	:	
	:	
Petitioner	:	Petition for Allowance of Appeal
	:	from the Order of the
v.	:	Commonwealth Court
	:	
	:	
SIMON CAMPBELL (OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS),	:	
	:	
	:	
Respondent	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 22nd day of June, 2022, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is **GRANTED, LIMITED TO** the issues set forth below. Allocatur is **DENIED** as to all remaining issues. The issues, as stated by Petitioner, are:

- (1) Did the Commonwealth Court err in holding that the Right-to-Know Law's ("RTKL") singling out of PIAA for inclusion within the definition of a "state-affiliated entity" did not constitute special legislation and a violation of PIAA's equal protection rights where PIAA is a private non-profit corporation that receives no Commonwealth funding of any kind, has not been granted and does not exercise any legislatively-granted powers, is not controlled by Commonwealth personnel and was not created by an act of the General Assembly, and where the only bases used by the Commonwealth Court relied on facts not of record (or accurate) and a standard (whether an entity is a state actor under federal civil rights law) never before applied by any court to determine whether an entity is a Commonwealth Agency?
- (2) Where a conflict concerning access to records exists between the Nonprofit Corporation Law of 1988 and the RTKL and where the RTKL provides that its record access provisions do not apply in the event of a conflict, did the Commonwealth Court err in holding that the provisions of the RTKL supersede those of the Nonprofit Corporation Law so as to negate the limitations in that law on disclosure of records of nonprofit corporations?

Justice Brobson did not participate in the consideration or decision of this matter.