

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL



HECTOR H. BALDERAS  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

---

May 31, 2019

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY**

Albuquerque Institute for Mathematics and Science  
Martin R. Esquivel, Esq.  
111 Lomas Blvd NW Suite 203  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102-2377  
Email: [mesquivel@esqlawnm.com](mailto:mesquivel@esqlawnm.com)

**Re: Inspection of Public Records Act Complaint – Chris D. Fernandez**

Dear Mr. Esquivel:

Thank you for your response to our inquiry regarding the complaint submitted to the Office of the Attorney General by Mr. Chris D. Fernandez alleging that the Albuquerque Institute for Mathematics and Science (hereinafter the “School”) violated the Inspection of Public Records Act (“IPRA”), NMSA 1978, Sections 14-2-1 to -12 (1947, as amended through 2018). As you know, Mr. Fernandez alleges that the School failed to provide him with any records responsive to his public records request dated March 8, 2019. Having reviewed Mr. Fernandez’s complaint and your response, we have a number of concerns as to the School’s handling of his records request. We advise the School to reevaluate Mr. Fernandez’s request and take appropriate remedial measures.

**Background**

The Inspection of Public Records Act is designed to provide the public with access to “the greatest possible information” about governmental affairs. NMSA 1978, § 14-2-5; *see also San Juan Agr. Water Users Ass’n v. KNME-TV*, 2011-NMSC-011, ¶ 16 (noting that, “IPRA is intended to ensure that the public servants of New Mexico remain accountable to the people they serve.”). To that end, IPRA states that the public has the right to inspect and copy all “public records” with only limited and specifically enumerated exceptions. Section 14-2-1(A). IPRA’s various provisions must be interpreted in light of its purpose, meaning that all exceptions to disclosure are construed narrowly and courts employ a strong “presumption in favor of the right to inspect.” Attorney General’s Inspection of Public Records Act Compliance Guide, p. 7 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2015) (“IPRA Guide”).

Mr. Fernandez emailed a request for public records to the School on March 8, 2019. This email stated that he sought “copies of any and all ‘distraction of class’ notifications, communications, email, or other correspondence” sent to or from a number of specific employees pertaining to his son (who appears to be a student at the School). He also asked “video be preserved from the stationary recording devices (Cameras)” within a number of classrooms at specified times, and that he sought “Any and all evidence” supporting the School’s claim that his son’s hair was “a distraction.” Mr. Fernandez’s email request did not, however, include his physical address or telephone number.

The School did not respond to Mr. Fernandez until ten days later, on March 18, 2019. On that day, the School’s principal sent Mr. Fernandez an email stating that she had received his IPRA request and that she was providing him the school’s dress code. She also stated that, “Video tapes of class activities are not allowed by IPRA as it shows other students and therefore potentially violates their FERPA.” The principal did not indicate that any other records were being withheld. Her March 18, 2019, email did not state who was responsible for the denial of the video recordings, nor did it identify the records that had been originally sought by Mr. Fernandez.

Between Mr. Fernandez’s complaint and the School’s response, this matter presents a wide array of issues related to IPRA that we must address. We first must resolve the School’s contention that Mr. Fernandez’s request was “invalid” on the basis of his not having provided the School a physical address or phone number in his request. Once that issue is addressed, we then reach Mr. Fernandez’s allegations that the School failed to provide him any responsive records, that the School failed to provide him a proper explanation of its denial of his request, and that the School violated IPRA’s specified deadlines. We will evaluate each of these five allegations in turn.

### The Validity of Mr. Fernandez’s Request

The first issue that we must resolve is whether Mr. Fernandez’s request was “invalid because it did not include his address and telephone number” as the School claims. Although Mr. Fernandez’s written request contained his email address and the School therefore had sufficient contact information in order to communicate with him, the School argued in response to our inquiry that his entire request was invalid because Mr. Fernandez was “bound by the Act to provide his address and telephone number.” The School’s argument strikes us as logically incomplete, as it did not argue that this alleged failure on Mr. Fernandez’s part gave it the legal basis to deny his request or to disregard IPRA’s specified procedures. However, for the sake of this analysis, we will assume that this is the School’s argument.

IPRA itself distinguishes between written and oral requests for public records. Significantly, the statute does not set forth specific procedures applicable to oral requests and states that, “The failure to respond to an oral request shall not subject the custodian to any penalty.” Section 14-2-8(A). By contrast, IPRA specifically outlines procedures for written requests, see generally Section 14-2-8, and damages for a public body’s noncompliance with those procedures. *See* § 14-2-11(C) and § 14-2-12(D). Although the distinction between written and oral requests is usually quite clear, some degree of ambiguity arises on occasion due to IPRA’s language regarding the content of written requests. Specifically, the statute provides that all written requests “shall provide the name, address

and telephone number of the person seeking access to the records and shall identify the records sought with reasonable particularity.” Section 14-2-8(C). Where a request sufficiently identifies the records sought but fails to include some other required information – say, the requestor’s address or phone number – there may be a question as to whether the request constitutes a “written request” sufficient to trigger IPRA’s varied procedures.

In evaluating another recent IPRA complaint, our Office determined that a requestor’s failure to provide a working telephone number in a records request was not a sufficient basis, by itself, for a public body to deny a public records request. *See* N.M. Atty. Gen. Letter to Patrick Hart, University of New Mexico, at 3 (April 11, 2019) (concluding that “the Inspection of Public Records Act does not permit a public body to deny a records request solely on the basis of the requestor’s failure to provide a valid telephone number, at least where the requestor has provided another valid means of communication”). As we noted in that determination, if we were to conclude that records requests were invalid in the absence of a working telephone number, “public bodies could deny records requests *even when possessing sufficient contact information*, effectively transfiguring a ‘telephone number’ into a strict requirement used to deny records requests.” *Id.* (emphasis in original).<sup>1</sup>

This case, of course, is different than our prior determination because here Mr. Fernandez provided neither a physical address nor a telephone number. That distinction clearly bolsters the School’s (apparent) argument that his request is not governed by IPRA’s specified procedures and deadlines. However, we remain faced with the same conundrum: were we to agree with the School’s position and conclude that Mr. Fernandez’s request was not a “written request,” we would be concluding that even where a public body has sufficient contact information to communicate with a requestor, it could still essentially deny a request based on not being provided other, nonessential contact information. Such an inflexible and strict interpretation of Section 14-2-8(C) would, we think, only serve to frustrate, rather than promote, governmental transparency. It undeniably would be inconsistent with the “presumption in favor of the right to inspect.” IPRA Guide, p. 7. Given that, as with any other statute, we must interpret IPRA so as to “facilitate and accomplish its purposes and intent,” *State ex rel. Stratton v. Gurley Motor Co.*, 1987-NMCA-063, ¶ 27, we cannot embrace this interpretation. *See also San Juan Agr. Water Users Ass’n*, 2011-NMSC-011, ¶ 14 (observing that, “We must construe IPRA in light of its purpose.”).

Here, our opinion is that Mr. Fernandez’s request was governed by IPRA’s specified procedures and deadlines. While the School certainly could have communicated with Mr. Fernandez and requested that he provide them his mailing address and telephone number, it would not have been able to simply deny his request on this basis. (We recognize and appreciate that the School did not do so.) To the extent that the School suggested in its response to our inquiry that Mr. Fernandez’s request was entirely “invalid” and that by implication it effectively was not a “written request,” we reject this argument. In short, when handling a request submitted by email, a public body may not disregard IPRA’s procedures and deadlines solely because the requestor failed to provide a mailing address and a phone number.

---

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, even while IPRA provides that its procedures and penalties are inapplicable to oral requests, it does not allow a public body to *deny* the request merely because it is submitted orally. *See* § 14-2-8(A).

This conclusion is reinforced by several practical considerations. First, given that Mr. Fernandez is by all appearances a parent of a student at the School, we think it is highly likely – if not a near certainty – that the School *did* have his address and telephone number on file on the date of his request. If that was the case, then the School’s interpretation and application of Section 14-2-8(C) places form over substance in a manner that clearly impedes Mr. Fernandez’s access to public records. Additionally, were we today to concur with the School’s position with respect to the validity of Mr. Fernandez’s request, he could always later resubmit the same request to the School with his address and phone number, and the substantive issues associated with this case would require review at that time. These considerations weigh strongly against the School’s position.

#### Whether Mr. Fernandez Received All Responsive Records

Mr. Fernandez’s most consequential allegation in his complaint is that the School provided him no responsive records. Given that the School did not respond to that and other specific questions we posed to it in our inquiry letter, we assume the allegation to be true.

IPRA is clear that a public body must either provide all records responsive to a records request or explain in writing why each record was denied. *See* § 14-2-11(B) (providing that, “If a written request has been denied, the custodian shall provide the requester with a written explanation of the denial.”). It is *not* sufficient to respond to only part of a request; the public body must either provide every responsive record to the requestor or explain in writing why it chose to deny access to that record.

At the outset, we note that the School Principal’s response to Mr. Fernandez’s request acknowledged the existence of responsive video records. That response stated that the videos were exempt from disclosure pursuant to FERPA, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Having not reviewed these videos, we cannot say whether or not they are exempt from disclosure or whether the School could have redacted portions of those videos so as to provide other portions to Mr. Fernandez. (We will address the propriety of the School’s denial letter later in this determination.) The videos are not the focal point of this allegation, though, because the School provided Mr. Fernandez a partial explanation of denial.

The remaining responsive records, however, are a somewhat open question. The School provided Mr. Fernandez only one record in response to his complaint: a copy of the dress code. While that particular record may or may not have been responsive to his request, it is clear that no other records were provided. Equally significant is the fact that the School also did not state in writing, either in response to Mr. Fernandez’s request or in response to our inquiry, that no other records existed. Given that Mr. Fernandez specifically requested all “notifications, communications, email, or other correspondence,” and no such records were provided, the School’s lack of clarity and communication on this issue creates a significant problem.

Because the School has not stated either to us or to Mr. Fernandez that it provided him all responsive records or a complete denial letter, we strongly advise it to reopen his request. The School must undertake a thorough search to determine if any additional records exist. If, after a

diligent search, the School finds no responsive records, then this information should be communicated to Mr. Fernandez. On the other hand, if the School finds additional records, it must either provide them to him or explain to him in writing why it is denying inspection.

### Remaining Issues

Mr. Fernandez next alleges that the School failed to provide him a proper explanation as to why it was denying him the opportunity to inspect a number of responsive videos. On this point, he is undeniably correct: the School's only written communication to him, dated March 18, 2019, neither described the records he sought nor "set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial." Section 14-2-11(B). These are required components of any denial letter. *See* IPRA Guide, p. 40 (explaining that a "denial notice must be in writing, describe the records sought to be inspected, set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial, and explain the reason for the denial"). As the School did not provide Mr. Fernandez with a proper explanation of its denial, this is an outstanding obligation with which it must comply as soon as possible.

Finally, Mr. Fernandez also alleges that the School failed to comply with IPRA's required deadlines. In particular, a public body must respond within three business days upon receipt of an IPRA request. *See* § 14-2-8(D) (providing that, "If the inspection is not permitted within three business days, the custodian shall explain in writing when the records will be available for inspection or when the public body will respond to the request."). This initial response must either provide the requested records or state "when the records will be available or when the agency will respond." IPRA Guide, p. 33. Here, the School did not respond to Mr. Fernandez's request until ten calendar days after it received his request. (This was another question that the School did not answer in response to our inquiry. We can only assume that this failure to answer represented an acknowledgement that it did not comply with IPRA's deadlines.) Similarly, given that it is unclear whether the School fully responded to Mr. Fernandez's request, it is also unclear whether the School complied with IPRA's general obligation to provide all requested records within fifteen calendar days. Section 14-2-8(D). As a result, we agree with Mr. Fernandez that the School did not follow IPRA's deadlines.

### Conclusion

As we have explained, the School's handling of Mr. Fernandez's IPRA request was deficient in a number of ways. To comport with its statutory obligations, the School should take remedial action as soon as possible. This must include, at a minimum, sending Mr. Fernandez a revised denial letter containing a description of the records he sought and the individuals responsible for the denied video records. Additionally, the School should ensure that it has fully accounted for all responsive records by conducting a thorough search. If any additional responsive records exist, either they should be provided to Mr. Fernandez or he should receive a "written explanation of the denial" consistent with Section 14-2-11(B).

More broadly, we strongly encourage the School to reevaluate its IPRA policies and its commitment to transparency and open government. IPRA represents the "public policy" of the

Albuquerque Institute for Mathematics and Science

May 31, 2019

Page 6

State of New Mexico, and as a public body, the School is required to provide the public with access to “the greatest possible information” about its business. Section 14-2-5. It is incumbent upon all public bodies to have adequate procedures in place to both timely and fully respond to all records requests, and the School should take urgent steps to ensure that it complies with this obligation.

For your reference, a copy of the IPRA Guide is available on the website of the Office of the Attorney General at [www.nmag.gov](http://www.nmag.gov). If you have any questions regarding this determination or IPRA in general, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Kreienkamp". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "K" and "C".

John Kreienkamp  
Assistant Attorney General

Enclosure

CC: Chris D. Fernandez

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL



HECTOR H. BALDERAS  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

## Electronic Complaint Submission

### Submission Detail

<b>ECS Reference Number</b>	NMOAG-ECS-20190422-4906
<b>Final Submit Date</b>	4/22/2019 7:54:40 PM

**Disclosure of your complaint:** This complaint is a public record, thus available under provisions of the NM Inspection of Public Records Act.

**Disclosure to other entities:** This complaint, its content, and other information may be disclosed to other law enforcement and regulatory agencies.

**I understand this complaint and any submitted documents are public record and may be shared with other law enforcement and regulatory agencies.**

**DECLARATION:** By submitting this form, I attest that the information in this complaint is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I further understand that by submitting this form I may be called to testify as a witness in this matter.

**I understand declaration statement.**

*The New Mexico Office of the Attorney General cannot give legal advice regarding this complaint and will not act as your personal attorney. If you have questions regarding your rights please contact a private attorney.*

*Submission of this complaint is not confirmation that an investigation will be initiated.*

## Complaint Detail

**Complaint Type** Inspection of Public Records (IPRA) Complaint

**Retained Attorney**

## Parties

### Complainant

**Mr. Chris D Fernandez**

Person

#### Address

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

#### Contact information

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] |

### Complaint against

**Albuquerque Institute for Mathematics and Science - Katharina Sandoval (IPRA Steward)**

Organization

#### Address

933 Bradbury Dr. S.E.  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

#### Contact information

[ksandoval@aims-unm.org](mailto:ksandoval@aims-unm.org)  
(505) 312-8651  
<http://www.aims-unm.org/>

## Complaint Specifics

<b>Format of IPRA request:</b>	Written
<b>Date IPRA request was submitted to the public body:</b>	3/8/2019
<b>Date of all responses received from the public body:</b>	3/18/2019
<b>Records</b>	No records were provided.
<b>Denied requests to inspect public records</b>	No records were provided and the records custodian did not deliver or mail a written explanation to the requester within fifteen (15) calendar days after receiving the request that included a description of the records sought, the names and titles of each person responsible for denying the request, and a description of the reasons for the denial.
<b>Deadlines (For purposes of deadlines imposed by the IPRA, the date the request is received is not counted)</b>	Inspection was not allowed within three (3) business days and the public body did not timely send a written "three-day letter" to the requester explaining when the records would be available or when the public body would respond to the request., The public body did not allow inspection or otherwise respond to the request within fifteen (15) calendar days from the date the custodian received the request.

## Transaction

## Documents



Gmail - Formal I.P.R.A. Request.pdf

IPRA EMail request

**Comments**



Gmail - Re\_ Formal I.P.R.A. Request Receipt and rerequest for POC for Attorney.pdf

Received receipt with bad email address for attorney

**Comments**



Gmail - Discrimination and I.P.R.A. Complaint-2018 Council.pdf

Email to Entire 2018 Governance Council

**Comments**

\*\*\* END OF COMPLAINT \*\*\*



Chris Fernandez &lt;chrisdfernandez@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Discrimination and I.P.R.A. Complaint

1 message

---

**Chris Fernandez** <chrisdfernandez@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 9, 2019 at 2:45 PM

To: Katharina Sandoval <ksandoval@aims-unm.org>, bobby cordova <bcordova@aims-unm.org>, ddunlap@aims-unm.org, kwatkins@aims-unm.org, gbalakrishnan@aims-unm.org, jho@aims-unm.org, bwalton@aims-unm.org, jfortuin@aims-unm.org, swhisler@aims-unm.org, ssmith@aims-unm.org, mesquivel@aims-unm.org

Greetings:

Please accept this redress of grievance in the violation of the civil rights and protection of student Aiden Fernandez as referenced in the A.I.M.S. handbook. Pursuant to the available online resources at the <http://www.aims-unm.org/> and instructions there stated, I am forwarding this email to the listed parties for resolution of complaints, grievances and discrimination concerns as specified. In addition, I am including this correspondence to the listed 2018 Governance Council Members to ensure that every vested party is aware of the nature of the complaint and resolution being sought.

Aiden Fernandez' civil liberties have been infringed upon and violated with the enforcement of a disparate rule that is not supported by the current A.I.M.S. charter. It is hereby stated that A.I.M.S. Charter School is selectively enforcing rules based on gender, in violation of the United States Civil Rights Act, and gender identification as expressly prohibited by the A.I.M.S. Charter by-laws, handbook and performance framework. Specifically, Aiden Fernandez is being restricted from pulling back and or braiding his hair, while other students previously, currently and continuously enjoy such privilege.

Aiden Fernandez is suffering harm in his pursuit of a Free Appropriate Public Education in that (1) he is missing scheduled education and class time as expressed and scheduled by the school calendar; (2) he is being held to a separate standard of conduct and receiving adverse action based on this disparate standard; and (3) he is being denied access and or being restricted from enjoying public accommodation as enjoyed by similarly situated students.

The material matter is that Aiden Fernandez is not being allowed to tie back his hair using a rubber band or in the contrary allowed to have his hair braided. These abilities and rights are enjoyed by similarly situated and classified students as well as administration, staff and faculty.

A.I.M.S. under the direction of Ms. Sandoval has cited the student hand book rule of: "Clothing, jewelry or appearances that are determined by the \*administration/staff\* and or faculty to be distracting to the learning environment will not be permitted" as the justification for imposing action against this student, while knowing or in the contrary should know, that similarly situated and classed students enjoy this privilege. Hence, the "no hair tied up or braided" restriction is being selectively enforced in violation of the student's standing and causing harm through continuous adverse action.

To date no communication, notification or message stating Aiden's hair is or was a "Distraction" has ever been received prior to him being restricted from having his hair pulled back or braided. Aiden had been going to school with his hair pulled back for approximately 4 months and was never notified or counseled on his hair and it being any type of "Distraction" prior to Ms. Sandoval's directive. I have asked Ms. Sandoval for the cited "Distractions" in both Email and Via the "Inspection of Public Records Act" or I.P.R.A. on 3/8/2019. To date this information has not been provided, in addition there has been no notification of additional time required to complete the I.P.R.A. request.

It has been more than 15 days from the date of receipt. It is our belief the I.P.R.A. Steward is in violation of the act. The referenced Email thread is available upon request.

## **DENIAL OF RIGHTS**

Free public school education is a right guaranteed to a student. The courts have defined the basis on which the denial of that right is justified. That right may be denied in response to behaviors that threaten the safety and security of the school population, are illegal, or have the potential to disrupt the educational process. It is the intent of the Governance Council that every reasonable effort is made on behalf of the student's education, even in the case of suspension or expulsion. However, attendance at AIMS@UNM is a privilege and a choice rather than a right.

Our son has been pulled out of class to address a non-existent "Distraction" as well as stopped from participating in school activities until his hair is in compliance with Ms. Sandoval's rule thus violating his right to education. We request he be treated equally and fairly with regard to his ability to tie back and or braid his hair.

Sincerely,

Chris Fernandez



**Discrimination and I.P.R.A. Complaint.pdf**

120K



Chris Fernandez &lt;chrisdfernandez@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Re: Formal I.P.R.A. Request**

---

**Chris Fernandez** <chrisdfernandez@gmail.com>  
To: Katharina Sandoval <ksandoval@aims-unm.org>  
Cc: Bobby Cordova <bcordova@aims-unm.org>

Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 3:48 PM

Hello and good afternoon,

The provided contact "[mesquivel@esqlaw.com](mailto:mesquivel@esqlaw.com)" is not valid. Each email sent to the address is rejected as " The response from the remote server was:

550 5.4.1 [[mesquivel@esqlaw.com](mailto:mesquivel@esqlaw.com)]: Recipient address rejected: Access denied [[BN3NAM01FT050.eop-nam01.prod.protection.outlook.com](#)]"

Please provide additional contact information so I can contact the individuals you are requesting I go through.

Thank You,

Chris Fernandez

On Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 1:01 PM <[ksandoval@aims-unm.org](mailto:ksandoval@aims-unm.org)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Fernandez,

I am in receipt of your IPRA request. Attached please find the dress code found in the student agenda with the following highlighted:

Clothing, jewelry or appearances that are determined by the **administration/staff** and or faculty to be distracting to the learning environment will not be permitted.

Video tapes of class activities are not allowed by IPRA as it shows other students and therefore potentially violates their FERPA.

Please direct all future communication regarding this incident to the schools Attorney, Mr. Martin Esquivel, [mesquivel@esqlaw.com](mailto:mesquivel@esqlaw.com)

K Sandoval-Snider

-----Original Message-----

From: "Chris Fernandez" <[chrisdfernandez@gmail.com](mailto:chrisdfernandez@gmail.com)>

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 2:43pm

To: "Katharina Sandoval" <[ksandoval@aims-unm.org](mailto:ksandoval@aims-unm.org)>, "Sandra Fernandez" <[sandralfernandez12@gmail.com](mailto:sandralfernandez12@gmail.com)>, [Bev.Friedman@state.nm.us](mailto:Bev.Friedman@state.nm.us), "bobby cordova" <[bcordova@aims-unm.org](mailto:bcordova@aims-unm.org)>

Subject: Formal I.P.R.A. Request

Hello and good afternoon,

Per the PED website you are listed as the point of contact for all Inspection of Public Records Acts correspondence / requests (Please see attachment CHARTER-SCHOOL-LIST-2.11.19.pdf).

I would like to formally request copies of any and all "distraction of class" notifications, communications, email, or other correspondence between Katharina Sandoval, Jerry Delmore, Robert (Bobby) Cordova, Paul DeHerrera, and John Weber referencing or concerning Aiden C. Fernandez within the past 4 months or to date (11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019) with regards to his hair, behavior, or educational performance.

We also ask that video be preserved from the stationary recording devices (Cameras) within the classrooms listed below for the below date and time frames.

From 11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019 Room: 104b 7:40 am to 9:00 am Monday Through Thursday

From 11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019 Room: 101 9:05 am to 9:20 am Monday Through Thursday

From 11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019 Room: 115 9:25 am to 10:45 am Monday Through Thursday

For clarification the above dates and times reflect the times Aiden is in these recorded areas.

A claim has been made that his hair is a distraction. We are now looking for evidence supporting the claim. Any and all evidence you can provide to support your claim would be greatly appreciated.

I have contacted the PED and they have provided the resources to complete this request.

Attached is the IPRA guide taken from: <https://webnew.ped.state.nm.us/bureaus/public-information-office/ipra-requests/>

I have also included the PED IPRA custodian Ms. Beverly Friedman on this email.

Thank you for your time, have a great spring break.

Chris Fernandez

Katharina Sandoval-Snider Principal, Albuquerque Institute for Mathematics and Science at UNM



Chris Fernandez &lt;chrisdfernandez@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Formal I.P.R.A. Request

---

**Chris Fernandez** <chrisdfernandez@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 8, 2019 at 2:43 PM

To: Katharina Sandoval &lt;ksandoval@aims-unm.org&gt;, Sandra Fernandez &lt;sandralfernandez12@gmail.com&gt;, Bev.Friedman@state.nm.us, bobby cordova &lt;bcordova@aims-unm.org&gt;

Hello and good afternoon,

Per the PED website you are listed as the point of contact for all Inspection of Public Records Acts correspondence / requests (Please see attachment CHARTER-SCHOOL-LIST-2.11.19.pdf).

I would like to formally request copies of any and all "distraction of class" notifications, communications, email, or other correspondence between Katharina Sandoval, Jerry Delmore, Robert (Bobby) Cordova, Paul DeHerrera, and John Weber referencing or concerning Aiden C. Fernandez within the past 4 months or to date (11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019) with regards to his hair, behavior, or educational performance.

We also ask that video be preserved from the stationary recording devices (Cameras) within the classrooms listed below for the below date and time frames.

From 11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019 Room: 104b 7:40 am to 9:00 am Monday Through Thursday

From 11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019 Room: 101 9:05 am to 9:20 am Monday Through Thursday

From 11/1/2018 - 3/8/2019 Room: 115 9:25 am to 10:45 am Monday Through Thursday

For clarification the above dates and times reflect the times Aiden is in these recorded areas.

A claim has been made that his hair is a distraction. We are now looking for evidence supporting the claim. Any and all evidence you can provide to support your claim would be greatly appreciated.

I have contacted the PED and they have provided the resources to complete this request.

Attached is the IPRA guide taken from: <https://webnew.ped.state.nm.us/bureaus/public-information-office/ipra-requests/>

I have also included the PED IPRA custodian Ms. Beverly Friedman on this email.

Thank you for your time, have a great spring break.

Chris Fernandez

---

### 2 attachments

 **Inspection of Public Records Compliance Guide 2015.pdf**  
1740K

 **CHARTER-SCHOOL-LIST-2.11.19.pdf**  
128K