

# THE COURTS

## Title 204—JUDICIAL SYSTEM GENERAL PROVISIONS

### PART V. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND CONDUCT [ 204 PA. CODE CH. 89 ]

#### Amendments to Rules of Organization and Procedure of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; Order No. 84

By this Order, the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania is amending its Rules of Organization and Procedure to modify Rule § 89.206 regarding the procedure for transmitting the record to the Supreme Court.

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania finds that:

(1) To the extent that 42 Pa.C.S. § 1702 (relating to rule making procedures) and Article II of the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L. 769, No. 240), known as the Commonwealth Documents Law, would otherwise require notice of proposed rulemaking with respect to the amendments adopted hereby, those proposed rulemaking procedures are inapplicable because the amendments adopted hereby relate to agency procedure and are perfunctory in nature.

(2) The amendments to the Rules of Organization and Procedure of the Board adopted hereby are not inconsistent with the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement and are necessary and appropriate for the administration of the affairs of the Board.

The Board, acting pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 205(c)(12), orders:

(1) Title 204 of the *Pennsylvania Code* is hereby amended as set forth in Annex A hereto.

(2) The Secretary of the Board shall duly certify this Order, and deposit the same with the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts as required by Pa.R.J.A. 103(c).

(3) The amendments adopted hereby shall take effect 30 days after publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

*By the Disciplinary Board of the  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*

JULIA M. FRANKSTON-MORRIS,  
*Secretary*

#### Annex A

### TITLE 204. JUDICIAL SYSTEM GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### PART V. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND CONDUCT

##### Subpart C. DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

##### CHAPTER 89. FORMAL PROCEEDINGS

##### Subchapter D. ACTION BY BOARD AND SUPREME COURT

#### § 89.206. Transmission of record to Supreme Court.

(a) *General rule.* Enforcement Rule 208(d)(2)(iii) provides that in the event that the Board shall determine that the matter should be concluded by probation, cen-

sure, suspension, disbarment, or by informal admonition, private reprimand, or public reprimand in cases where the respondent-attorney is unwilling to have the matter concluded by informal admonition, private reprimand, or public reprimand, the Board shall file its findings and recommendations, together with the briefs, if any, before the Board and the entire record, with the Supreme Court.

(b) *Procedure.* The Board Chair shall file the record, the briefs on exceptions and the briefs opposing exceptions, if any, **and** the finding and recommendations of the Board[ , **and a statement of the Secretary of any expenses taxable under § 93.111 (relating to determination of reimbursable expenses)** ] with the Supreme Court by means of Form DB-13 (Request for Supreme Court Action) and an appropriate letter of transmittal. Copies of such finding and recommendations[ , **statement of taxable expenses,** ] and letter of transmittal shall be served by the Office of the Secretary upon the participants.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-174. Filed for public inspection February 2, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]

## Title 204—JUDICIAL SYSTEM GENERAL PROVISIONS

### PART V. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND CONDUCT [ 204 PA. CODE CH. 91 ]

#### Amendments to Rules of Organization and Procedure of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; Order No. 83

By this Order, the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania is amending its Rules of Organization and Procedure to modify Rule § 91.173 regarding the procedure for approval and termination of eligible institutions as depositories for trust accounts.

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania finds that:

(1) To the extent that 42 Pa.C.S. § 1702 (relating to rule making procedures) and Article II of the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L. 769, No. 240), known as the Commonwealth Documents Law, would otherwise require notice of proposed rulemaking with respect to the amendments adopted hereby, those proposed rulemaking procedures are inapplicable because the amendments adopted hereby relate to agency procedure and are perfunctory in nature.

(2) The amendments to the Rules of Organization and Procedure of the Board adopted hereby are not inconsistent with the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement and are necessary and appropriate for the administration of the affairs of the Board.

The Board, acting pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 205(c)(12), orders:

(1) Title 204 of the *Pennsylvania Code* is hereby amended as set forth in Annex A hereto.

(2) The Secretary of the Board shall duly certify this Order, and deposit the same with the Administrative

Office of Pennsylvania Courts as required by Pa.R.J.A. 103(c).

(3) The amendments adopted hereby shall take effect 30 days after publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

*By the Disciplinary Board of the  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*

JULIA M. FRANKSTON-MORRIS,  
*Secretary*

#### Annex A

### TITLE 204. JUDICIAL SYSTEM GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### PART V. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND CONDUCT

##### Subpart C. DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

##### CHAPTER 91. MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

##### Subchapter H. FUNDS OF CLIENTS AND THIRD PERSONS; MANDATORY OVERDRAFT NOTIFICATION

#### § 91.173. Approval and termination of Eligible Institutions.

(a) *Approval.* Enforcement Rule 221(h) provides that an Eligible Institution shall be approved as a depository for Trust Accounts if it shall file with the Board an agreement [ **(in a form provided by the Board) in a form approved by the Board** in which the Eligible Institution agrees to **comply with IOLTA Regulations governing approved Eligible Institutions and to make a prompt report to the Lawyers Fund for Client Security Board under the circumstances described in § 91.174 (relating to reports of overdrafts).** Upon receiving a signed agreement from an Eligible Institution as required by this subsection, the Board shall report that fact to the Supreme Court with a recommendation that the Court enter an order approving the Eligible Institution as a depository for Trust Accounts.

(b) *Termination of approval.* Enforcement Rule 221(k) provides that a failure on the part of an Eligible Institution to make a report **to the Lawyers Fund for Client Security Board called for by this subchapter or to comply with IOLTA Regulations governing approved Eligible Institutions** may be cause for termination of its approval by the Supreme Court, but such failure shall not, absent gross negligence, give rise to a cause of action by any person who is proximately caused harm thereby. Upon learning that a financial institution has failed to make a report called for by this subchapter, the Board shall report that fact to the Supreme Court with a recommendation that the Court enter an order terminating the approval of the financial institution as a depository for Trust Accounts.

(c) *List of approved Eligible Institutions.* The Board will periodically publish in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* a list of Eligible Institutions that are approved at the time as depositories for Trust Accounts under this subchapter. The current list shall also be published in the *Pennsylvania Code* as an appendix to this section.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-175. Filed for public inspection February 2, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]

## Title 231—RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

### PART II. ORPHANS' COURT RULES

#### [ 231 PA. CODE PART II ]

#### Proposed Amendment of Pa. O.C. Rule 1.8 and Pa. O.C. Rule 10.1

The Orphans' Court Procedural Rules Committee is planning to propose to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania the amendment of Pa. O.C. Rule 1.8 and Pa. O.C. Rule 10.1, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying explanatory report. Pursuant to Pa.R.J.A. No. 103(a)(1), the proposal is being published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* for comments, suggestions, or objections prior to submission to the Supreme Court.

Any reports, notes, or comments in the proposal have been inserted by the Committee for the convenience of those using the rules. They neither will constitute a part of the rules nor be officially adopted by the Supreme Court. Additions to the text of the proposal are bolded and underlined; deletions to the text are bolded and bracketed.

The Committee invites all interested persons to submit comments, suggestions, or objections in writing to:

Orphans' Court Procedural Rules Committee  
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania Judicial Center  
PO Box 62635  
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2635  
FAX: 717-231-9526  
orphanscourtproceduralrules@pacourts.us

All communications in reference to the proposal should be received by April 6, 2018. E-mail is the preferred method for submitting comments, suggestions, or objections; any e-mailed submission need not be reproduced and resubmitted via mail. The Committee will acknowledge receipt of all submissions.

*By the Orphans' Court  
Procedural Rules Committee*

WAYNE M. PECHT, Esq.,  
*Chair*

#### Annex A

### TITLE 231. RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

#### PART II. ORPHANS' COURT RULES

##### CHAPTER I. PRELIMINARY RULES

#### Rule 1.8. Forms.

(a) The forms approved by the Supreme Court for statewide practice and procedure before the Registers and courts shall be used exclusively **and accepted for filing** by all Registers and clerks; **provided, however, versions of a Supreme Court-approved form shall be acceptable for filing if identical in content and sequential ordering.** [ **Where a Supreme Court-approved form exists, no other form shall be allowed or required by local rule or practice.** ]

(b) The forms approved by the Supreme Court for statewide practice are set forth in an Appendix to these Rules. The forms may be revised and supplemented from time to time. The forms shall also be maintained for public access at the official website of the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts.

(c) A court may require a legal paper to be accompanied by a cover sheet or checklist. A court that imposes such requirements must promulgate a local rule, numbered Local Rule 1.8(c), stating the requirements and setting forth the form of the cover sheet or checklist.

**Note:** Rule 1.8 is substantively similar to former Rule 1.3, but with some modifications.

**Explanatory Comment:** [ Rule 1.8 has been modified from former Rule 1.3 by now mandating the exclusive use of statewide forms promulgated by the Supreme Court. Previously, forms approved or mandated for use pursuant to local rule could be accepted by the local register and clerk so long as the local register and clerk also permitted and accepted forms promulgated by the Supreme Court. Now, if the Supreme Court has promulgated or approved a form for use before the register or clerk, then such form is the only one that may be used by the applicant or petitioner and is the only one that can be accepted by the local register or clerk. ]

The [ mandatory ] statewide forms are set forth in the Appendix attached hereto. The current website for electronic access to the forms is found at [www.pacourts.us/forms](http://www.pacourts.us/forms) under the For-the-Public category. The forms posted on the website are capable of on-line completion.

**In 2018, Rule 1.8 was revised to permit versions of Supreme Court forms to be accepted for filing provided the replication was identical in content. This revision was intended to permit forms to differ stylistically as to format if content requirements do not differ. This revision was not intended to permit the re-ordering of content required by a form.**

#### CHAPTER X. REGISTER OF WILLS

##### Rule 10.1. Forms.

The forms approved by the Supreme Court for statewide practice before the Register as set forth in the Appendix shall be used **exclusively and accepted for filing by all Registers; provided, however, versions of a Supreme Court-approved form shall be acceptable for filing if identical in content and sequential ordering.** [No other forms shall be allowed or required by local rule or practice in such instances. ]

**Note:** Rule 10.1 is new, but is derived from former Rule 10.1.

**Explanatory Comment:** [ Rule 10.1 has been modified from former Rule 10.1 by now mandating the exclusive use of statewide forms promulgated by the Supreme Court. ]

**In 2018, Rule 10.1 was revised to permit versions of Supreme Court forms to be accepted for filing provided the replication was identical in content. This revision was intended to permit forms to differ stylistically as to format if content requirements do not differ. This revision was not intended to permit the re-ordering of content required by a form. See Rule 1.8.**

#### PUBLICATION REPORT

##### Proposed Amendment of Pa. O.C. Rule 1.8 & Pa. O.C. Rule 10.1

In 2006, when statewide forms for orphans' courts and registers of wills were adopted, the goal was to bring

uniformity to then-divergent, local practices. Pa. O.C. Rule 1.3 required that the statewide forms be accepted for orphans' court filings in addition to locally adopted forms. Pa. O.C. Rule 10.1 required that local register forms be "in substantially conformity" with the statewide forms.

In 2015, these rules were rescinded and replaced with Pa. O.C. Rule 1.8 and Pa. O.C. Rule 10.1. The new rules required that the statewide forms be used exclusively and prohibited any other forms allowed or required by local rule.

After the new rules were adopted, the Orphans' Court Procedural Rules Committee received a report from the Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Section of the Pennsylvania Bar Association of some filing offices refusing to accept third-party forms; instead, requiring the use of the statewide forms. This approach reportedly frustrated efforts to complete the necessary forms using estate administration software, which can prepopulate fields from stored data.

The Committee did not intend for Rule 1.8 and Rule 10.1 to displace the use of third-party forms, provided those forms contain the identical content as the statewide forms and present the information in the same order as the statewide forms. The exclusive use of statewide forms was intended to prohibit the promulgation of varying local forms. Non-substantive variations in style and format were not anticipated to cause the rejection of an otherwise compliant form for filing.

Accordingly, the Committee proposes amendments of Rule 1.8 and Rule 10.1 to eliminate non-substantive variations in style and format as the sole basis for rejection of an otherwise compliant filing. The Committee invites all comments, concerns, and suggestions regarding this proposal.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-176. Filed for public inspection February 2, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]

## Title 234—RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

### [ 234 PA. CODE CH. 5 ]

#### Order Amending Rule 590 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure; No. 501 Criminal Procedural Rules Doc.

#### Order

*Per Curiam*

*And Now*, this 18th day of January 2018, upon the recommendation of the Criminal Procedural Rules Committee; the proposal having been published before adoption at *See* 46 Pa.B. 3636 (July 9, 2016), and a Final Report to be published with this Order:

It is Ordered pursuant to Article V, Section 10 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania that Pennsylvania Rule of Criminal Procedure 590 is amended, in the following form.

This Order shall be processed in accordance with Pa.R.J.A. No. 103(b), and shall be effective April 1, 2018.



Annex A

TITLE 234. RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
CHAPTER 5. PRETRIAL PROCEDURES IN COURT CASES

PART H. Plea Procedures

Rule 590. Pleas and Plea Agreements.

\* \* \* \* \*

(B) PLEA AGREEMENTS.

(1) [ When ] At any time prior to the verdict, when counsel for both sides have arrived at a plea agreement, they shall state on the record in open court, in the presence of the defendant, the terms of the agreement, unless the judge orders, for good cause shown and with the consent of the defendant, counsel for the defendant, and the attorney for the Commonwealth, that specific conditions in the agreement be placed on the record in camera and the record sealed.

(2) The judge shall conduct a separate inquiry of the defendant on the record to determine whether the defendant understands and voluntarily accepts the terms of the plea agreement on which the guilty plea or plea of nolo contendere is based.

(3) Any local rule that is inconsistent with the provisions of this rule is prohibited, including any local rule mandating deadline dates for the acceptance of a plea entered pursuant to a plea agreement.

(C) MURDER CASES.

\* \* \* \* \*

Comment

\* \* \* \* \*

The 1995 amendment deleting former paragraph (B)(1) eliminates the absolute prohibition against any judicial involvement in plea discussions in order to align the rule with the realities of current practice. For example, the rule now permits a judge to inquire of defense counsel and the attorney for the Commonwealth whether there has been any discussion of a plea agreement, or to give counsel, when requested, a reasonable period of time to conduct such a discussion. Nothing in this rule, however, is intended to permit a judge to suggest to a defendant, defense counsel, or the attorney for the Commonwealth, that a plea agreement should be negotiated or accepted.

Paragraph (B)(1) was amended and paragraph (B)(3) was added in 2018 to clarify that the intent of this rule is that a plea made pursuant to an agreement may be entered any time prior to verdict. Any local rule that places a time limit for the entry of such pleas prior to verdict is in conflict with this rule and therefore invalid.

Under paragraph (B)(1), upon request and with the consent of the parties, a judge may, as permitted by law, order that the specific conditions of a plea agreement be placed on the record in camera and that portion of the record sealed. Such a procedure does not in any way eliminate the obligation of the attorney for the Commonwealth to comply in a timely manner with Rule 573 and the constitutional mandates of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny. Similarly, the attorney for the Commonwealth is responsible for notifying the cooperating defendant that the specific conditions to which the defendant agreed will be disclosed to third parties within a specified time period, and should afford the cooperating

defendant an opportunity to object to the unsealing of the record or to any other form of disclosure.

\* \* \* \* \*

Official Note: Rule 319(a) adopted June 30, 1964, effective January 1, 1965; amended November 18, 1968, effective February 3, 1969; paragraph (b) adopted and title of rule amended October 3, 1972, effective 30 days hence; specific areas of inquiry in Comment deleted in 1972 amendment, reinstated in revised form March 28, 1973, effective immediately; amended June 29, 1977 and November 22, 1977, effective as to cases in which the indictment or information is filed on or after January 1, 1978; paragraph (c) added and Comment revised May 22, 1978, effective July 1, 1978; Comment revised November 9, 1984, effective January 2, 1985; amended December 22, 1995, effective July 1, 1996; amended July 15, 1999, effective January 1, 2000; renumbered Rule 590 and Comment revised March 1, 2000, effective April 1, 2001; amended September 18, 2008, effective November 1, 2008; Comment revised March 9, 2016, effective July 1, 2016; amended January 18, 2018, effective April 1, 2018.

Committee Explanatory Reports:

\* \* \* \* \*

Final Report explaining the March 9, 2016 Comment revision concerning the Rule 705.1 restitution procedures published with the Court's Order at 46 Pa.B. 1540 (March 26, 2016).

Final Report explaining the January 18, 2018 amendments concerning plea agreement deadlines published with the Court's Order at 48 Pa.B. 730 (February 3, 2018).

FINAL REPORT<sup>1</sup>

Amendment of Pa.R.Crim.P. 590
Plea Agreement Deadlines

On January 18, 2018, effective April 1, 2018, upon the recommendation of the Criminal Procedural Rules Committee, the Court amended Rule 590 (Pleas and Plea Agreements) to clarify that any time limitation short of the time of verdict for the entry of a guilty plea pursuant to an agreement is contrary to the provisions of Rule 590(B).

The Committee had been presented with a proposed local criminal rule that contained a time limitation prior to trial after which a defendant would not be permitted to enter a plea pursuant to an agreement. If this date is missed, the defendant is then required to enter an open plea or take a trial. Upon further investigation, the Committee discovered that several counties had local rules that contain similar restrictions.<sup>2</sup>

The Committee concluded that these provisions are in conflict with statewide Rule 590(B) that provides the procedures for the entry of pleas made pursuant to a plea agreement. Rule 590(B) provides:

(1) When counsel for both sides have arrived at a plea agreement, they shall state on the record in open court, in the presence of the defendant, the terms of the agreement, unless the judge orders, for good cause shown and with the consent of the defendant, counsel for the defendant, and the attorney

<sup>1</sup> The Committee's Final Reports should not be confused with the official Committee Comments to the rules. Also, note that the Supreme Court does not adopt the Committee's Comments or the contents of the Committee's explanatory Final Reports.

<sup>2</sup> It appears that most of these rules were in place prior to 2009 when Committee approval was required prior to a local rule being adopted.

ney for the Commonwealth, that specific conditions in the agreement be placed on the record *in camera* and the record sealed.

(2) The judge shall conduct a separate inquiry of the defendant on the record to determine whether the defendant understands and voluntarily accepts the terms of the plea agreement on which the guilty plea or plea of *nolo contendere* is based.

Statewide Rule 590(B) does not contain a temporal limit for the entry of a negotiated plea. The Committee considered the argument that the statewide rule does not prohibit deadlines because it is silent on the matter. However, the interpretation should be just the opposite. Because the statewide rule does not contain a time limitation on the entry of a plea, it is intended to remain open. The Committee concluded that the creation of such a deadline in a local rule constitutes an additional local requirement not contemplated by the statewide rule and creates an inconsistency with practice elsewhere in the Unified Judicial System.

The Committee appreciates that the main rationale of these local deadlines is to administer more effectively a court's trial caseload. The Committee also understands that the proponents of plea agreement deadlines believe they provide incentive for early resolution of cases by "holding the parties' feet to the fire" and eliminate those cases where parties wait to last minute to resolve cases. However, the timing of the plea does not necessarily reflect the diligence of the parties in working to reach an agreement. There are circumstances in which a negotiated plea may be entered late in a case, even during trial. Often, the manner in which evidence is presented at trial will alter the parties' positions with regard to agreeing to a plea. In an adversarial system, the prosecution and defense are in the best position to judge whether the interests of the Commonwealth and the victim, on the one hand, and the defendant, on the other, are best served by a negotiated plea.

An absolute bar on the acceptance of post-deadline agreements is counter-productive. While some "downtime" may result when a scheduled trial is resolved by a plea, it seems far less inefficient than forcing the parties into a trial that they are willing to forego for a negotiated plea. The Committee believes that a trial judge should exercise individualized consideration on the merits of a negotiated plea in determining whether to accept or reject it rather than reliance on a set deadline. Therefore, the Committee concluded that the prerogative of the parties to freely enter into a negotiated disposition of a case should not be summarily refused solely because of the timing of the presentation of the agreement to the court.

The Committee recognizes that there is no right to a plea bargain and a trial judge has a great amount of discretion in whether to accept a plea bargain. In response to an argument that the prohibition of a deadline impinges on the judge's discretion to accept a plea, the Committee concluded that the clarification that general deadlines are improper does not limit the proper exercise of a judge's discretion to accept a plea. Instead, the Committee believes that the rule change makes clear the decision to accept or reject a plea should be based on the circumstances of the individual case and should not be based solely upon the failure to meet an arbitrary deadline.

Although the Committee believes that such locally mandated deadlines already are in conflict with statewide Rule 590, the Committee concluded that some clarifica-

tion of this point would be beneficial. Therefore, Rule 590(B)(1) has been amended by the addition of a prefatory statement that a plea pursuant to an agreement may be entered any time prior to the verdict. The prohibition against plea entry deadlines is further elaborated in the Comment.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-177. Filed for public inspection February 2, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]

## Title 249—PHILADELPHIA RULES

### PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

#### Philadelphia Water Liens Filed Pursuant to the Municipal Claim and Tax Liens Act; Administrative Order No. 02 of 2018

##### Order

*And Now*, this 22nd day of January, 2018, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* as follows:

(1) effective January 22, 2018 and thereafter, the City of Philadelphia may electronically file and the Office of Judicial Records (formerly the "Prothonotary") shall receive, City of Philadelphia Water Liens which shall be indexed and searchable through the dockets maintained by the Office of Judicial Records and the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania; and

(2) effective January 22, 2018 the Office of Judicial Records shall assess and collect the filing fee required by its fee bill, 42 Pa.C.S. § 1725, as itemized in the Fee Schedule of the Office of Judicial Records which is available on the website of the First Judicial District at [www.courts.phila.gov/pdf/prothyfees.pdf](http://www.courts.phila.gov/pdf/prothyfees.pdf) (see "Filing of a Lien as a First Filing"). Provided, however, that the filing fee may be added by the City of Philadelphia to the amount owed by the owner(s) of the real estate, shall be collected by the City of Philadelphia, and shall be paid to the Office of Judicial Records by the City of Philadelphia within ninety (90) days of the date the lien is marked satisfied.

It is further *Ordered and Decreed* that:

(a) the Office of Judicial Records shall migrate, as soon as practicable, all existing and unsatisfied Water Liens filed pursuant to the Municipal Claim and Tax Liens Act ("MCTLA"), 53 P.S. §§ 7101—7505, to the Banner case management system, and such liens shall be indexed and searchable through the dockets maintained by the Office of Judicial Records and the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania; and

(b) the Office of Judicial Records shall continue to maintain an in rem index, the form and location of which shall be within the discretion of the Office of Judicial Records.

This Order is issued in accordance with the Municipal Claim and Tax Liens Act ("MCTLA"), Act of May 16, 1923, P.L. 207, 53 P.S. §§ 7101—7505, Pa.R.C.P. No. 239 and the April 11, 1986 Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Eastern District, No. 55 Judicial Administration. This Order shall be filed with the Office of Judicial Records in a docket maintained for Orders issued by the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania and shall be published in *The Legal Intelligencer*, and will be posted on the First Judicial District's website at <http://www.courts.phila.gov>. One certified copy of this Order shall be

filed with the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts; two certified copies of this Order, and a copy on a computer diskette, shall be distributed to the Legislative Reference Bureau for publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*. Copies shall be submitted to American Lawyer Media, the Jenkins Memorial Law Library, and the Law Library for the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania.

*By the Court*

HONORABLE JACQUELINE F. ALLEN,  
*Administrative Judge, Trial Division*  
*Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County*  
*First Judicial District of Pennsylvania*

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-178. Filed for public inspection February 2, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]

---

## Title 249—PHILADELPHIA RULES

### PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

#### Rescission of Philadelphia Criminal Rule 576(f) and (h)(1)—(3); Administrative Doc. No. 01 of 2018

#### Order

*And Now*, this 5th day of January 2018, it is hereby *Ordered* and *Decreed* that effective on January 6, 2018, subsections (f) and (h)(1) through (3) of Philadelphia Criminal Rule 576 Pilot Program: Electronic Filing and Service of Motions and Other Legal Papers are rescinded. All other provisions of Philadelphia Criminal Rule 576 remain in full force and effect.

*By the Court*

HONORABLE JACQUELINE F. ALLEN,  
*Administrative Judge, Trial Division*  
*Court of Common Pleas*  
*Philadelphia County*

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 18-179. Filed for public inspection February 2, 2018, 9:00 a.m.]