



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-074

March 2, 2026

In re: Kyle Thompson/Green River Correctional Complex

Summary: The Green River Correctional Complex (“the Complex”) did not violate the Open Records Act (“the Act”) when it sought clarification of an ambiguous request for public records.

Open Records Decision

Inmate Kyle Thompson (“the Appellant”) submitted a request to the Complex for a “copy of [his] authorized housing, institution only, from 2018 till current. Not in-house placement.” In a timely response, the Complex stated it could not determine which records the Appellant wished to obtain and asked him to provide a more precise description of “what information [he was] requesting (example: housing assignments or bed assignments).” This appeal followed.

A person requesting copies of public records must “precisely describe[] the public records which are readily available within the public agency.” KRS 61.872(3)(b). A description is precise “if it describes the records in definite, specific, and unequivocal terms.” 98-ORD-17 (internal quotation marks omitted). Here, the Complex states the Appellant’s request “implicate[s] multiple categories of records” and it cannot determine from the request whether the Appellant seeks records pertaining to his housing assignments or his bed assignments. Because the request was ambiguous, the Complex asked the Appellant to specify the type of records he was requesting. A “request in good faith for clarification of an ambiguity, or for further information needed to locate the correct records, does not violate the [Act].” 22-ORD-123; *see also* 19-ORD-035; 19-ORD-028; 14-ORD-037; 06-ORD-253. Therefore, the Complex did not violate the Act when it sought a clarification of the Appellant’s request.¹

¹ The Appellant also complains about the Complex’s similar disposition of another request. However, after the Appellant clarified that request on appeal, the Complex allowed inspection of the records. Accordingly, this appeal is moot as to that request. *See* 40 KAR 1:030 § 6 (“If the requested

A party aggrieved by this decision may appeal it by initiating an action in the appropriate circuit court pursuant to KRS 61.880(5) and KRS 61.882 within 30 days from the date of this decision. Pursuant to 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/ James M. Herrick
James M. Herrick
Assistant Attorney General

#102

Distributed to:

Kyle Thompson, #248317
Charles Bates, Esq.
Nathan Goens, Esq.
Ms. Sara Talarigo
Ms. Ann Smith

documents are made available to the complaining party after a complaint is made, the Attorney General shall decline to issue a decision in the matter.”).