

**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 25-25**  
**March 20, 2025**

**Board of Professional Counselors & Therapists, Custodian**  
**Phil Garcia, 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).<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> *See* § 4-1A-04(b)(3)(i); COMAR 14.02.07.04D(1) and (2).

This matter involves a PIA request identified in the BPCT’s complaint underlying PIACB 25-34. The request was sent on September 23, 2024, and asked for “all documents and records your agency has” related to an attorney whom the complainant alleged had “filed false affidavits and fictitious information about [the complainant’s] wife, Rachel Garcia, in the Baltimore City Circuit Court.” The complainant indicated that “[t]his includes all pleadings, all records, and all internal communications your agency has . . . [and] all pleadings rejected by the court for the apparent fraud as well.” The BPCT

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

<sup>2</sup> 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). PIACB 24-29 and PIACB 25-32 involved PIA requests sent from the email account associated with this complainant.

responded on October 1, 2024, stating that it had no responsive records. *See* § 4-202(d) (governing responses for non-existent records). In this complaint, the complainant alleges that he was “wrongfully denied 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. 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 this PIA request.<sup>3</sup> 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*

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 this PIA request 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.