

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LEHIGH COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL DIVISION

DANIEL PATRICK SHEEHAN and)	
THE MORNING CALL a/k/a)	
MORNING CALL,)	
Appellants)	Case No.: 2022-C-1571
v.)	
SOUTH WHITEHALL TOWNSHIP,)	
Appellee)	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 2nd day of May, 2023, upon consideration of the Notice of Appeal filed by Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call a/k/a Morning Call with the Clerk of Judicial Records - Civil Division on July 29, 2022, briefs by both parties, after argument thereon, and for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, **IT IS ORDERED** that said Appeal is denied and the Final Determination of the Office of Open Records is affirmed; **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the request for the documents is denied and the request for an award of reasonable costs and attorney's fees is denied.

BY THE COURT:



MELISSA T. PAVLACK, J. /mb

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LEHIGH COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL DIVISION

DANIEL PATRICK SHEEHAN and)
THE MORNING CALL,)
Appellants) Case No.: 2022-C-1571
vs.)
SOUTH WHITEHALL TOWNSHIP,)
Appellee)

APPEARANCES:

Paula Knudsen Burke, Esquire
For Petitioner

Jennifer R. Alderfer, Esquire
For Respondent

OPINION

MELISSA T. PAVLACK, J.

On July 29, 2022, pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a),¹ Requesters Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call (Requesters) filed a Notice of Appeal from the decision of the Office of Open Records (OOR) issued on July 5, 2022. When review is sought in court, the Right-to

¹ (a) **General rule.**--Within 30 days of the mailing date of the final determination of the appeals officer relating to a decision of a local agency issued under section [65 P.S. § 67.1101(b) or of the date a request for access is deemed denied, a requester or local agency may file a petition for review or other document as required by rule of court with the court of common pleas for the county where the local agency is located. The decision of the court shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law based upon the evidence as a whole. The decision shall clearly and concisely explain the rationale for the decision.

(b) **Stay.**--A petition for review under this section shall stay the release of documents until a decision under subsection (a) is issued.

65 P.S. § 67.1302.

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

Know-Law (RTKL) specifies that “[t]he record before a court shall consist of the request, the agency's response, the appeal filed under section 1101, the hearing transcript, if any, and the final written determination of the appeals officer.” 65 P.S. § 67.1303(b). *Bowling v. Off. of Open Recs.*, 621 Pa. 133, 134, 75 A.3d 453, 458 (2013). This court has received the documents that constitute the record of this case; no hearing was held at any stage; therefore, no transcript exists.

After argument on this matter, the court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Appellant Daniel Sheehan² (Requester) is an adult individual employed as a reporter at The Morning Call, with a business address of PO Box 1260, Allentown, PA 18105.
2. Appellant The Morning Call is headquartered in Allentown, Pennsylvania, and is part of the Tribune Publishing Company portfolio. Its business address is PO Box 1260, Allentown, PA 18105.
3. Appellee is South Whitehall Township (the Township), a governmental unit with a business address of 4444 Walbert Avenue, Allentown, PA 18104.
4. The Township is a “local agency” as that term is defined by the RTKL.
5. Randy Cope is the Township’s Interim Township Manager and the Open Records Officer (ORO) for the Township. Under the RTKL, he is designated as the responsible authority

² Peter Hall, a reporter for the Morning Call was the original requester of the documents sought pursuant to this right to know request. Mr. Hall changed jobs and is working with a different news organization. On June 2, 2022, he authorized another Morning Call reporter, Daniel Sheehan to substitute for him in this matter. Mr. Sheehan appealed the May 18, 2022 denial by the Interim Township Manager, Randy Cope, the Township’s Open Records Officer.

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

to receive and respond on behalf of the Township to requests for public data made pursuant to the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law.

6. On April 11, 2022, a request for five sets of documents³ was made to the Township pursuant to Pennsylvania's (RTKL), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 – 67.3104.
7. Per letter dated April 18, 2022, the Township confirmed receipt of the requested records and provided notice of a 30-day extension of time pursuant to 65 P.S. § 67.902 to conduct a legal review to determine whether the records were subject to access.
8. On May 18, 2022, the Township granted in part and denied in part the request for records.
9. As to the request for: “any settlement and release ending litigation in Theresa M. Serano’s federal civil rights lawsuit, *Serano v. Golden*, docketed at 5:21-cv-84 in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania” (*Serano* lawsuit) said request was denied.
10. The Township’s denial states:

Based on a thorough examination of records in the possession, custody and control of South Whitehall Township, the records you requested do not exist in the possession, custody and control of South Whitehall Township. Your request is duplicative of an earlier RTKL Request submitted by you on September 29, 2021. That request was denied for the same reasons. You subsequently appealed that denial and the OOR denied your appeal in a Final Determination dated December 2, 2021. You also filed a Petition for Reconsideration, which the OOR denied on

³ The requested records were:

- Any settlement and release ending litigation in Theresa M. Serano’s federal civil rights lawsuit, *Serano v. Golden*, docketed at 5:21-cv-84 in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- All attorney and professional fees relating to the Township’s defense of itself and Officer Kyle Golden in the *Serano* lawsuit.
- Payment records to Theresa M. Serano, Officer Kyle Golden, and their agents, related to the *Serano* lawsuit.
- Checkbook register for South Whitehall Township for any payments dated January 7, 2019 to present day.
- Requester seeks records of the agency’s final action regarding the demotion or discharge of Officer Kyle Golden.

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

December 28, 2021. For all of the reasons cited in the Township's original denial as well as the OOR's Final Determination and the denial of your Petition for Reconsideration, your request is again DENIED.

11. Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (OOR); the appeal was received by the OOR on June 2, 2022.
12. On June 14, 2022, Jennifer R. Alderfer, Esquire, submitted a "Request to Participate Before the OOR" as the attorney with the Solicitor's Office. Included with the June 14, 2022 submission was an "Attestation Regarding Agency Possession of Records" and a Memorandum of Law.
13. Randy Cope, as the Township's ORO, made the following declarations in the Attestation:
 - a. I conducted a thorough examination of files in the possession, custody, control of the Township and inquired with relevant third-party contractors for records responsive to the request by contacting counsel at Marshall Dennehey who was appointed by the Township's insurance carrier to defend the Township in the litigation that is subject of record request.
 - b. The caption of the subject litigation in an Amended Complaint was as follows: "Theresa Serano, Plaintiff vs. Officer Kyle Golden, John/Jane Does 1-X, and South Whitehall Township, Defendants."
 - c. Defendant South Whitehall Township was dismissed with prejudice by agreement of the parties by Court Order dated September 21, 2021.
 - d. The Township was not involved in any settlement or release agreement because it was dismissed with prejudice as a party to the litigation.
 - e. By Court Order dated October 6, 2021 [in the Serano lawsuit], Plaintiff Theresa Serano and Defendant Kyle Golden, and their respective counsel, were barred from making public disclosures of the settlement terms between the parties.⁴
 - f. The Township has no knowledge or access to any settlement or release between the remaining parties.

⁴ The Court Order dated October 6, 2021 states: "Plaintiff, Theresa M. Serano, her counsel, Defendant, Kyle Golden, and his counsel, are each barred from making public disclosure of the settlement terms between the parties and of the underlining allegations and claims brought in this matter unless pursuant to other valid legal process following reasonable notice to opposing counsel or further Order of Court."

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

- g. The only payments made by the Township related to the subject litigation were to Marshall Dennehey for legal fees incurred in the defense of the Township.
 - h. The Township's Board of Commissioners discharged Kyle Golden and he was no longer an employee of the Township as of February 6, 2019.
14. A Final Determination denying the request for the settlement and release documents was issued on July 5, 2022; the Township was advised it was not required to take any further action.
15. The Final Determination reasoned that in the absence of any evidence that the Township acted in bad faith or that the requested records exist in the possession, custody or control of the Township, the averments in Mr. Cope's attestation should be accepted as true, based on the evidence provided, the Township has met its burden of proof that it does not possess the records sought in the Request.
16. The settlement agreement is not a record or public record as defined by the RTKL.
17. The Township was not a party to the settlement or a party to the Serano lawsuit when the settlement agreement was entered.
18. The settlement agreement was not information documenting a transaction or activity of the Township.
19. The settlement agreement was not created, received or retained pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the Township.
20. The Township does not have actual or constructive possession, custody or control of the settlement agreement.
21. Requesters are not entitled to sanctions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

1. A RTKL “record” is “information, regardless of physical form or characteristics, that documents a transaction or activity of an agency and that is created, received or retained pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the agency...” 65 P.S. § 67.102.
2. A “public record” is a record of a local agency that is *not* exempt under section 708. 65 P.S. § 67.102 (emphasis added).
3. The RTKL does not require the Township to seek requested documents from former employees. *Breslin v. Dickinson Tp.*, 68 A.3d 49 (2013).

DISCUSSION

Requesters raise the following question for our review: did the OOR err as a matter of law in determining that the Township met its burden of proving the *Serano v. Golden* settlement agreement (settlement agreement) in *Serano*’s federal civil rights lawsuit, *Serano v. Golden*, docketed at 5:21-cv-84 in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, is not in its possession, custody, or control. In support of its position, Requesters assert that the OOR erred in the following ways: 1. The OOR decision failed to consider that the settlement agreement is in the Township’s constructive possession; 2. The OOR did not conduct the proper analysis of possession, and if it had it would have concluded that the settlement agreement was a public record subject to disclosure under the RTKL because Golden was a police officer and was sued in his official capacity; 3. The OOR decision to deny the records request contravenes the remedial intent of the RTKL which provides access to this type of information to allow the

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

public to scrutinize the actions of public officials and make public officials accountable for their actions. This court addresses the issues raised by Requesters, but not in the order presented.

This court first examines Requesters' second issue: whether the settlement agreement is a public record.

In 2008, the General Assembly enacted the RTKL... and provided for significantly broadened access to public records. Under the new law, agency records are presumed to be public records, accessible for inspection and copying by anyone requesting them, and must be made available to a requester unless they fall within specific, enumerated exceptions or are privileged. 65 P.S. §§ 67.305(a), 67.701(a), 67.708(b) (listing categories of records that are exempt from public access). To justify a determination to deny a requester access to a requested record, the relevant government agency bears the "burden of proving ... by a preponderance of the evidence" that an exception applies. 65 P.S. § 67.708(a).

Bowling, supra., 621 Pa. at 140, 75 A.3d at 457 (2013).

The RTKL requires state and local agencies to provide access to public records upon request. 65 P.S. § 67.302. A "public record" is a "record, including a financial record, of a Commonwealth or local agency that: (1) is not exempt under section 708; (2) is not exempt from being disclosed under any other Federal or State law or regulation or judicial order or decree; or (3) is not protected by a privilege." 65 P.S. § 67.102. Further, the term "record" is defined as:

Information, regardless of physical form or characteristics, that documents a transaction or activity of an agency and that is created, received or retained pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the agency. The term includes a document, paper, letter, map, book, tape, photograph, film or sound recording, information stored or maintained electronically and a data-processed or image-processed document.

65 P.S. § 67.102.

In determining whether the requested record in this case is a public record as defined by the RTKL, this court must examine whether the settlement agreement between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden was information that documented a transaction or activity of the Township and that

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

was created, received or retained pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the Township.

This court finds that a settlement agreement between two private individuals, neither of whom are current agents of the Township, does not constitute information that documents a transaction or activity of the Township; the settlement agreement was information that documented a transaction or “meeting of the minds” of the two parties to that agreement only. The settlement agreement between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden did not involve any contract or deal involving the Township. The Township was not a signatory to the settlement agreement and was not an entity subject to the subsequent order barring the parties to the agreement from making public disclosure of the settlement terms. Requesters’ Exhibit D. The Township, like the public at large, was not entitled to the settlement terms without other valid legal process or special order of court.

In addition, the settlement agreement was not created in connection with business of the agency, it was created in connection with business between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden, specifically Ms. Serano’s right to obtain damages from Mr. Golden. The settlement agreement was not received or retained by the Township pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the Township. To the contrary, the Township could not receive or retain the settlement agreement unless pursuant to other valid legal process following reasonable notice to opposing counsel or further order of court pursuant to the order barring public disclosure of the settlement terms.

Requesters argue that the settlement agreement is a Township public record because it resolved claims against a police officer sued in his official capacity under 42 U.S.C. section 1983. However, as previously stated above, the settlement agreement was between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden, a former police officer, only; by Order dated September 21, 2021, Defendant South Whitehall Township was dismissed with prejudice by agreement of the parties. Petitioner’s

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

Exhibit B. The Township was dismissed with prejudice from the suit prior to the remaining parties settling the case. Requesters' Exhibit C. The Township was not privy to the terms of the settlement agreement and was not a party obligated to pay funds towards the settlement. Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden alone agreed to the terms of the settlement and the Township was not bound in any way as it was no longer a party to the action.

Requesters assert that the settlement agreement between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden is a public record of the Township because records belonging to or created by individuals (not government agencies) may still qualify as public records and be accessible under the RTKL if they document agency activities or are received by agency members acting in their official capacity. As previously discussed, this court finds that the settlement agreement does not document agency activities and it was not received by an agency member acting in his official capacity as Mr. Golden had been terminated as a police officer years before the Serano lawsuit was commenced.

Requesters relied on *Bagwell v. Pa. Dep't of Educ.*, 76 A.3d 81, 89 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013) and *Mollick v. Township of Worcester*, 32 A.3d 859 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011) for their assertion that the settlement agreement is a public record. In *Bagwell*, a requester sought records from the Pennsylvania Department of Education (Department), specifically from the Secretary of Education (Secretary) in his capacity as an *ex officio* member of the Pennsylvania State University (PSU) Board of Trustees (Board). PSU is not an agency subject to the RTKL; the Department is a Commonwealth agency as defined by the RTKL. For PSU to be eligible for state-related status, the Secretary must be appointed as an *ex officio* Board member in order to protect the students and citizens of the Commonwealth. *Id.* The Secretary is statutorily required

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

to serve as a PSU Board member by virtue of his office, and his service as a PSU Board member is inseparable from his role as Secretary because he holds the membership solely because he is Secretary. The Court held that only one party needs to be an agency to lead to RTKL disclosure and the Department agreed the Secretary acted on behalf of the Commonwealth while serving on PSU's Board, and acknowledged the Secretary was a "state actor" serving the Commonwealth's interests. The Court further held the records sent from the PSU Board members or staff to the Secretary, in his capacity as an *ex officio* member of the Board qualify as records of an "agency" as defined by the RTKL ("[p]rivate persons and entities may create correspondence and send it to an agency, thereby potentially making it a record of the agency").

The *Bagwell* case is distinguishable from the instant case because the settlement agreement was only between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden. Even if Mr. Golden was sued in his official capacity as a South Whitehall Township police officer, he was no longer employed by the Township at the time he entered into the settlement agreement. At least one party needs to be an agency to lead to RTKL disclosure and that condition was not met in the instant case.

The second case relied on by Requesters was *Mollick, supra*. In *Mollick*, the Commonwealth Court "considered the capacity in which an individual acted in assessing whether the record documented an agency activity... reasoning that the records on personal computers of township supervisors may qualify as records of an agency when they were received by supervisors in their official, as opposed to private individual, capacity." Specifically, the township only operates through its board of supervisors and if two or more supervisors exchanged emails that document a transaction or activity of the township and were created, received or retained in connection with a transaction, business, or activity of the township, the

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

supervisors may have been acting as the township and those emails could be “records” of the township.

Again, that case is also distinguishable from the instant case. The instant case does not involve a current officer of the Township creating, receiving, or retaining documents involving Township business. This case is a former employee entering into a personal settlement agreement for behavior conducted while in his official capacity. Mr. Golden did not create, receive or retain information that documents a transaction or activity of the Township.

The settlement agreement between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden is not a public record as defined by the RTKL. In addition, the:

RTKL has a procedure in place that puts the burden upon a local agency, through its [ORO], to make a good faith determination as to whether any requested record is in fact a “public record” and, if so, then determine whether the identified public record is within its possession, custody or control. 65 P.S. §§ 67.502; 67.901. In making such good faith determination of whether a requested record is a public record, the [ORO] is required, *inter alia*, to direct requests to other appropriate persons within the agency. Section 502 of the RTKL, 65 P.S. § 67.502.

In re Silberstein, 11 A.3d 629, 633 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011).

The Township’s ORO in this case made a good faith determination as to whether the settlement agreement between Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden was within its possession, custody or control. Pursuant to Mr. Cope’s Affidavit, he conducted a thorough examination of files in the possession, custody and control of the Township and inquired with relevant third-party contractors for records responsive to the request by contacting counsel at the law firm who was appointed by the Township’s insurance carrier to defend the Township in the litigation that is the subject of the record request. Mr. Cope further testified that the Township was not involved in any settlement or release agreement and has no knowledge or access to any settlement or release

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

between the remaining parties [Ms. Serano and Mr. Golden]. In addition to attesting that the Township is not in such possession, current Township possession of the settlement agreement would indicate that one of the parties to the settlement agreement violated the federal court order that bars the parties to the settlement agreement from disclosing the agreement's terms.

Requesters argue that the Township is in constructive possession of the settlement agreement. "Constructive possession is the concept of accessing records 'of' an agency that are outside an agency's possession, but are within its legal custody or control." *UnitedHealthCare of Pa., Inc. v. Baron*, 171 A.3d 943, 958 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2017). Again, we reiterate that the settlement agreement is not a record "of" the agency. In addition, this court finds the settlement agreement is not within the Township's legal custody or control.

Requesters attempt to argue that the Township was in control of the settlement agreement because the Township was dismissed as a party from the action on the same day the remaining parties entered into the settlement agreement. Requesters argue that the timing of the Township's dismissal is suspicious and evidences that the Township was involved in negotiating settlement terms. Such suggestion and suspicion is not sufficient for this court to find the Township was in control of the settlement agreement.

This court finds that the Township is without the legal custody or control to access the records for constructive possession. The only individuals that have possession of the settlement agreement are Ms. Serano and her counsel and Mr. Golden and his counsel. The Township has no obligation to request access to the settlement agreement from any of them. Presumably Requesters are suggesting that the Township assert legal custody or control over Mr. Golden to receive access to the settlement agreement. However, the RTKL does not require the Township

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

to seek requested documents from former employees. *Breslin v. Dickinson Tp.*, 68 A.3d 49 (2013), citing *Barley v. Consolidated Rail Corporation*, 820 A.2d 740, 744-45 (Pa. Super. 2003) (“in the context of discovery, the Superior Court has held that documents in the possession of the former employees of a party are not in the “possession, custody, or control” of the party”).⁵ See also 65 P.S. § 67.506.⁶

As the Township is not required to seek requested documents from former employees, the Township has no custody or control over the requested document. Therefore, the Township does not have actual or constructive possession of the settlement agreement.

Requesters’ reliance on *Trib.-Rev. Publ’g Co. v. Westmoreland Cnty. Hous. Auth.*, 833 A.2d 112, 117-18 (Pa. 2003) does not apply in this case. In *Trib.-Rev.* the local agency, Westmoreland County Housing Authority, entered into a confidential settlement agreement with its employee to settle a federal civil rights action. In that case, even though there was a confidentiality agreement, and the settlement agreement was in possession of the attorney-in-fact for the reciprocal insurer, and the housing authority objected to and did not sign the settlement agreement, the settlement was determined to be a “public record” because the settlement

⁵ As discussed in *Breslin*, enforcement of a request to a former employee of a party is problematic; it would permit constructive possession of a document without a mechanism to ensure that the former employee complies with the request to actually turn over the document.

⁶ (d) **Agency possession.**--

- (1) A public record that is not in the possession of an agency but is in the possession of a party with whom the agency has contracted to perform a governmental function on behalf of the agency, and which directly relates to the governmental function and is not exempt under this act, shall be considered a public record of the agency for purposes of this act.
- (2) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require access to any other record of the party in possession of the public record.
- (3) A request for a public record in possession of a party other than the agency shall be submitted to the open records officer of the agency. Upon a determination that the record is subject to access under this act, the open records officer shall assess the duplication fee established under section 1307(b)¹ and upon collection shall remit the fee to the party in possession of the record if the party duplicated the record.

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

agreement involved conduct of the agency in its official capacity and contained information related to the administration of the business of the public, and the authority had control over production and the insurer acted as its agent. The instant case differs in that the Township was not a party to the settlement agreement and an agent of the Township does not have the settlement agreement in its possession.

Requesters' final argument for the production of the settlement relies on the remedial intent of the current RTKL that significantly expanded public access to government records with the goal of promoting government transparency. This court is mindful of the goal of governmental transparency but will not widen the net of requested documents beyond that of the public records within the possession, custody or control of an agency. The requested settlement agreement was neither a public record nor within the actual or constructive possession, custody or control of the Township. Therefore, the Requesters' request for the settlement agreement is denied.

In addition to the request for production of the settlement agreement, Requesters' requested sanctions for the Township's alleged bad faith in this matter. A court may "award attorney fees if the court ... grants access when either: (1) an agency acted with willful or wanton disregard of the right to access in bad faith; or (2) an agency's denial was not based on a reasonable interpretation of law." *Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Pa. Dept. of Corr.*, 197 A.3d 825, 832 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2018), *aff'd*, 243 A.3d 19 (Pa. 2020) quoting *Bagwell, supra*. 131 A.3d 638, 660-61 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2015) and 65 P.S. § 67.1304. This court finds it unnecessary to address the merits of this claim as this court did not grant access to the requested document. The requested sanctions are denied.

Daniel Patrick Sheehan and The Morning Call v. South Whitehall Township; Case No. 2022-C-1571

For all of the above reasons, Requesters' appeal is denied and the Final Determination of the Office of Open Records is affirmed.

DATE: May 2, 2023

BY THE COURT:



MELISSA T. PAVLACK, J.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL COURT DIVISION

File No.: 2022-C-1571
Other

Civil Appeals Admin Agencies - Statutory Appeal

Daniel Patrick Sheehan, The Morning Call, Also Known As Morning Call
- VS -
South Whitehall Township

Copies of this Order were e-mailed/mailed to all counsel of record and pro se litigants on
5/2/2023.

236 NOTICE

Pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. § 236, notice is hereby given that an order, decree, or judgment in
the above captioned matter has been entered.

Andrea E. Naugle
Clerk of Judicial Records

**NOTICE: All parties and counsel must maintain correct and current contact information,
INCLUDING E-MAIL ADDRESSES, with the Clerk of Judicial Records Civil Division as
well as through E-File & Serve.**

Jennifer R Alderfer, Esq ✓ jalderfer@zatorlaw.com

Paula Knudsen Burke, Esq ✓ pknudsen@rcfp.org

~~Zator Law
4400 Walbert Ave at
Ridgeview Drive
Allentown PA 18104
PO Box 1328
Lancaster PA 17608~~

