



FINAL DETERMINATION

DATE ISSUED AND MAILED: September 17, 2026

IN RE: *William McElhill v. Westtown Township*, OOR Dkt. AP 2026-2952

Upon review of the appeal filed with the Office of Open Records (“OOR”) to the above-referenced docket number, as well as the parties’ submissions, the appeal is **DENIED** because:

The redacted information is exempt from disclosure. Section 708(b)(6) of the Right-to-Know Law expressly exempts from disclosure “home, cellular or personal telephone numbers” and “personal e-mail addresses.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(6)(i)(A). Here, the Request seeks records related to the filling of the Township supervisor position. On July 24, 2026, the Westtown Township (“Township”) submitted an attestation made subject to penalties under 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904, relating to unsworn falsifications to authorities, authored by Pam Packard (“Packard Attestation”), the Township’s Agency Open Records Officer (“AORO”), who attests that personal telephone numbers and personal email addresses were redacted from the responsive records provided to the Requester. *See* Packard Attestation ¶ 5.¹ Based upon this evidence, the Township has demonstrated that the redacted information is exempt from disclosure. Therefore, the Township has met its burden of proof. 65 P.S. § 67.708(a)(1).

For this reason, the Township is not required to take any further action. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, either party may appeal or petition for review with the Chester County Court of Common Pleas. 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a). All parties must be served with notice of the appeal. The OOR also shall be served notice and have an opportunity to respond according to court rules as per 65 P.S. § 67.1303, but as the quasi-judicial tribunal adjudicating this matter, the OOR is not a proper party to any appeal and should not be named as a party.² All documents or communications following the issuance of this Final Determination shall be sent to oor-postfd@pa.gov. This Final Determination shall be placed on the website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

Issued by:

/s/ Bandy L. Jarosz

BANDY L. JAROSZ, ESQ., APPEALS OFFICER

Sent via portal only to: William McElhill; Patrick M .McKenna, Esq.; Pam Packard

¹ The Requester does not dispute “personal identification information” should be redacted, but only that the Township inconsistently applied the redactions in the responsive records, such as names and mailing addresses. As the Township indicated, there were no redactions made to names or mailing addresses. *See* Township position statement p. 3. This is confirmed upon the OOR’s review of the redacted records. As such, this issue will not be addressed in this Final Determination.

² *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).