



STATE OF INDIANA

MIKE BRAUN, Governor

**PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR
JENNIFER RUBY**

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W470
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2745
Telephone: (317) 234-0906
Email: pac@opac.in.gov
Website: www.IN.gov/pac

December 11, 2025

Re: Complaint 25-FC-119
Pamela Frazee (Complainant) v.
Tippecanoe County Sheriff's Office (Respondent)

This advisory opinion is issued in response to the above-referenced complaint filed June 8, 2025. Similar or related complaints were filed under 25-FC-126, 25-FC-223 to 238 and 279, and those complaints are being combined under 25-FC-119.

Notices of Complaint, along with a copy of the complaint, were sent to the Respondent on October 20 and 21, 2025, requesting formal responses by November 18 and 19, 2025. Formal responses, submitted by Douglas Masson of Hoffman, Luhman & Masson, PC on behalf of Respondent, were received by this office on November 18 and 19, 2025.

The complaints allege that Respondent violated the Access to Public Records Act (APRA) by failing to provide copies of Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) logs requested for specific addresses over specific date ranges.

ANALYSIS

The public policy of APRA states that "[p]roviding persons with information is an essential function of a representative government and an integral part of the routine duties of public officials and employees, whose duty it is to provide the information." Indiana Code (IC) 5-14-3-1. Respondent is a public agency for purposes of APRA; and therefore, subject to the requirements. IC 5-14-3-2(q). As a result, unless an exception applies, any person has the right to inspect and copy Respondent's public records during regular business hours. IC 5-14-3-3(a).

APRA contains exceptions-both mandatory and discretionary-to the general rule of disclosure. APRA prohibits a public agency from disclosing certain records unless access is specifically required by state or federal statute or is ordered by a court under the rules of discovery. IC 5-14-3-4(a).

Complainant states that on May 19, 2025, she requested a copy of CAD records for a specific Lafayette address spanning a period from January 1, 2012, to May 19, 2025, including specific information of the dates, nature, disposition, case number and responding units for each incident. Respondent, through Captain Hainje, denied the request citing that the request did not have reasonable specificity to identify the records.

Complainant states that on May 23, 2025, she requested a copy of CAD records for two (2) specific Lafayette addresses spanning a period from January 1, 2012, to March 5, 2024, including specific information of the dates, nature, disposition, case number and responding units for each incident. Initially, Respondent thought this was a duplicate request to the May 19, 2025, request. However, Respondent, through Captain Hainje, denied the request citing again that the request did not have reasonable specificity to identify the records.

Respondent did not give an exception to APRA regarding the requested records, but denied these initial records request based upon lack of specificity.

Complainant, complying with Captain Hainje's direction, initiated new APRA requests on August 21, 2025, each of which included the same information but limited to only one calendar year. These renewed requests were not denied as lacking reasonable specificity.

APRA requires an agency to maintain a daily log or record that lists suspected or investigated crimes, accidents, or complaints, and the following information shall be made available for inspection and copying:

- 1) The time, substance, and location of all complaints or requests for assistance received by the agency.
- 2) The time and nature of the agency's response to all complaints or requests for assistance.
- 3) If the incident involves an alleged crime or infraction:
 - A) the time, date and location of occurrence;
 - B) the name and age of any victim, unless the victim:
 - i) is less than eighteen (18) years of age, unless and to the extent that the victim's parent, guardian, or custodian, who has been not charged with or convicted of a crime against the victim, consents in writing to public disclosure of the records; or

- ii) is a victim under IC 35-42-4-or IC 35-42-3.5;
- C) the factual circumstances surrounding the incident; and
- D) a general description of any injuries, property, or weapons
Involved.

The information required herein shall be made available for inspection and copying. IC 5-14-3-5(c).

Respondent does not contend that the records do not exist. Respondent is required to create and maintain them. The information requested by Complainant was very similar, if not identical, to the information required to be contained in the CAD log.

Finally, APRA requires that if a public record contains disclosable and non-disclosable information, the public agency shall, upon receipt of a request, separate the material that may be disclosed and make it available for inspection and copying.

Respondent's initial denial for lack of specificity was inaccurate. Nothing in the original request was different from the subsequent requests except that all the requested years were in a single request.

The Complainant requested records for specific address(s) that were readily accessible on the CAD system. Respondent subsequently searched the system, based upon the renewed requests for records of August 21, 2025, and identified some 17 records for the calendar years 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025, through the dates requested by Complainant, that were responsive to the record request.

Respondent pursuant to APRA then redacted those records and made them available to the Complainant on October 3, 2025, subject to a fee for copying of \$7.70. Respondent justified this fee under the statutes.

When asked for clarification regarding the prior nine (9) years of records requested by Complainant and why they had not been provided, Respondent explained that Respondent's computer system underwent a cut-over in 2021 that required additional time and effort to capture the earlier records.

Respondent also stated that some eighty-nine (89) records had been identified for the period January 1, 2012, through December 31, 2020. However, Complainant refused to pay for the copies for the last five (5) years of the request, which had been redacted, copied, been made available to Complainant, and are waiting to be picked up. Therefore, Respondent is

reluctant to proceed with the efforts to redact and copy those nine (9) years of records, if Complainant does not intend to pay for and pick up the records.

Respondent also makes the argument that Complainant's complaints from the APRA request on August 21, 2025, were not ripe for submission to our office because there was no denial when she submitted them in September. Normally, we would agree. But we disagree in this case, the Complainant has been trying to access these records since May 23, 2025, making that argument irrelevant.

CONCLUSION

This office finds that the Respondent violated APRA by denying the Complainant's requests on grounds of lack of specificity and failing to provide the public records.

However, the Respondent renewed its efforts to comply with APRA regarding the records request from August 21, 2025, by copying, redacting and making a portion of the requested records available to the Complainant for a fee. The fee is statutorily supported if Complainant wants to pick up those records.



Jennifer G. Ruby
Public Access Counselor

This Advisory Opinion combines and is issued in lieu of separate advisory opinions for the following complaints:

25-FC-126	25-FC-228	25-FC-234
25-FC-223	25-FC-229	25-FC-235
25-FC-224	25-FC-230	25-FC-236
25-FC-225	25-FC-231	25-FC-237
25-FC-226	25-FC-232	25-FC-238
25-FC-227	25-FC-233	25-FC-279