September 13, 2024

**To:** Mr. Matthew Petti

**Muckrock News** 

Department MR 169268 263 Huntington Avenue Boston, MA 02115

**From:** Major Earl Phillips

**Deputy Director** 

Maryland Coordination and Analysis Center

Subject: Maryland Public Information Act Request for records pertaining to information from 7

October 2023 to 14 October 2023 (inclusive) regarding specific terms.

Mr. Petti,

I am in receipt of your Public Information Act request concerning records pertaining to all advisories, suspicious activity reports, tips, intelligence briefs, intel reports, leads information or data, maps, bulletins, BOLOs, and/or joint bulletins from 7 October 2023 to 14 October 2023 (inclusive) regarding an alleged pro-Hamas "day of jihad" or "day of rage."

Research of your request identified three (3) documents that contained the words "day of rage" and/or "day of Jihad".

Document 1 is a state government agency document. Your request to obtain a copy of this document is denied. The document is exempt from PIA for the following reasons:

For certain named agencies, the custodian may deny the right of inspection of records of investigations conducted by the agency, intelligence information, or security procedures. The listed agencies are any sheriff or police department, any county or city attorney, State's Attorney, or the Attorney General's office. GP § 4-351(a)(1). This exception also applies to intelligence information and security procedures of these agencies, as well as of State and local correctional facilities. GP § 4-351(a)(3).

Documents 2 & 3 are federal government agency documents. Your request to obtain a copy of this document is denied. The document is exempt from MPIA for the following reasons:



Certain critical infrastructure information and homeland security information that the federal government shares with the State or local governments may not be disclosed under the PIA. See 6 U.S.C. §§ 133(a)(1)(E) and 482(e), respectively. These exceptions are basically statements of the federal preemption doctrine. See 94 Opinions of the Attorney General 44, 46-64 (2009); 88 Opinions of the Attorney General 205 (2003).

Respectfully,



