

THE COURTS

Title 249—PHILADELPHIA RULES

PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

Notice to the Mass Tort Bar; Amended Protocols and Year-End Report; Trial Division; General Court Regulation No. 2013-01

This Court adopted transitional working rules ("protocols") on February 15, 2012 (see General Court Regulation No. 2012-01) and amended on June 18, 2012 (see General Court Regulation No. 2012-03) to address concerns that the mass tort inventory was experiencing explosive growth, i.e.:

1. In the last six (6) years, the pending inventory rose from 2,542 cases to 5,302 cases, or a 52% increase.

2. While meeting the ABA standards for time to disposition in 90% of all major jury cases, only 37.5% of the mass tort cases were disposed in accordance with these standards. (These standards are unrealistically short for mass torts.)

3. The 2011 year-end inventory of 6,174 cases burdened FJD resources and required prudent management and court oversight to assure meeting scheduled events and trial dates.

Based on the results from January through December, 2012 terms, the Court reports the following:

1. There were 816 mass tort filings for 2012. This is a 70% reduction from the 2,690 cases filed in 2011 and a return to pre-2009 filing levels.

2. There has been a slight reduction in the total out of state filings. In percentage terms, pharmaceutical cases have been reduced from 88% to 86%, and in asbestos cases from 47% to 44%.

3. There has been heightened settlement activity. Mediation activity in both asbestos and pharmaceutical cases has increased notably.

4. Discovery disputes have greatly diminished as a result of adopting separate discovery rules written by the Asbestos Bar and the Pharmaceutical Bar.

5. Since January 1, 2012, two additional judges have been assigned to the Program in an effort to reduce the swelling inventory.

6. The overall inventory of mass tort cases has been reduced by 14% to 5,302 cases as of December 31, 2012.

7. In 2012, only six (6) mass tort cases were tried to jury verdict with two (2) resulting in plaintiff verdicts and four (4) in defense verdicts. These results can be compared with the Major Jury Program in which 148 cases were tried to jury verdict with 49% resulting in plaintiff verdicts and 51% in defense verdicts.

Accordingly, the Court now republishes the protocols as modified over the past year.

Order

And Now, this 7th day of February, 2013, it is hereby *Ordered, Adjudged and Decreed* that:

1. There shall be no reverse bifurcation of any mass tort case, including asbestos, unless agreed upon by all counsel involved.

2. Consolidation of mass tort cases shall not occur absent an agreement of all parties, except in the asbestos program in accordance with the protocols set forth herein below.

3. All punitive damage claims in asbestos claims shall be deferred. Punitive damage claims may be litigated in pharmaceutical mass tort cases provided that the Coordinating Judge, following appropriate motion practice by defense counsel at least 60 days in advance of trial, rules that there are sufficient requisite proofs to support the claim going to trial.

4. Pro hac vice counsel shall be limited to no more than four (4) trials per year, but otherwise will not be limited on pre-trial appearances. The Court encourages non-Pennsylvania counsel to pass its Bar Examination and thereby become familiar with Pennsylvania law, rules and procedures.

5. Discovery Rules: The following discovery rules were proposed to the Court by the Asbestos Bar and the Pharmaceutical Bar and have been adopted by the Mass Tort Program.

Asbestos Bar Discovery Rule

Unless otherwise agreed by opposing counsel or upon showing of exigent circumstances, all discovery shall take place in Philadelphia; however, a party may notice a deposition to take place at a location outside of Philadelphia so long as that party provides video conferencing, or telephone conferencing if video conferencing is impracticable, at no expense to opposing parties.

A notice of deposition shall be served on all parties at least 7 days prior to the scheduled deposition date, unless court approval is obtained for a shorter period of time.

Pharmaceutical Bar Discovery Rule

All plaintiffs shall be made available for deposition in Philadelphia unless otherwise agreed by all parties or upon motion and for good cause shown.

6. Consolidation of Asbestos Cases: Asbestos cases shall be grouped in groups of a minimum of 8 and a maximum of 10 and counsel shall be required to propose cases for consolidation considering the following criteria:

a. Same law. Cases that involve application of the law of different states will not be tried together;

b. Same disease. The disease category for each case in a group must be identical. The disease categories of cases to be grouped for trial are mesotheliomas, lung cancers, other cancers and non-malignancy cases;

c. Same plaintiff's law firm. Primary trial counsel for all cases in each group will be from a single plaintiff firm. Cases where Philadelphia plaintiff firms serve as local counsel for out-of-state counsel will not be grouped with cases from the local firm;

d. Fair Share Act cases will not be consolidated with non-Fair Share Act cases;

e. Pleural mesothelioma is a disease that is distinct from mesotheliomas originating in other parts of the body, and will not be tried on a consolidated basis with non-pleural mesothelioma cases;

f. Non-pleural mesothelioma cases will be further classified for trial, so that non-pleural mesothelioma cases allegedly caused by occupational exposure will not be

tried on a consolidated basis with non-pleural mesothelioma cases allegedly caused by para-occupational (bystander) exposure;

g. And such other factors as determined appropriate in weighing whether all parties to the litigation can receive a prompt and just trial. The Court's present backlog of asbestos cases shall not be an overriding factor in the consolidation determination.

7. Any grouping of cases less than 8-10 in number shall not receive a trial date until a group is formed of 8-10 cases. A maximum of 3 of these 8-10 cases may be tried, with the other 5-7 cases either resolving through settlement or returned to the Coordinating Judge for regrouping and relisting for trial.

8. Mediation: Once grouped, assigned a trial date and after Motions for Summary Judgment have been decided by the Court, counsel are urged to seek mediation from a special panel of former judges named herein below. Either side may request mediation. The mediator selected by the parties shall advise the Court whether the plaintiff firm's participation was in good faith or not. In the discretion of the Coordinating Judge, any plaintiff firm's failure to proceed in good faith in mediation may constitute just cause to remove that group of cases from the trial list and any defendant's failure to proceed in good faith may result in an increase of the maximum 3 cases consolidated for trial. Since no more than 3 cases may be consolidated and proceed to trial in any group of 8-10, the remaining 5-7 cases should be resolved and settled. Otherwise, those unresolved cases shall be relisted for trial. All parties will share the expense of mediation.

9. The panel of former judges invited to participate in the special mediation of mass tort cases are the following:

1. Phyllis W. Beck, Judge
Independence Foundation
Offices at the Bellevue
200 South Broad Street, Suite 1101
Philadelphia, PA 19102
2. Jane Cutler Greenspan, Justice
JAMS Arbitration, Mediation and ADR Services
1717 Arch Street
Suite 4010—Bell Atlantic Tower
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 246-9494
3. G. Craig Lord, Judge
Blank Rome LLP
One Logan Square
130 North 18th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6998
(215) 569-5496
4. James R. Melinson, Judge
JAMS Arbitration, Mediation and ADR Services
1717 Arch Street
Suite 4010—Bell Atlantic Tower
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 246-9494
5. Russell Nigro, Justice
210 W. Washington Square
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 287-5866
6. Diane M. Welsh, Judge
JAMS Arbitration, Mediation and ADR Services
1717 Arch Street
Suite 4010—Bell Atlantic Tower
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 246-9494

10. The Court shall designate which of the cases will proceed to trial. The parties may object to the cases selected to be tried together and request the Court to reconsider.

11. Immediately prior to trial of up to 3 consolidated asbestos cases, the assigned trial judge shall independently determine whether the cases will be tried in a consolidated manner based on the criteria herein above set forth and any other factors deemed relevant to the issue of consolidation and a fair trial.

12. The Coordinating Judge will accept and rule upon Petitions for advanced listings premised upon a medically verifiable prognosis of imminent death.

This General Court Regulation is promulgated in accordance with Pa.R.C.P. No. 239 and the April 11, 1986 Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Eastern District, No. 55 Judicial Administration. The original General Court Regulation shall be filed with the Prothonotary in a Docket maintained for General Court Regulations issued by the Administrative Judge of the Trial Division, Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, and shall be submitted to the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* for publication. Copies of the General Court Regulation shall be submitted to the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, the Civil Procedural Rules Committee, American Lawyer Media, *The Legal Intelligencer*, Jenkins Memorial Law Library, and the Law Library for the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, and shall be posted on the website of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania: <http://courts.phila.gov/regs>.

By the Court

HONORABLE JOHN W. HERRON,
Administrative Judge, Trial Division

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 13-315. Filed for public inspection February 22, 2013, 9:00 a.m.]

SUPREME COURT

Pilot Program for Electronic Filing and Service of Motions and Other Legal Papers in the First Judicial District Court of Common Pleas, Trial Division—Criminal Section and the Philadelphia Municipal Court—Criminal Section; No. 424 Criminal Procedural Rules Doc.

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 6th day of February, 2013, *It Is Ordered* pursuant to Article V, Section 10 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania that the First Judicial District Court of Common Pleas, Trial Division—Criminal Section and the Philadelphia Municipal Court—Criminal Section are authorized to implement a pilot program for electronic filing, pursuant to the local rule in the following form. The pilot program shall be effective for a period of one year commencing April 1, 2013. During the pilot program, the provisions of the local rule shall control to the extent that the local rule's provisions conflict with the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Electronic Case Record Public Access Policy and the Records Retention and Disposition Schedule With Guidelines. This *Order* shall be processed in accordance with Pa.R.J.A. No. 103(b), and shall be effective immediately.

Philadelphia Criminal Rule 576. Pilot Program: Electronic Filing and Service of Motions and Other Legal Papers in the Court of Common Pleas, Trial Division—Criminal Section, and Municipal Court—Criminal Section.

(a)(1) *General Scope and Purpose of this Rule.* The electronic filing of motions and other legal papers in the criminal courts of Philadelphia County is hereby authorized as specifically provided in this rule. The applicable general rules of court and court policies that implement the rules shall continue to apply to all filings regardless of the method of filing. Electronic filing and service shall be governed by this rule.

(2) *Legal papers.* In the context of this rule, the “legal papers” which may be filed electronically shall encompass all written motions, written answers and any notices or documents for which filing is required or permitted, including orders, exhibits and attachments, but excluding:

- (i) applications for a search warrant;
- (ii) applications for an arrest warrant;
- (iii) criminal complaints;
- (iv) bills of information;
- (v) grand jury materials;
- (vi) legal papers filed *ex parte* as authorized by law; and
- (vii) legal papers filed or authorized to be filed under seal.

Comment

The primary intent of this rule is to facilitate the electronic filing of all legal papers other than as specifically excluded in this subsection. Until such time as necessary protocols are adopted to permit the electronic filing of these excluded legal papers, they shall be filed in paper format so as to limit potential harm to any party and to protect the confidentiality of information as provided by law.

(b) *Participation and Fees.*

(1) An attorney must establish an account, apply for a Username, Password and Personal Identification Number (“PIN”), and supply an email address in order to use the *Criminal Electronic Filing System*. An attorney is responsible for the actions of other individuals whom the attorney authorizes to use the attorney’s account. Parties who are proceeding without counsel must also establish an account, apply for a Username, Password and Personal Identification Number (“PIN”), supply an email address and be authorized to access their cases through the *Criminal Electronic Filing System*. Service of electronic filings on attorneys who have established an account and on parties without counsel who have been authorized will be made automatically by the *Criminal Electronic Filing System*.

(2) The clerk of court shall not require the payment of a filing fee by any party found by the court to be indigent and is represented by an attorney appointed pursuant to Pa.R.Crim.P. 122 or Pa.R.Crim.P. 904, or who has been granted *in forma pauperis* status, or is represented by an attorney who is providing free legal service to the party and has filed the praecipe required by Pa.R.C.P. No. 240 (d).

(3) Applicable filing fees shall be paid electronically through procedures established by the clerk of courts, and

at the same time and in the same amount as required by statute, court rule or order. The clerk of courts shall accept payment as follows:

(i) electronically, at the time the legal paper is electronically filed through the *Criminal Electronic Filing System*, with the following credit or debit cards: American Express, Discover, MasterCard, and Visa;

(ii) by mail, with certified or cashier check and money order; and

(iii) in person, in cash, certified checks and with the following credit or debit cards: American Express, Discover, MasterCard, and Visa.

(c) *Use of the Criminal Electronic Filing System.*

(1) Electronic filings may be submitted through the website of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania: <http://www.courts.phila.gov> beginning on April 1, 2013 in accordance with the filing instructions contained in this rule and as may be otherwise provided at that site.

(2) Electronic filings may be submitted at any time (with the exception of periodic maintenance).

(3) *The Criminal Electronic Filing System* will attribute the filing of an electronic legal paper to the party whose Username, Password and PIN is used to log on and file the legal paper. The following additional provisions govern the signature and verification of legal papers:

(i) The signature of the filer on electronic filings shall be in the following form: /s/ Chris L. Smith.

(ii) The sworn affidavit or verification required by Pa.R.Crim.P. 575(A)(2)(g) and (B)(3)(d) shall be converted to a portable document format (hereinafter “pdf”) and shall be attached to the legal paper when it is electronically submitted.

(iii) Any exhibit or other legal paper that requires or contains multiple signatures shall be converted to a pdf and shall be attached to the legal paper when it is electronically submitted.

(iv) The electronic filer shall maintain the original of a sworn or verified document contained in an electronic filing (e.g., affidavit) or contained within an electronic filing (e.g., verification), and shall make it available upon direction of the court or reasonable request of the signatory or opposing party.

(4) All legal papers electronically filed must be filed in a pdf and shall be maintained and retained by the clerk of courts in an electronic format. Neither the clerk of courts nor the court is required to maintain a hard copy of any legal paper filed electronically as provided in this rule.

(5) The electronic filing of a motion constitutes a certification pursuant to Pa.R.Crim.P. 575 that the filing party or attorney has read the motion, that to the best of the filing party’s or attorney’s knowledge, information and belief there is good ground to support the motion, and that it is not interposed for delay.

(6) The clerk of courts shall provide, through the *Criminal Electronic Filing System’s* website, an acknowledgement that the legal paper has been received, including the date and time of receipt, in a form which can be printed for retention by the filing party.

(7) Unless the legal paper is rejected by the clerk of courts, and provided that the requisite payment has been received prior to or at the date and time of submission, the filing date and time of a legal paper shall be the date and time of submission. If the legal paper is not rejected

by the clerk of courts, and the payment is received after the date and time of submission, the filing date and time of a legal paper shall be the date and time payment is received.

(8) Upon review of the legal paper, the clerk of courts shall provide, through the *Criminal Electronic Filing System's* website, an acknowledgement that:

(i) the legal paper has been accepted for filing, including the date and time of acceptance, and that the legal paper was served on the parties as provided in this rule, in a form which can be printed for retention by the filing party; or

(ii) the legal paper has been rejected as authorized by law. The clerk of courts shall immediately notify, by email, the filing party of the reason for the rejection and whether the legal paper may be modified or a new legal paper must be submitted.

(9) A filing party shall be responsible for any delay, disruption, interruption of the electronic signals and legibility of the document electronically filed, except when caused by the failure of the *Criminal Electronic Filing System's* website.

(d) *Legal Papers Filed in a Paper Format.* Any legal paper submitted for filing to the clerk of courts in a paper (or "hard-copy") format beginning on April 1, 2013 shall be accepted by the clerk of courts in that format and shall be retained by the clerk of courts as may be required by applicable rules of court and record retention policies. The clerk of courts shall convert such hard-copy legal paper, other than any legal paper filed under seal, to pdf. Once converted to pdf, the pdf version of the legal paper shall be deemed to be, and shall be treated as, the original legal paper and may be used by the parties and the court for all purposes, including court hearings and trials, in the Municipal Court and the Court of Common Pleas.

(e) *Record on Appeal.* Electronically filed legal papers, and copies of legal papers filed in a paper format as provided in subsection (d), shall become the record on appeal.

(f) *Confidential information. Ex parte filing of legal papers. Filing legal papers under seal.*

(1) Counsel and unrepresented parties must refrain from including confidential information in legal papers filed with the clerk of courts or the court regardless of whether the legal paper is filed electronically or in a paper format. Counsel and unrepresented parties must include confidential information relevant to the case on a court-approved *Confidential Information Form*. The *Confidential Information Form* shall be served on and made available to the parties to the case, the court and appropriate court staff, as provided by law. The *Confidential Information Form* shall not be released or otherwise accessed by the public. The following information is designated as confidential information:

(i) in a prosecution involving a child victim of sexual or physical abuse, the name of the child victim;

(ii) social security numbers;

(iii) financial information; and

(iv) any other information deemed to be confidential, as provided by law.

(2) Legal papers which, according to law, may be filed *ex parte* or under seal shall continue to be filed in a paper format as provided in subsection (a)(2).

(g) *Service of Legal Papers.*

(1) Use of the *Criminal Electronic Filing System* shall constitute the filer's certification that the submission is authorized and that electronic notice and service of other documents through the *Criminal Electronic Filing System* will be accepted by the filer.

(2) The submission of an electronic filing shall satisfy the service requirements of Pa.R.Crim.P. 576 on any attorney or party who has established an account as provided in subsection (b)(1) of this rule.

(3) Service of electronic filings on any attorney or party who has not established an account as provided in subsection (b)(1) of this rule shall be made by the traditional methods required under Pa.R.Crim.P. 576.

(h) *Miscellaneous provisions.*

(1) Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the clerk of courts shall not be required to redact any pleading filed electronically or in a hard-copy format. However, if the legal paper is submitted for filing in violation of subsection (f) of this rule, the clerk of courts may reject it or refuse to accept it for filing.

(2) The clerk of courts is authorized to delay the availability of legal papers to the general public in the courthouse for five (5) days after the legal paper is accepted for filing, to minimize any potential prejudice or harm to the parties or witnesses, and to enable the parties to seek a protective order when a legal paper is not filed as required by subsections (a)(2) and (f) of this rule.

(3) Legal papers shall only be made available remotely to attorneys of record and *pro se* parties. A party who is represented by counsel shall not have remote access to any legal papers filed in connection with the party's case. Access to the official case file and legal papers, as required or provided by law and applicable Public Access policies, is available in Rooms 200 and 310 at the Criminal Justice Center. Additional access may be provided by the clerk of courts at such additional places which may be designated from time to time.

(4) The clerk of courts shall provide training and assistance to all parties as may be necessary to electronically file legal papers as provided in this rule.

(5) The clerk of courts shall provide sufficient computer terminals at such locations as may be determined from time to time to allow parties and the public to access legal papers as provided by this rule and as authorized by applicable Public Access policies.

(i) As provided in subsection (a), the procedures contained in this rule control in the event a provision herein conflicts with the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure. In all other respects, the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure apply.

(j) *Duration of Pilot Program.* Unless otherwise provided, the Pilot Program established by this rule shall end on April 1, 2014. The terms of the Pilot Program may be modified from time to time by the issuance of a local rule adopted pursuant to Pa.R.Crim.P. 105.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 13-316. Filed for public inspection February 22, 2013, 9:00 a.m.]

Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 2nd Judicial District; No. 307 Magisterial Rules Doc.

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 7th day of February 2013, upon consideration of the Petition to Reestablish the Magisterial Districts of the 2nd Judicial District (Lancaster County) of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* that the Petition, which provides for the elimination of Magisterial District 02-3-08, within Lancaster County, to be effective May 1, 2013, is granted; and that the Petition, which provides for the realignment of Magisterial Districts 02-2-08, 02-3-01, 02-3-06, and 02-3-09 within Lancaster County, to be effective May 1, 2013, is granted; and that the Petition, which also provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial Districts 02-1-01, 02-1-02, 02-1-03, 02-2-01, 02-2-02, 02-2-03, 02-2-04, 02-2-05, 02-2-06, 02-2-07, 02-3-02, 02-3-03, 02-3-04, 02-3-05, and 02-3-07 within Lancaster County, to be effective immediately, is granted. The judgeship for district 02-3-08 shall not appear on the ballot for the 2013 municipal election.

Said Magisterial Districts shall be as follows:

Magisterial District 02-1-01 Magisterial District Judge Cheryl N. Hartman	City of Lancaster (Wards 4 & 8)
Magisterial District 02-1-02 Magisterial District Judge David P. Miller	Manheim Township
Magisterial District 02-1-03 Magisterial District Judge Robert A. Herman, Jr.	Columbia Borough Mountville Borough West Hempfield Township
Magisterial District 02-2-01 Magisterial District Judge Kelly S. Ballentine	City of Lancaster (Wards 3 & 7)
Magisterial District 02-2-02 Magisterial District Judge Bruce A. Roth	City of Lancaster (Wards 1, 5, 9-1, 9-2, and 9-3)
Magisterial District 02-2-03 Magisterial District Judge Mary Mongiovi Sponaugle	City of Lancaster (Wards 9-4 & 9-5) Lancaster Township
Magisterial District 02-2-04 Magisterial District Judge Janice Jimenez	City of Lancaster (Wards 2 & 6)
Magisterial District 02-2-05 Magisterial District Judge Brian E. Chudzik	East Petersburg Borough East Hempfield Township
Magisterial District 02-2-06 Magisterial District Judge Joshua R. Keller	Millersville Borough Conestoga Township Manor Township
Magisterial District 02-2-07 Magisterial District Judge Tony S. Russell	Akron Borough Ephrata Borough Clay Township Ephrata Township
Magisterial District 02-2-08 Magisterial District Judge Edward A. Tobin	Lititz Borough Elizabeth Township Penn Township Warwick Township

Magisterial District 02-3-01 Magisterial District Judge Scott E. Albert	Manheim Borough Marietta Borough Mt. Joy Borough East Donegal Township Rapho Township
Magisterial District 02-3-02 Magisterial District Judge B. Denise Commins	East Lampeter Township Upper Leacock Township
Magisterial District 02-3-03 Magisterial District Judge William E. Benner, Jr.	Strasburg Borough Pequea Township Strasburg Township West Lampeter Township
Magisterial District 02-3-04 Magisterial District Judge Stuart J. Mylin	Quarryville Borough Colerain Township Drumore Township East Drumore Township Eden Township Fulton Township Little Britain Township Martic Township Providence Township
Magisterial District 02-3-05 Magisterial District Judge Isaac H. Stoltzfus	Christiana Borough Bart Township Caernarvon Township Leacock Township Paradise Township Sadsbury Township Salisbury Township
Magisterial District 02-3-06 Magisterial District Judge Rodney H. Hartman	New Holland Borough Terre Hill Borough Brecknock Township Earl Township East Earl Township West Earl Township
Magisterial District 02-3-07 Magisterial District Judge Nancy G. Hamill	Adamstown Borough Denver Borough East Cocalico Township West Cocalico Township
Magisterial District 02-3-09 Magisterial District Judge Jayne F. Duncan	Elizabethtown Borough Conoy Township Mt. Joy Township West Donegal Township

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 13-317. Filed for public inspection February 22, 2013, 9:00 a.m.]

Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 49th Judicial District; No. 306 Magisterial Rules Doc.

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 7th day of February 2013, upon consideration of the Petition to Reestablish the Magisterial Districts of the 49th Judicial District (Centre County) of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* that the Petition, which provides for the

realignment of Magisterial Districts 49-2-01, 49-3-02, and 49-3-04, within Centre County, to be effective May 1, 2013, is granted; and that the Petition, which also provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial Districts 49-1-01, 49-3-03, and 49-3-05, within Centre County, to be effective immediately, is granted.

Said Magisterial Districts shall be as follows:

Magisterial District 49-1-01 State College Borough
 Magisterial District Judge (Voting Districts East 2,
 Carmine W. Prestia, Jr. 3, and 4, East Central 2
 & 3, South 2, South
 Central 1 & 2, Southeast,
 and West Central 2)

Magisterial District 49-2-01 College Township (Voting
 Magisterial District Judge Districts North (41) &
 Leslie A. Dutchcot West (44))
 Ferguson Township
 Halfmoon Township
 Patton Township

Magisterial District 49-3-02 Bellefonte Borough
 Magisterial District Judge Howard Borough
 Daniel R. Hoffman, II Milesburg Borough
 Unionville Borough
 Benner Township
 Boggs Township
 Curtin Township
 Howard Township
 Liberty Township
 Marion Township
 Spring Township (Voting
 Districts North (78), West
 (80), and East (86))
 Union Township
 Walker Township

Magisterial District 49-3-03 Philipsburg Borough
 Magisterial District Judge Port Matilda Borough
 Allen W. Sinclair Snow Shoe Borough
 South Philipsburg Borough
 Burnside Township
 Huston Township
 Rush Township
 Snow Shoe Township
 Taylor Township
 Worth Township

Magisterial District 49-3-04 Centre Hall Borough
 Magisterial District Judge Millheim Borough
 Thomas N. Jordan College Township (Voting
 Districts South (42) &
 East (43))
 Gregg Township
 Haines Township
 Harris Township
 Miles Township
 Penn Township
 Potter Township
 Spring Township (Voting
 Districts South (79) &
 Southwest (87))

Magisterial District 49-3-05 State College Borough
 Magisterial District Judge (Voting Districts East 1,
 (Vacant) East Central 1, North,
 Northeast, Northwest,
 South 1, West 1 & 2, and
 West Central 1)

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 13-318. Filed for public inspection February 22, 2013, 9:00 a.m.]