



## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

RUSSELL COLEMAN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

1024 CAPITAL CENTER DRIVE  
SUITE 200  
FRANKFORT, KY 40601  
(502) 696-5300

26-ORD-043

February 10, 2026

In re: La'Daya Daniels/Kentucky State Police

**Summary:** The Kentucky State Police (“KSP”) did not violate the Open Records Act (“the Act”) when it denied a duplicate request for records where the requester failed to show some justification for resubmitting that request.

### *Open Records Decision*

La'Daya Daniels (“Appellant”) submitted two requests for records to KSP. First, she requested “a specific set of records that appear to be missing from the materials previously produced.”<sup>1</sup> Second, she requested “any and all existing records documenting or reflecting the muting of audio on [a specific Trooper’s] body-worn camera during the incident involving [her].”<sup>2</sup> KSP denied the first request because it “is duplicative of [her] previous request.”<sup>3</sup> This appeal followed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Specifically, the Appellant’s first request was for “the audio and/or video recording of the conversation or interaction between” a specific Trooper and another specific person after that person “contacted dispatch and requested to speak with [the Trooper], and before the decision to arrest [the Appellant].” The Appellant specified that she also requested “any audio or video recordings, call logs, radio traffic, dispatch records, or other documentation reflection any communication between [the Trooper] and any caller or individual.”

<sup>2</sup> KSP denied the second request because she has “not provided a statement explaining the manner in which [she is] a ‘resident of the Commonwealth under KRS 61.870(10)(a) to (f).’” The Appellant does not challenge this, and it is not at issue in this appeal. Under KRS 61.872(2)(a), “[a]ny resident of the Commonwealth shall have the right to inspect public records.” A public agency “may require the applicant to provide a statement in the written application of the manner in which the applicant is a resident of the Commonwealth under KRS 61.870(10)(a) to (f).” *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> KSP noted that the records it previously provided to the Appellant were redacted under KRS 61.878(1)(a), as it included “information of a personal nature where the public disclosure thereof would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” KSP specified that it redacted “social security numbers, operators license numbers, dates of birth and personal addresses.” These redactions are not at issue in this appeal.

The Office has generally upheld the denial of a duplicate request for records as imposing an “unreasonable burden” under KRS 61.872(6). *See, e.g.*, 05-ORD-198. “To produce [records] once entails some inconvenience to the agency; to produce them three and four times requires a level of ‘patience and long-suffering’ that the legislature could not have intended.” OAG 92-91 (quoting OAG 77-151). In 95-ORD-47, the Office stated that an agency is not “required to satisfy the identical request a second time in the absence of some justification for resubmitting that request.” Thus, in 04-ORD-018, the Office found that a prisoner who had inspected his inmate file once was not entitled to view it again unless he could “explain the necessity of reproducing the same records which either already have been provided or have been inspected by him, such as loss or destruction of the records.” This explanation need not be extensive. *See, e.g.*, 09-ORD-076 (finding an inmate was entitled to inspect the same medical records a second time when he had a new concern about a medical condition). Here, the Appellant already possesses all the records responsive to the prior request and has not articulated “some justification for resubmitting that request.”<sup>4</sup> As a result, the Office cannot find that KSP violated the Act when it denied a duplicate request.

A party aggrieved by this decision may appeal it by initiating an action in the appropriate circuit court under KRS 61.880(5) and KRS 61.882 within 30 days from the date of this decision. Under KRS 61.880(3), the Attorney General shall be notified of any action in circuit court, but shall not be named as a party in that action or in any subsequent proceedings. The Attorney General will accept notice of the complaint emailed to [OAGAppeals@ky.gov](mailto:OAGAppeals@ky.gov).

**Russell Coleman**  
**Attorney General**

/s/ Matthew Ray  
Matthew Ray  
Assistant Attorney General

---

<sup>4</sup> Here, the Appellant explained that she was making a duplicate request because certain requested records were absent from KSP’s production of records in her previous request. Instead of appealing KSP’s response to that request, she initiated a duplicate request for the missing records. KSP asserts that it informed the Appellant in the previous records request that the “other documents she requested did not exist.” KSP further asserts that it “provided [the] Appellant with all recordings relating to her arrest” in the previous records request. The previous request and KSP’s response thereto are not at issue in this appeal.

#43

Distributed to:

La'Daya Daniels

Kristin Logan Mischel

Sara Talarigo

Charles Bates

Captain Bradley Stotts

Sgt. Zack Morris

Emmalie K. Hankinson

Jonathan Courtwright

Ann Smith

Nathan Goens

Lydia Kendrick