

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board

JOSEPH STOKES AND STEPHEN WELSH :  
 :  
 v. : Case No. PF-C-24-32-W  
 :  
 CECIL TOWNSHIP :

**FINAL ORDER**

Cecil Township (Township) filed timely exceptions with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (Board) on August 5, 2025, challenging a Proposed Decision and Order (PDO) issued on July 16, 2025. In the PDO, the Board's Hearing Examiner concluded that the Township violated Section 6(1)(a) and (c) of the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Act (PLRA), as read *in pari materia* with Act 111 of 1968, when it issued harsher discipline to Officers Joseph Stokes and Stephen Welsh because they had union counsel represent them during their investigatory interviews regarding the posting of a meme on an official police report. Pursuant to an extension of time granted by the Secretary of the Board, the Township filed a brief in support of its exceptions on September 5, 2025. Joseph Stokes and Stephen Welsh (Complainants) filed a response to the Township's exceptions on August 12, 2025, and a brief on September 15, 2025, after an extension granted by the Secretary.

The findings relevant to the exceptions are as follows. Cecil Township Police Wage and Policy Unit, FOP Lodge #22 (Union) is the exclusive bargaining representative of the Township's police officers.<sup>1</sup> (FF 3). The Township and Union are parties to a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) which includes a three-step grievance procedure: step one is a meeting with the Chief of Police, step two is before the Township Board of Supervisors, and step three is before an arbitrator. (FF 3, 4).

At the time of the hearings in this matter, Officer Stokes was employed as a sergeant and had been an employe of the Township for over twelve years, in addition to being Union President for the last six years. He was also a supervising sergeant for his shift. (FF 5, 8, 11). Officer Welsh was employed as a Township police officer for approximately seven years when he left Township employment on July 5, 2024. (FF 6). Police Chief Shawn Bukovinsky was a Township police officer for over 30 years, with the last twelve as Chief. (FF 7).

In March 2023, Officer Stokes arrested an individual and seized their vehicle, which was impounded and turned over to two Department detectives to be searched. Another officer had again searched the same still-impounded vehicle for an unrelated reason in January 2024 and found a clear zip-lock baggie of methamphetamine in the driver's side door compartment that the detectives had missed in their March 2023 search. (FF 10). Officer Welsh found it humorous that the two had not found the clear baggie in their own search. Thereafter, on January 18, 2024, he printed out several copies of the updated official police report and highlighted specific sections emphasizing

---

<sup>1</sup> Complainants filed and pursued this Charge against the Township as individuals, without Union involvement. (FF 9).

the detectives' oversight. Officer Welsh also searched online, found, and attached to these printouts a meme showing former NBA player Nick Young smiling awkwardly and surrounded by question marks. (FF 11-12). Officer Welsh put a printout with meme attachment in each detective's office mailbox, put one in another officer's desk drawer, and posted another in the locker room. Officer Stokes was Welsh's supervising sergeant for their shift that day and was aware of Officer Welsh's actions. (FF 11, 25).

Both detectives complained to Lieutenant Egizio about the document in their mailboxes. Lieutenant Egizio then went to Chief Bukovinsky's office, presented the document and explained what had happened. Chief Bukovinsky was immediately upset and stated out loud in his office that he was going to fire Officer Welsh, although the Chief later testified that this was said in anger and he didn't actually intend to fire anyone. (FF 13-14, 40, 42). Unaware, Officer Welsh worked his next scheduled twelve-hour shift and then went home without incident. He was later called by Chief Bukovinsky, who stated that Officer Welsh was placed on administrative suspension and that he should immediately come back to the station. Once there, Chief Bukovinsky ordered Officer Welsh to turn in his issued police equipment, police ID and badge, and suspended his IT access. (FF 15). Chief Bukovinsky issued Officer Welsh a letter the next day, January 19, 2024, confirming the administrative suspension. Officer Stokes was issued a similar letter that same day. (FF 17-18).

Officers Stokes and Welsh were suspended on administrative leave from January 19, 2024 through February 28, 2024. (FF 19). An internal investigation was started and both Officers Stokes and Welsh received letters from Chief Bukovinsky ordering them to attend a fact-finding interview on January 29, 2024. (FF 19, 21, 23). Both officers learned that Chief Bukovinsky had said that he was going to fire Officer Welsh. This concerned the Complainants enough that they obtained Union counsel Ronald Retsch to represent them during the investigation. (FF 16, 40, 42). When both attended their respective mandatory fact-finding interviews on January 29, 2024, each was represented by Attorney Retsch. Present for the Township at each pre-discipline meeting was Chief Bukovinsky, Lieutenant Egizio, and Township Solicitor Catherine Clark. (FF 22, 24).

At the invitation of Chief Bukovinsky, Officer Welsh agreed to attend a voluntary, "informal" meeting with the same parties, minus Lieutenant Egizio, on February 23, 2024. The purpose of this meeting was to review and discuss the investigation prior to the formal report being issued with any recommended discipline. Officer Welsh used this meeting to confirm that the Township investigation did not raise concerns about any "racial connotations" relating to the meme document. Officer Stokes declined to attend. (FF 29-30).

After the informal meeting with Officer Welsh on February 23, 2024, Chief Bukovinsky issued separate letters to Officers Stokes and Welsh notifying them that he had determined they had violated enumerated Police Department rules and Township policies. Each letter informed the officers of the Chief's recommended discipline for each of them and their right to address this recommendation with him within five days. Chief Bukovinsky's recommended discipline for Officer Welsh was a deduction of 40 hours of pay,

and for Officer Stokes a deduction of 40 hours of pay plus a two-month demotion from sergeant.<sup>2</sup> (FF 31, 33).

On February 26, 2024, Chief Bukovinsky issued Officers Stokes and Welsh each a letter constituting his final written decision sustaining the violations and findings of misconduct and imposing the recommended discipline as final. Their discipline was to take effect beginning with the day shift on February 29, 2024. (FF 32, 34). Officers Stokes and Welsh submitted written grievances to Chief Bukovinsky the day after receiving their final notices. Pursuant to the CBA, separate step one meetings with Chief Bukovinsky occurred the morning of February 28, 2024. Officer Welsh was first, followed by Officer Stokes. Another department officer, Richard Oddi, acted as Union representative to both, while the Chief was the only other present for each step one meeting. (FF 37, 40, 42).

Officer Welsh testified that at the February 28, 2024 grievance meeting, he attempted to present Chief Bukovinsky with mitigating documents<sup>3</sup>, but the Chief refused to look at or consider them, stating that he "was not going to hold court over this matter". Officer Welsh further stated that, when asked what factors were used to decide on the discipline imposed, Chief Bukovinsky stated the reason for the five-day suspension was that Officer Welsh got a lawyer at the onset of the investigation. (FF 42). Officer Stokes also testified about his own meeting immediately following Officer Welsh, stating that he had the same mitigating documents as Officer Welsh and tried giving them to Chief Bukovinsky, who similarly refused to consider them. Officer Stokes additionally stated that, in response to his comment that no officer had been so severely disciplined for any reason in the time he had been with the Township, Chief Bukovinsky stated that "the punishment would have been much less if [Stokes] would have come to him and met with [the Chief] and not got attorneys involved". (FF 40). Chief Bukovinsky testified that his reasoning for the level of discipline imposed was based on the complaints received from the two detectives, Officer Welsh's use and alteration of an official arrest report and that neither officer took any responsibility for their actions. (FF 35, 36).

While Stokes was suspended from February 29 through March 7, 2024, he was called to work overtime as part of an ongoing officer rotation, notwithstanding Chief Bukovinsky's February 26 final decision letter stating that Officer Stokes "[is] not to work [his] shifts during the 40-hour deduction period". However, Chief Bukovinsky informed Officer Stokes that he (Stokes) could work overtime shifts during his suspension. (FF 32, 50). Officer Stokes refused two overtime calls during the suspension because Union counsel believed it would be improper to work overtime shifts while on suspension due to benefits eligibility and any personal liability that may arise during the work while suspended. Officer Stokes also believed that Chief Bukovinsky was contradicting the written notice of discipline that ordered him not to work his shifts. Per the parties CBA, a refusal of three consecutive overtime shift opportunities results in that officer being suspended from future overtime shift opportunities for 30 days. When Officer

---

<sup>2</sup> The demotion's lower salary also resulted in a 10% reduction in Officer Stokes' pay during the two months. (FF 38).

<sup>3</sup> These were described as "internet jokes" and included at least one printout previously made by department officers at the expense of other officers, but had not resulted in any discipline. (FF 42).

Stokes refused another overtime shift opportunity on March 11, 2024, it was deemed as a third consecutive refusal and Officer Stokes was unable to work extra duty or overtime for 30 days. (FF 50).

As there was no resolution at step one of the grievance process, Officers Stokes and Welsh initiated step 2 on or about March 4, 2024 by individually advancing their grievances and submitting documents to the Township Board of Supervisors. On March 6, 2024, the Board of Supervisors issued each officer a letter denying their grievance. (FF 41, 43-45). Officers Stokes and Welsh then notified the Township of their intent to proceed to binding arbitration in accordance with step three of the CBA. (FF 46). Their grievances were consolidated and heard by Arbitrator Marc Winters who issued an Opinion and Award (Winters Award) on August 6, 2024. In the Winters Award, the arbitrator found that, although there was sufficient cause for the Township to discipline Officers Stokes and Welsh, the grounds were insufficient to support the forty hours of unpaid suspension and Officer Stokes' two-month demotion. Therefore, the arbitrator ordered that the discipline for both be reduced to eight hours of unpaid suspension and that Officer Stokes' demotion be reversed and he be made whole, excluding missed overtime opportunities. Neither party appealed the Winters Award, making it final. (FF 47).

Officers Stokes and Welsh are the first officers to file discipline grievances under the CBA's grievance procedure at any step for the prior twelve-year duration of Bukovinsky's term as Chief. Instead, all prior officer disciplines were not handled through the formal process, but were resolved informally between Chief Bukovinsky and the officer. No discipline had exceeded agreed-upon sanctions such as a reduction of twelve hours from a vacation bank, or the loss of a vacation or comp day. (FF 48-49).

Complainants filed their Charge of Unfair Labor Practices on April 8, 2024, alleging that the Township violated Section 6(1)(c) of the PLRA, as read *in pari materia* with Act 111, by disciplining them in retaliation for engaging in protected activity. In addition to the discipline imposed by the Township, Officer Stokes further alleged that he missed overtime opportunities as a result of the retaliation, and Officer Welsh claimed that he was removed from the County SWAT Team by Chief Bukovinsky as additional retaliation. On May 1, 2024, the Secretary of the Board issued a Complaint and Notice of Hearing, assigning the matter to a Hearing Examiner and directing a hearing. Hearings were held on January 10, 2025, and April 11, 2025, in which both parties were afforded a full opportunity to present testimony, cross-examine witnesses, and introduce documentary evidence. The parties each filed post-hearing briefs in support of their respective positions.

In the PDO, the Hearing Examiner concluded that the Township committed an unfair labor practice under Section 6(1)(a) and (c) of the PLRA when it disciplined Officers Stokes and Welsh. In finding that the discipline imposed on Officers Stokes and Welsh was discriminatory, the Hearing Examiner concluded that the two engaged in protected activity by having Union counsel represent them during their disciplinary meetings, that the Township, through Chief Bukovinsky, issued a more severe level of discipline to the officers due to their insistence on having Union counsel present at those meetings, and that the Township failed to establish a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for its actions. Concerning Officer Stokes' 30-day suspension from consideration for overtime and extra duty work, the Hearing Examiner concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish that the Township

was motivated by anti-union animus when issuing the decision to disqualify Officer Stokes from overtime and extra duty work consideration. However, the Hearing Examiner further concluded that Officer Stokes' decision to not take the overtime shifts was a natural outcome of the Township's unfair labor practice to discipline him in the first place, and consequently ordered the Township to compensate Officer Stokes for the overtime missed during the two extra shifts scheduled during his suspension and missed overtime opportunities during the 30 days he was suspended from overtime consideration. As a further remedy, the Hearing Examiner ordered that the Township rescind all discipline imposed on Officers Stokes and Welsh and make them whole.<sup>4</sup>

Initially, the Township excepts to the Hearing Examiner's Conclusion 4, which states "[t]he Township has committed unfair labor practices in violation of Section 6(1)(a) and (c) of the PLRA and Act 111" (PDO at 19) because the Complainants did not allege a violation of Section 6(1)(a) in the Charge nor did they amend their Charge to allege such a violation. The Complainants in their response to exceptions and supporting brief acknowledge that the Charge of Unfair Labor Practices only alleged a violation of Section 6(1)(c). After a review of the Complainants' Charge and the absence of an amendment thereto, the Board agrees that the Complainants' allegations were limited to a cause of action under Section 6(1)(c) of the PLRA. Accordingly, the Township's exception is sustained and the Hearing Examiner's conclusion that the Township violated Section 6(1)(a) of the PLRA is vacated.

The Township next alleges that the Hearing Examiner erred in finding that the Township committed an unfair labor practice in violation of Section 6(1)(c) of the PLRA because it presented legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for the discipline issued to Officers Stokes and Welsh. It is well established that in order to sustain a charge of discrimination under Section 6(1)(c), a charging party must establish (1) that the employee engaged in protected activity; (2) that the employer was aware of this activity; and (3) that the adverse action complained of was taken because of the protected activity or union animus. St. Joseph's Hospital v. PLRB, 373 A.2d 1069 (Pa. 1977). It is the employer's motive that creates the offense under Section 6(1)(c). PLRB v. Ficon, 254 A.2d 3 (Pa. 1969). An employer may rebut a claim of discrimination under Section 6(1)(c) by proving that the adverse employment action was based on valid, non-discriminatory reasons. Duryea Borough v. PLRB, 862 A.2d 122 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2004).

For purposes of the exceptions, the Hearing Examiner's decision will be upheld if the factual findings are supported by substantial and legally credible evidence, and the legal conclusions drawn from those facts are reasonable, and not capricious, arbitrary or illegal. Abington Transportation Association v. PLRB, 570 A.2d 108 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990). Substantial evidence is such "relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to

---

<sup>4</sup> The Hearing Examiner additionally determined that the Township did not commit an unfair labor practice when Officer Welsh was removed from SWAT because Chief Bukovinsky had a legitimate and non-discriminatory reason for Officer Welsh's removal. The Complainants have not filed exceptions to the Hearing Examiner's decision finding no unfair labor practice concerning Officer Stokes missed overtime opportunities and Officer Welsh's removal from SWAT. 34 Pa. Code § 95.98(a)(3) ("[a]n exception not specifically raised shall be waived").

support a conclusion." PLRB v. Kaufmann Department Stores, Inc., 29 A.2d 90, 92 (Pa. 1942); Lycoming County v. PLRB, 943 A.2d 333, n. 20 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2007). Additionally, the Hearing Examiner's function is to resolve conflicts in evidence, make findings of fact from conflicting evidence, and draw inferences from those findings of fact. Kaufmann Department Stores, supra. The Board defers to the credibility determinations of its Hearing Examiners who observe the manner and demeanor of the witnesses during the testimony. Pennsylvania State Corrections Officers Association v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections (Pittsburgh SCI), 34 PPER 134 (Final Order, 2003). The Hearing Examiner may accept or reject the testimony of any witness in whole or in part. Id.; International Association of Firefighters Local 840 v. Larksville Borough, 48 PPER 82 (Final Order, 2017).

In concluding that the discipline issued by Chief Bukovinsky to Officers Stokes and Welsh was motivated by union animus, the Hearing Examiner noted that Officers Stokes, Welsh, and Oddi each testified credibly that Chief Bukovinsky stated that the discipline imposed was due to the officers getting Union counsel involved with the investigation. Here, the Hearing Examiner wrote in relevant part:

[Chief Bukovinsky] told [Officer] Stokes in the step one grievance meeting that the amount of discipline Stokes received "was because you got lawyers involved." Bukovinsky continued, "the punishment would have been much less if [Stokes] would have come to him and met with him and not got attorneys involved." ... [I]n [Officer] Welsh's step one meeting, Bukovinsky told Welsh that he decided on a 40-hour suspension because Welsh did not come to see him without counsel. Specifically, Bukovinsky stated to Welsh that the reason that the punishment was so high is because Stokes and Welsh got an attorney before anything even started. This is plain and overt evidence of unlawful motivation on behalf of Bukovinsky and the discipline issued to Stokes and Welsh was based on them engaging in protected activity.

(PDO 15). The evidentiary record substantially supports this "plain and overt" finding of unlawful motivation based on union animus.

Nevertheless, the Township argues that Chief Bukovinsky's decision to issue more severe discipline to Officers Stokes and Welsh was made prior to them retaining counsel to represent them during their investigatory meetings and, therefore, it was error for the Hearing Examiner to find union animus. Notably, the Township's exceptions only challenge the Hearing Examiner's credibility determinations concerning Chief Bukovinsky's motivation in issuing more severe discipline to Officers Stokes and Welsh.<sup>5</sup> To that end, the Hearing Examiner specifically stated:

Based upon the record as a whole, including the demeanor of the witnesses on the stand, I credit the testimony of

---

<sup>5</sup> The Township asserts that Finding of Fact 28 is not supported by the record "insofar as it misstates the import of the Chief's testimony." (Township Exceptions ¶16). Finding of Fact 28 states that, "[a]fter reviewing this letter from Welsh (Union Exhibit 8), the Township no longer had any concerns about any 'racial connotation' in the meme document created by Welsh." (FF 28). The Board finds that Finding of Fact 28 is supported by the record and, therefore, the Township's exception is dismissed.

[Officers] Stokes, Welsh and Oddi over [Chief] Bukovinsky and find that he did in fact say to Stokes and Welsh (with Oddi present) that the discipline level was chosen because they had insisted on having an attorney with them at pre-disciplinary meetings.

(PDO 16). Indeed, the Hearing Examiner made explicit findings that Chief Bukovinsky's concern about the meme becoming public was not credible, and that his other proffered reasons (that an official police report had been modified for printing and the potential for public relations concerns) were, at best, not adequate to justify the excessive discipline. The Board will not disturb the Hearing Examiner's credibility determinations on this issue as the Township has failed to present any compelling reasons to warrant reversal. Kaufmann Department Stores, supra. See also City of Reading v. PLRB, 568 A.2d 715 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1989) (it is the PLRB's function to appraise the conflicting evidence, determine credibility matters, resolve factual questions and draw inferences from the facts and circumstances).

The Township also excepts to the Hearing Examiner's determination that the Chief's "obstinate refusal to meaningfully participate" in the step one meeting process supports an inference of anti-union animus on his part. Notwithstanding the Township's references to Chief Bukovinsky's testimony that he wanted a resolution to the grievance, it is not disputed that the Chief refused to consider any of the mitigating documents brought to the meeting and that there was testimony that he stated, "I am not going to hold court over the matter." Certainly, Chief Bukovinsky's refusal to consider Officers Stokes' and Welsh's arguments concerning lesser discipline that the Chief himself imposed in similar situations where union counsel was not involved supports an inference of anti-union animus. Therefore, the Township's exception to the Hearing Examiner's finding in this regard is dismissed.

The Township next turns to the Winters Award to support its claim that it rebutted the discrimination claim by proving that the adverse employment action was based on valid, non-discriminatory reasons. Specifically, the Township states that the arbitrator determined that "[t]he Chief's concern [over implicit bias that may be caused by the altered Police Report with the picture of a black male] is legitimate" to sustain a one-day suspension for Officers Stokes and Welsh. The Township argues that this legitimacy determination by the grievance arbitrator demonstrates that the Hearing Examiner erred in finding that there was no legitimate reason to suspend the officers. Under Section 8(a) of the PLRA<sup>6</sup>, the Board has exclusive jurisdiction over unfair labor practices and is not bound by the decision of an arbitrator. City of Reading v. PLRB, 568 A.2d 715 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1989), citing Philadelphia Housing Authority v. PLRB, 461 A.2d 649 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1983); PSSU, Local No. 668 v. Washington County, 23 PPER ¶ 23073 (Final Order, 1992). Here, the determination of whether the Township had "just cause" to discipline Officers Stokes and Welsh is not determinative of

---

<sup>6</sup> Section 8(a) provides: "The board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice listed in section six of this act. This power shall be exclusive and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that have been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise." 43 P.S. § 211.8 (Prevention of Unfair Labor Practices).

whether the Township committed an unfair labor practice by unlawfully imposing discipline with discriminatory intent. Id. Therefore, the Hearing Examiner did not err in finding that the Township failed to present legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for its actions.

Lastly, the Township excepts to the Hearing Examiner's remedy directing it to compensate Officer Stokes for the overtime he missed while serving the 40-hour suspension and the overtime and extra duty opportunities he missed during the 30 days he was suspended from consideration of the same. The Township argues that this remedial order should be set aside because it is improperly punitive and is not a "reasonable" action to effectuate the policies of the PLRA, and further that the remedy lacks substantial evidence in the record. It is within the Board's discretion to determine the appropriate remedy in an unfair labor practice case. Palmyra Borough Police Officers Association v. Palmyra Borough, 46 PPER 72 (Final Order, 2015). The Board is authorized under Section 8(c) to issue an order requiring the respondent to "cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such reasonable affirmative action ... as will effectuate the policies of [the PLRA]." 43 P.S. § 211.8(c). The Board's exclusive power to remedy an unfair labor practice must be remedial and not punitive. Appeal of Cumberland Valley School District from Final Order of PLRB, 394 A.2d 946 (Pa. 1978).

The Township claims that the loss of overtime pay was due to Officer Stokes refusal to work overtime during his suspension, and that the 30-day suspension from future overtime opportunities was an automatic operation of the parties' negotiated CBA, triggered by Officer Stokes, and was not an independent act by the Township. Because the Hearing Examiner found that the Complainants did not meet their burden to prove a retaliatory motive in disqualifying Officer Stokes from 30 days of overtime consideration, the Township argues it should not be required to pay Officer Stokes the overtime he did not receive due to his own actions. However, the Board agrees with the Hearing Examiner's finding that Officer Stokes' missed overtime opportunities were a "natural outcome" of his unlawful suspension by the Township. As such, the Board finds that the Hearing Examiner's order directing the Township to compensate Officer Stokes for the missed overtime opportunities, during his suspension and the 30-day suspension from consideration of overtime, is remedial and in furtherance of the purposes and policies of the PLRA. Accordingly, the Township's exception to the remedial order is dismissed.

After a thorough review of the exceptions and all matters of record, the Hearing Examiner properly concluded that the Township committed an unfair labor practice in violation of Section 6(1)(c) of the PLRA and Act 111 when it disciplined Officers Stokes and Welsh in retaliation for their engagement in protected activity. The Board shall sustain in part and dismiss in part the exceptions and affirm the Proposed Decision and Order as modified.

#### CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS 1 through 3 of the Proposed Decision and Order are affirmed and incorporated herein by reference.

CONCLUSION 4 is vacated and set aside and the following additional conclusion is made:

5. The Township has committed unfair labor practices in violation of Section 6(1)(c) of the PLRA and Act 111.

ORDER

In view of the foregoing and in order to effectuate the policies of the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Act and Act 111, the Board

HEREBY ORDERS AND DIRECTS

that the exceptions filed by Cecil Township are hereby sustained in part and dismissed in part, that the Conclusion on page 19 finding that the Township violated Section 6(1)(a) is vacated and the July 16, 2025 Proposed Decision and Order be and the same is hereby made absolute and final as modified.

SEALED, DATED and MAILED at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania pursuant to conference call meeting of the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board, Gary Masino, Chairman, and Albert Mezzaroba, Member, this seventeenth day of February, 2026. The Board hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Board, pursuant to 34 Pa. Code 95.81(a), to issue and serve upon the parties hereto the within Order.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board

JOSEPH STOKES AND STEPHEN WELSH :  
 :  
 v. : Case No. PF-C-24-32-W  
 :  
 CECIL TOWNSHIP :

**AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE**

Cecil Township hereby certifies that it has ceased and desisted from its violation of Section 6(1)(c) of the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Act; that it immediately rescinded the February 26, 2024 discipline issued to Officers Stokes and Welsh; that it immediately paid and made Officers Stokes and Welsh whole including interest at the rate of six percent *per annum* on the outstanding backpay owed to them; that it has complied with the Proposed Decision and Order and Final Order as directed therein; that it has posted a copy of the Proposed Decision and Order and Final Order as directed therein; and that it has served an executed copy of this affidavit on Officers Stokes and Welsh.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

SWORN AND SUBSCRIBED TO before me  
the day and year first aforesaid.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Notary Public