



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-059

February 20, 2026

In re: Jonathan Enyart/Lee Adjustment Center

Summary: The Lee Adjustment Center (“the Center”) violated the Open Records Act (“the Act”) when it failed to, within five business days, fulfill a request for public records or deny it and explain why.

Open Records Decision

Jonathan Enyart (“Appellant”) submitted a request to the Center for a “copy of outgoing legal mail log, for part of: October 9, 2025[,] to October 31, 2025.” In response, the Center provided “a copy of outgoing legal mail that was logged for [the Appellant] in October 2025.” This appeal followed.¹

Under the Act, a public agency has five business days to fulfill a request for public records or deny such a request and explain why. KRS 61.880(1). Here, the Appellant requested a “copy of outgoing legal mail log, for part of: October 9, 2025[,] to October 31, 2025.” Yet, the Center did not provide the requested legal mail log to fulfill the Appellant’s request. Instead, the Center transcribed portions of the record into a new document, providing some responsive information from the requested legal mail log but withholding other information contained in the log.² Thus, the Center violated the Act when it failed to fulfill a request for a public record or explain why it denied the request.³

¹ The Appellant also raises issues unrelated to the Act. An open records appeal is not the appropriate forum to resolve issues unrelated to the Act because the Office’s jurisdiction is limited to an agency’s alleged violations of the Act. *See* KRS 61.880(2)(a).

² The Center does not divulge what information was omitted from its transcription of the legal mail log, nor does it provide any basis for withholding the omitted information. Under KRS 61.880(2)(c), the public agency has the burden of proof to sustain its actions.

³ On appeal, the Center states it provided a redacted copy of the requested legal mail log and asserts the appeal is now moot. Under 40 KAR 1:030 § 6, “[i]f the requested documents are made available to the complaining party after a complaint is made, the Attorney General shall decline to issue a decision

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.

Russell Coleman
Attorney General

/s/ Matthew Ray
Matthew Ray
Assistant Attorney General

#058

Distributed to:

Jonathan Enyart #229333
G. Edward Henry
Kristy Hale
Danny Dodd
Jason Sizemore

in the matter.” However, mootness only applies when the agency provides the requested records in their entirety, not redacted copies. *See, e.g.*, 25-ORD-204 n.2; 23-ORD-313 n.2; 20-ORD-078; 12-ORD-046. Because the Center states that it provided a *redacted* copy of the requested legal mail log, this appeal is not moot. Further, because the Appellant initiated this appeal due to the Center’s alleged failure to provide the requested record or explain why it denied his request, the substance of the Center’s subsequent response is not ripe for review. *See, e.g.*, 23-ORD-135 n.3. The Office has previously found that it cannot resolve a factual dispute between the parties to an appeal. *See, e.g.*, 22-ORD-010 (declining to resolve a factual dispute that the records received were different from the records requested).