

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIDDLE DISTRICT**

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,	:	No. 563 MAL 2025
	:	
Respondent	:	
	:	
v.	:	Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Order of the Superior Court
	:	
	:	
SADIE (O'DAY) COYNE, AMY HELCOSKI, ERIK KRAUSER, BRYAN WALKER, AND RANDY RAMIK,	:	
	:	
Petitioners	:	
	:	
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,	:	No. 595 MAL 2025
	:	
Cross-Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Order of the Superior Court
	:	
	:	
SADIE (O'DAY) COYNE, AMY HELCOSKI, ERIK KRAUSER, BRYAN WALKER, AND RANDY RAMIK,	:	
	:	
Respondents	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 18th day of February, 2026, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal and the Cross-Petition for Allowance of Appeal are **GRANTED**. The issues, as stated by Petitioners and the Commonwealth, are:

- (1) Whether the Superior Court erred in failing to read all sections of the Child Protective Services Law (CPSL) together and in conjunction with each other, resulting in an interpretation that improperly strips county agency employees of the criminal immunity explicitly granted under 23 Pa.C.S.[] § 6318(b) for their alleged failure to report child abuse pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S.[] § 6319?
- (2) Does the Superior Court’s holding—that a mandated reporter who is also an employee of a county agency is not shielded by the absolute criminal immunity of [Section] 6318(b) for a violation of the mandatory reporting duty in [Section] 6319—present a question of substantial public importance concerning the proper interpretation of a crucial statewide law intended to protect child welfare professionals, thereby creating uncertainty as to the scope of immunity for caseworkers and undermining the exercise of professional assessment in child-protection decisions deterring good-faith professional judgment?
- (3) Whether the Superior Court erred in finding that [Petitioners] were immune from prosecution for EWOC under 23 Pa.C.S. § 6318(b) where that statute only precludes civil suit or criminal prosecution for reporting abuse or for providing services, and [Petitioners] were charged with [EWOC] by violating a duty of care, protection or support for their failure to provide necessary services to protect the children from what clearly should have been perceived as suspected child abuse.

The Prothonotary is directed to list this case for argument with *Commonwealth v. Kiessling*, 15-17 MAP 2026.