

pennsylvania
OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS
FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**CASEY MONAGHAN,
Requester**

v.

**LYCOMING COUNTY,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No: AP 2026-3199

As the Appeals Officer assigned to this matter by the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), I have reviewed the appeal filed with the OOR, as well as Lycoming County’s (“County”) submissions filed on August 24, 2026, in support of its position. Casey Monaghan (“Requester”) did not provide any additional submissions on appeal. Based upon my review of the appeal and necessary evidence, I make the following conclusions of law and findings of fact:

- The County has met its burden of proving that no records responsive to Item 1 of the Request exist in its possession, custody or control. The Neiman Attestation demonstrates that the County’s Open Records Officer conducted a good faith search for responsive records by inquiring with likely custodians from the County Public Safety Office, Sherriff’s Office, and District Attorney’s Office. *See* Neiman Attestation ¶¶ 7-9; *Hodges v. Pa. Dep’t of Health*, 29

A.3d 1190, 1192 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011). The Requester has not submitted sufficient, credible evidence to rebut the Neiman Attestation.

- The County has met its burden of demonstrating that it properly redacted personal identification information from the personnel file of Tyson Havens responsive to Item 2 of the Request. Section 708(b)(6)(i)(A) of the RTKL expressly exempts personal identification information from disclosure, including “[a] record containing all or part of a person’s Social Security number, driver’s license number, personal financial information, home, cellular or personal telephone numbers, personal email addresses, employee number or other confidential personal identification number.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(6)(i)(A). Additionally, Section 708(b)(6)(i)(C) protects “[t]he home address of a law enforcement officer or judge.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(6)(i)(C). The Hartley Attestation affirms that the personnel file was redacted of Mr. Haven’s various personal identification information and financial information,¹ and his home address as a confirmed law enforcement officer. *See* Hartley Attestation ¶¶ 6-7. Accordingly, the OOR determines that such redactions pursuant to Section 708(b)(6) of the RTKL are proper.
- The County may redact the identity of an employment reference from the responsive personnel file pursuant to the constitutional right to privacy. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the Commonwealth Court, and the OOR have recognized that, in certain circumstances, names of private citizens are subject to a right to privacy, and disclosable only where the public interest favors disclosure. *Sapp Roofing Co. v. Sheet Metal Workers Int’l Ass’n*, 552 Pa.

¹ The OOR has previously held that the redactions of specific financial contributions, deductions, and tax withholding information to be proper where the relevant individual employee’s name was already public in relation to the records. *Linton v. Connoquenessing Twp.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2026-2073, 2026 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 2797; *Mezzacappa v. Colonial Intermediate Unit 20*, OOR Dkt. AP 2019-0880, 2019 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 768; *see also Pennsylvanians for Union Reform v. Pa. Office of Admin.*, 129 A.3d 1246 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2015).

105 (1998); *Hartman v. Dep't of Conserv. & Nat. Resources*, 892 A.2d 897 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2005); *Yakim v. Monroeville*, OOR Dkt. AP 2017-0741, 2017 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 792; *Lehman v. Northampton Cnty.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2017-0098, 2017 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 421. The OOR has previously held that the names of employment references are protected from public disclosure under the constitutional right to privacy. *See, e.g., Lehman and The Morning Call v. Northampton Co.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2017-0098, 2017 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 421. There has been no articulated interest in this information, and the OOR cannot discern a public interest that would outweigh the privacy interests of the name of private citizen present in the records. Accordingly, the County properly redacted the name of an employment reference from the responsive records.

- The Requester asserts on appeal that the County failed to provide the press release record responsive to Item 3 of the Request. However, the County asserts that it provided a copy of this record with its final response, but provided this record once more during the pendency of the appeal. Accordingly, the appeal is moot as to Item 3.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **denied in part** and **dismissed as moot in part**, and the County is not required to take any further action. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal to the Lycoming 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 as per Section 1303 of the RTKL. 65 P.S. § 67.1303. However, 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. 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 OOR website at:
<http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: September 30, 2026

/s/ Tope L. Quadri

TOPE L. QUADRI
APPEALS OFFICER

Sent via portal to: Casey Monaghan
 Marirose Neiman, AORO
 Stephen C. Hartley, Esq.