



FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**ALYSSA KING,
Requester**

v.

**CRANBERRY TOWNSHIP,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No: AP 2026-4500

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On October 8, 2026, Alyssa King (“Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to Cranberry Township (“Township”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq*, seeking all records regarding a named individual, specifically referring to any child abuse or child endangerment.

On October 9, 2026, the Township partially denied the Request, identifying sixteen responsive police reports, four of which were deemed to relate to a criminal investigation, 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16). The remaining twelve reports were provided to the Requester in redacted form from which personal identification information and the name, home address or date of birth of a minor child was redacted. 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(6)(i)(A), (b)(30).

On October 12, 2026, the Requester filed an appeal with the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging the partial denial and stating grounds for disclosure. More specifically, the

Requester asks if the Township can “black out the minors['] info” and provide the reports. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and informed the Township that notice to third parties may be necessary, 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On October 26, 2026, the Township submitted a position statement, reiterating its grounds for denial, and the affidavit, made subject to the penalties set forth in 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904, from Ken Ruckel (“Ruckel Affidavit”), Chief of the Township’s Police Department. The Requester did not submit any additional legal argument or evidence during the appeal.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

As the Appeals Officer assigned to this matter, I have reviewed the appeal filed with the OOR, as well as the parties’ submissions in support of their positions. Based upon my review of the appeal and the necessary evidence, I make the following conclusions of law and findings of fact:

1. The OOR does not have jurisdiction over criminal investigative records in the possession of the Township.

The Township denied access to four responsive police reports, arguing that they relate to a criminal investigation. 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(16); *see also* Ruckel Affidavit, ¶¶ 2-3. As the OOR does not have jurisdiction over appeals of records alleged to be criminal investigative records within the possession of a local agency, and the Township, in its final response to the Request, correctly directed the Requester to file any such appeal with the Appeals Officer for the Butler County District Attorney’s Office, the appeal, as it relates to these four police reports, is dismissed. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.503(d)(ii) (requiring the district attorney of a county to designate an appeals officer to hear appeals relating to access to criminal investigative records in the possession of a local agency of that county).

2. The Township may redact personal telephone numbers, dates of birth and home addresses from the responsive records.

The Township redacted personal telephone numbers from the responsive records. Ruckel Affidavit, ¶ 5. Section 708(b)(6)(i)(A) of the RTKL expressly permits the redaction of certain personal identification information, including personal telephone numbers, from responsive records. 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(6)(i)(A). Insofar as the redacted telephone numbers are not held out to the public, the Township may redact them from the records. 65 P.S. § 67.708(a); *see also Pa. State Sys. of Higher Educ. v. Fairness Ctr.*, No. 1203 C.D. 2015, 2016 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 245 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2016). Furthermore, with respect to the dates of birth and home addresses, the Township's position statement explains that dates of birth and home addresses are those of minor children and, as a result, are expressly exempt from disclosure under 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(30) (exempting from disclosure a record identifying the name, home address or date of birth of a child 17 years of age or younger).¹

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **denied in part** and **dismissed in part**, and the Township 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 or petition for review to the Butler 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

¹ The Requester has also confirmed on her appeal form that the Township may redact the information of minors from the records. Additionally, while the Township's submission is not clear whether the home addresses and dates of birth of adult individuals were redacted from the records, where the personal information is connected to private citizens, the OOR has found such information to be protected by the constitutional right to privacy. *See, e.g., Evangelou v. Council Rock Sch. Dist.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2024-0737, 2024 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 1144 (permitting the redaction of home addresses of private citizens pursuant to the right to privacy); *Grill v. Elizabethtown Borough Police Dep't*, OOR Dkt. AP 2023-1684, 2023 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 2223 (permitting the redaction of the dates of birth of private citizens pursuant to the right to privacy).

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 website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: 27 October 2026

/s/ Joshua T. Young

JOSHUA T. YOUNG, ESQ.
SENIOR DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL

Sent via OOR e-file portal to: Alyssa King;
Paul N. Lalley, Esq. and Dan Santoro, AORO