

WES MOORE
GOVERNOR

ARUNA MILLER
LT. GOVERNOR



SAREESH RAWAT, CHAIR
SAMUEL G. ENCARNACION
DEBRA LYNN GARDNER
QUINTON M. HERBERT
NIVEK M. JOHNSON

STATE OF MARYLAND
PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT COMPLIANCE BOARD

PIACB 25-24

March 20, 2025

Board of Professional Counselors & Therapists, Custodian
John Davis, Complainant

In August of 2023, an individual named James Alford sent a Public Information Act (“PIA”) request to the Board of Professional Counselors and Therapists (“BPCT”). In that request, he asked for records related to a specific BPCT licensee, Louis Leibowitz, and suggested that “sensitive information” about him (Mr. Alford) was involved in a “disciplinary review or complaint or something.” After the BPCT denied Mr. Alford’s PIA request, it began to receive additional requests for the same specific universe of records sent under different names from different email accounts, including that of this complainant. Eventually, the BPCT filed a complaint with our Board alleging that the PIA requests were frivolous, vexatious, or in bad faith. *See* § 4-1A-04(b).¹ After a careful and thorough review of the record before us, we concluded that those PIA requests were vexatious and in bad faith. *See* PIACB 25-34 (Mar. 7, 2025). We thus ordered that the BPCT may ignore the PIA requests identified in its complaint, as well as any subsequent or future requests, from the same or different email accounts, for records that were “substantially the same”—i.e., records that related back to James Alford, Louis Leibowitz, and matters between them.² *See* § 4-1A-04(b)(3)(i); COMAR 14.02.07.04D(1) and (2).

This matter involves PIA requests identified in the BPCT’s complaint underlying PIACB 25-34. One request was sent on August 14, 2024, and asked for “a copy of the BOPCT’s notice sent to all parties related to the action for C-24-CV-24-001520, the certificate of compliance filed with the court, and the certificate of service.” The BPCT responded the next day, stating that it had no responsive records. *See* § 4-202(d) (governing responses for non-existent records). The second request was sent on August 27, 2024, and asked for “all documents and records your agency has in any form directly or indirectly

¹ Statutory citations are to the General Provisions Article of Maryland’s Annotated Code unless otherwise stated.

² We have granted similar relief to other custodians concerning PIA requests from the same group of requesters for records related in some way to James Alford and Louis Leibowitz. *See* PIACB 24-29 (Mar. 29, 2024) (Office of the State’s Attorney for Baltimore City); PIACB 24-106 (Sept. 26, 2024) (Maryland Office of the Attorney General); PIACB 25-32 (Feb. 21, 2025) (Baltimore Police Department). All of those decisions involved PIA requests sent from the email account associated with this complainant.

related to Louis R Leibowitz, LBA580.” On August 29, 2024, the BPCT provided the complainant with a letter in which it indicated that it would take more than ten working days to produce the records and the fee for production would range from \$2,088 to \$3,384. *See* § 4-203(b). In this complaint, the complainant alleges that the BPCT’s response to the first PIA request constitutes a constructive denial, and that the BPCT has charged an unreasonable fee for the second PIA request, thus denying him access to public records.

Though not stated explicitly, we presume that the relief sought in this complaint is an order directing the BPCT to produce records responsive to the complainant’s PIA request either free of charge or for a substantially reduced fee. We cannot grant this relief, however, if we are to follow our own reasoning and the conclusions, we reached in PIACB 25-34. This is because, by that decision, we have already directed that the BPCT may ignore these PIA requests.³ It would defy logic and reason for us, after review, to resolve this complaint in any way inconsistent with our conclusions in PIACB 25-34. We therefore dismiss this complaint as moot. *Cf. Frazier v. Castle Ford, Ltd.*, 430 Md. 144, 162 (2013) (explaining that “[a]n issue is moot if, at the time it is before the court, there is no longer an existing controversy between the parties, so that there is no longer any effective remedy that the court can provide”). While we are aware that, from the complainant’s perspective, there is still much in controversy, in our view we cannot order any “effective remedy” here.

Public Information Act Compliance Board

Sareesh Rawat, Chair
Samuel G. Encarnacion
Debra Lynn Gardner
Quinton M. Herbert
Nivek M. Johnson

³ We are aware that our decision in PIACB 25-34 has been appealed. *In the Matter of Steven Brown*, Case No. C-24-CV-25-001995 (Cir. Ct. Balt. City). Should the Circuit Court reverse or otherwise alter our decision and order, we are confident that the Court’s opinion and order will guide the BPCT’s handling of these PIA requests and the many others it has received related to PIACB 25-34. Though the PIA provides that an appeal “automatically stays the decision of the Board pending the circuit court’s decision,” § 4-1A-10(b)(2), this provision does not prevent us from electing to remain consistent in our fact-finding and reasoning here.