

Mr. Carrasco,

This email is to file a formal complaint for IPRA violations.

The following violations of IPRA have occurred.

1) On July 10, 2015, I filed an IPRA request for NOTICE OF HEARINGS FOR ALL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS FOR HEARINGS Issued in or OCCURRING IN June, July, August and September 2015. On July 31st I received SOME of the responsive documents. I had confirmed at that time with the RLD Custodian that the responsive documents were for any notices issued up through July 31st. On August 8, 2015, when I had picked up a subsequent IPRA request for Notice of Hearings, I was provide two Notices that were not included, but should have been, for the July 10th IPRA request. Respectively they were notices for Pro Plumbing and In-Tile Design. Please see attached documents, "Notice of hearings 081015 ipra sent to Carrasco" and "071015 IPRACID Notice of Hearings-1 responsive documents received 073115 to carrasco."

This violation of IPRA is particularly disturbing since RLD and CID are well aware that I need timely responses of these IPRA requests in order to attend these hearings and video record them to educate the public.

2) On August 10, 2015, I filed an IPRA request for NOTICE OF HEARINGS FOR ALL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS FOR HEARINGS Issued in or OCCURRING IN July, August, September and October 2015 and all orders vacating hearings for June, July and August. On September 8, 2015, I received SOME of the responsive documents. While RLD did provide orders vacating hearings for other boards, they provided NO ORDERS vacating hearings for CID. Instead they listed those orders. Please see attached "Notice of hearings 081015 IPRA sent to Carrasco" on page 1. Why would RLD not provide those vacated orders for CID yet comply with the IPRA request for all other boards? I look forward to those orders since this is a violation of IPRA.

This is particularly disturbing since I had intended to video record those hearings but was told that they were vacated. In summary, I have been told by the prosecuting attorneys they were vacated, and as a response to my IPRA request they were vacated, yet

have not received the responsive documents which would verify they were vacated.

I look forward to your investigation into these IPRA violations. Please confirm receipt of this complaint.

If you have any questions, please let me know. I can also be reached :

Dianne Goodman



## Attorney General Of New Mexico

**HECTOR H. BALDERAS**  
Attorney General

**ELIZABETH A. GLENN**  
Chief Deputy Attorney General

January 20, 2016

Diane Goodman  
14112 Grand Ave. NE  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87123

Re: Inspection of Public Records Act Complaint – Regulation and Licensing Department.

Dear Ms. Goodman:

We have completed our review of your complaint alleging that the Regulation and Licensing Department (“RLD”) violated the Inspection of Public Records Act (NMSA 1978, §§ 14-2-1 to -12). According to your complaint, you submitted written requests on July 10, 2015 and on August 10, 2015, to the RLD for certain public records. While the RLD provided records in response to your requests, you allege that the RLD failed to provide all records requested.

Pursuant to our usual procedures, we sent an inquiry letter and a copy of your complaint to the RLD. We received a response to our inquiry and provided that response to you. Within their response, the RLD confirmed that it has not denied access to any of the records you requested. Your reply requested a copy of specific records referenced in the RLD response and subsequent to that request, the RLD provided those documents.

The Inspection of Public Records Act only requires that a public body make public records available for inspection when requested or, if inspection is denied, provide the requestor with the reasons for denying access to the records. NMSA 1978, §§ 14-2-8, 14-2-9, 14-2-11. Here, Claudia Armijo, Deputy General Counsel on behalf of the RLD, has stated that RLD has fully complied with your IPRA requests. Unless contrary facts come to light, demonstrating that additional records exist, it appears at this time that the RLD has complied with its obligations under the Inspection of Public Records Act.

Please note that the enforcement authority of the Attorney General under the Inspection of Public Records Act is limited. The Attorney General may bring an enforcement action in district court requesting the court can issue an order requiring the public body to comply with the Act’s provisions. NMSA 1978, § 14-2-12(A)-(B). As discussed above, the RLD has apparently met the Act’s requirements with respect to your inspection requests, so there are no grounds for us to proceed further.

Ms. Diane Goodman  
Jan 20, 2015  
Page 2

Although we did not find a violation of the Inspection of Public Records Act in this instance, we appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Sullivan".

Susan Sullivan  
Assistant Attorney General

cc: Claudia Armijo, Deputy General Counsel, RLD