

THE COURTS

Title 231—RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

PART I. GENERAL

[231 PA. CODE CH. 1300]

Order Amending Rule 1311.1 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure; No. 733 Civil Procedural Rules Docket

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 19th day of May, 2022, upon the recommendation of the Civil Procedural Rules Committee; the proposal having been published for public comment at 51 Pa.B. 4265 (August 7, 2021):

It is Ordered pursuant to Article V, Section 10 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania that Rule 1311.1 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure is amended in the attached form.

This Order shall be processed in accordance with Pa.R.J.A. 103(b), and shall be effective July 1, 2022.

Additions to the rule are shown in bold and are underlined.

Deletions from the rule are shown in bold and brackets.

Annex A

TITLE 231. RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

PART I. GENERAL

CHAPTER 1300. ARBITRATION

Subchapter A. COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Rule 1311.1. Procedure on Appeal. Admission of Documentary Evidence.

(a) **Election.** The plaintiff may elect **[a limit of \$25,000.00] an amount equal to the jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration of the judicial district in which the action was filed** as the maximum amount of damages recoverable upon the trial of an appeal from the award of arbitrators. The election shall be filed and served upon every other party at least **[thirty] 30** days from the date the appeal is first listed for trial. The election may be withdrawn at any time by agreement of the parties. If the parties cannot agree, upon plaintiff's motion to withdraw the election, the court may grant the withdrawal of the election upon good cause shown.

(b) **Offer of Documents at Trial.** If the plaintiff has filed and served an election as provided in subdivision (a), any party may offer at trial the documents set forth in Rule 1305(b)(1). The documents offered shall be admitted if the party offering them has provided written notice to every other party of the intention to offer the documents at trial at least **[twenty] 20** days from the date the appeal is first listed for trial. The written notice shall be accompanied by a copy of each document to be offered.

(*Editor's Note:* Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1 as printed in 231 Pa. Code reads "Official Note" rather than "Note.")

[Note: The deadline for providing notice of the intention to use the procedures of this subdivision

may be altered by the court upon cause shown, provided that no party is prejudiced.

The term "plaintiff" includes a defendant who is the plaintiff in a counterclaim.]

(c) **Permissible Use of Documents.** A document which is received into evidence under subdivision (b) may be used for only those purposes which would be permissible if the person whose testimony is waived by this rule were present and testifying at the hearing. The court shall disregard any portion of a document so received that would be inadmissible if the person whose testimony is waived by this rule were testifying in person.

(d) **Other Parties.** Any other party may subpoena the person whose testimony is waived by this rule to appear at or serve upon a party a notice to attend the trial and any adverse party may cross-examine the person as to the document as if the person were a witness for the party offering the document. The party issuing the subpoena shall pay the usual and customary fees and costs of the person subpoenaed to testify, including a usual and customary expert witness fee if applicable.

(1) If another party subpoenas or otherwise arranges for the attendance at trial of the person whose testimony is waived by this rule, the document may be presented to the judge or jury as direct examination as if the person has not been subpoenaed by another person, or the plaintiff may conduct a direct examination of the witness.

(2) Any party, or the person subpoenaed, may require that the testimony be given by deposition pursuant to **[Pa.R.C.P.] Rule 4020(a)(5)**. The party issuing the subpoena shall pay the witness's usual and customary fee for such testimony.

(e) **Election Form.** The election required by subdivision (a) shall be substantially in the following form:

(Caption)

Election to Limit Monetary Recovery
Pursuant to **[Rule] Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1**

To: _____
(Name of Party/Parties)

_____, plaintiff, elects **[\$ 25,000.00]** _____ as the maximum amount of damages recoverable upon the trial of the appeal from the award of arbitrators in the above captioned action.

(Name of Plaintiff)

(Attorney for Plaintiff)

Date

Note: The term "plaintiff" includes a defendant who is the plaintiff in a counterclaim.

A plaintiff may include in a single document the election and the notice of intent to offer documents.

(f) **Notice Form.** The notice required by subdivision (b) shall be substantially in the following form:

(Caption)

Notice of
Intent to Offer Documentary Evidence
Pursuant to [Rule] Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1

To: _____
(Name of Party/Parties)

_____, (Plaintiff, Defendant, Additional Defendant), intends to offer the documents attached hereto at the trial of the appeal from the award of arbitrators, in the manner provided by Rule [of Civil Procedure] 1311.1. The following documents are attached (list all documents to be offered):

1. _____ .
2. _____ .

(Name of Party)

(Attorney for Party)

Date

(Editor's Note: The following explanatory comments are not currently codified in the *Pennsylvania Code*.)

[EXPLANATORY COMMENT—2003

New Rule 1311.1 introduces a new practice with respect to the admission of documentary evidence at the trial of an appeal from the award of arbitrators in compulsory arbitration. The new rule incorporates the concept of Rule 1305 which permits specified documents to be admitted into evidence at the arbitration hearing upon notice by the party offering the documents to every other party accompanied by a copy of the documents.

The new procedure is limited to cases in which the "plaintiff stipulates to \$15,000.00 as the maximum amount of damages recoverable upon the trial of an appeal from the award of arbitrators." Subdivision (a) authorizes this stipulation and subdivision (f) provides a form of "Stipulation to Limitation of Monetary Recovery Pursuant to Rule 1311.1".

Once the plaintiff has filed and served the stipulation, subdivision (b) of the new rule provides that "any party may offer at trial the documents set forth in Rule 1305(b)(1)." In so providing, subdivision (b) is substantially similar to the introductory language of Rule 1305(b)(1). The admission of the documentary evidence is conditioned upon notice to every other party accompanied by a copy of each document to be offered. Subdivision (g) contains a form of "Notice of Intent to Offer Documentary Evidence Pursuant to Rule 1311.1".

Rule 1311.1 draws upon Rule 1305 in two other respects as well. First, subdivision (c) of the new rule tracks Rule 1305(b)(3) stating the purposes for which the documents admitted into evidence may be used and directing the court to disregard "any portion of a document so received that would be inadmissible if the person whose testimony is waived by this rule were testifying in person." Second, subdivision (d) is substantially similar to Rule 1305(b)(4) governing the right of any other party to subpoena the person whose testimony is waived by the rule. Both subdivisions (c) and (d)

vary from their counterparts in Rule 1305 only to accommodate the procedural posture of a trial rather than an arbitration hearing.

Rule 1311 governing the procedure on appeal from the award of arbitrators is amended to conform to the new rule by revising the title to read "Procedure on Appeal. Generally" and by adding to the note a cross-reference to the new rule.

EXPLANATORY COMMENT—2006

Rule 1311.1 governing the admission of documentary evidence upon the trial de novo of an appeal from the award of arbitrators in compulsory arbitration became effective September 1, 2003. The rule as originally promulgated applied to appeals in which the plaintiff stipulated to \$15,000.00 as the maximum amount of recoverable damages in the appeal. In light of the favorable reception to the rule, the maximum amount of recoverable damages has been increased to \$25,000.00.

EXPLANATORY COMMENT—2013

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has amended Rule 1311.1 governing the admission of documentary evidence upon the appeal of an award of arbitrators in compulsory arbitration in three respects. Currently, subdivision (a) of the rule provides for a party to stipulate to \$25,000 as the maximum amount recoverable. The rule is silent as to any procedure for withdrawing the stipulation. The amended rule will allow a plaintiff to elect, rather than stipulate, a limit of \$25,000. An election can subsequently be withdrawn upon agreement by the parties or pursuant to a court order upon good cause shown.

Subdivision (d) of the current rule provides that the expert witness be paid a reasonable fee for his or her testimony. The amendment changes the reasonable fee to a usual and customary fee.

The amendment to subdivision (d) also provides a new procedure when another party subpoenas the witness whose testimony is waived under this rule. The amendment would allow the plaintiff to present the document to the judge or jury as direct examination as if the person has not been subpoenaed by another person, or allow the plaintiff to conduct a direct examination of the witness.]

Comment:

Rule 1311.1 governs procedure with respect to the admission of documentary evidence at the trial of an appeal from the award of arbitrators in compulsory arbitration. It incorporates into the arbitration appeal before the court of common pleas the concept of Rule 1305, which permits specified documents to be admitted into evidence at the arbitration hearing upon notice by the party offering the documents to every other party, accompanied by a copy of the documents.

The maximum jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration is set forth in 42 Pa.C.S. § 7361. Each judicial district may, by local rule, set an arbitration amount up to its maximum jurisdictional limit. See generally Pa.R.Civ.P. 1301. Under Rule 1311.1, a plaintiff, which includes a defendant who is a

plaintiff in a counterclaim, may elect as the maximum amount of damages an amount equal to the compulsory arbitration limit set by the judicial district in which the action was filed. Rule 1311.1(a) also permits an election to be withdrawn either by agreement of the parties or court order for good cause shown.

In return for electing a maximum amount of damages, the party may offer at trial those documents set forth in Rule 1305(b)(1), which include, particularly, expert reports and descriptions of expert qualifications. However, the documents are not admissible for all purposes. See Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1(c).

The deadline for providing notice of the intention to use the procedures of subdivision (b) may be altered by the court upon cause shown, provided that no party is prejudiced.

CIVIL PROCEDURAL RULES COMMITTEE ADOPTION REPORT

Amendment of Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1

On May 19, 2022, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania adopted an amendment to Rule of Civil Procedure 1311.1. The Civil Procedural Rules Committee has prepared this Adoption Report describing the rulemaking process. An Adoption Report should not be confused with Comments to the rules. See Pa.R.J.A. 103, Comment. The statements contained herein are those of the Committee, not the Court.

Pursuant to a request, the Civil Procedural Rules Committee considered an amendment to Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1 governing the limit a party may elect as the maximum amount of damages recoverable upon the trial of an appeal from the award of arbitrators.

Section 7361 of the Judicial Code, 42 Pa.C.S. § 7361(b) sets the maximum jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration: “No matter shall be referred [to compulsory arbitration]. . . where the amount in controversy, exclusive of interests and costs, exceeds \$50,000.” *Id.* Pa.R.Civ.P. 1311.1 waives the necessity of testimony by a witness as a prerequisite to the admission of documentary evidence in an arbitration proceeding under Pa.R.Civ.P. 1305(b). Prior to the instant amendment, the rule applied to arbitration appeals in which the “plaintiff elects a limit of \$25,000.00 as the maximum amount of damages recoverable upon the trial of an appeal from the award of arbitrators.”

Most judicial districts have adopted a jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration between \$25,000 and \$50,000. For those judicial districts that have a jurisdictional limit that exceeds \$25,000, the prior rule created a disconnect between the jurisdictional limit for arbitration, e.g., \$50,000, and the maximum amount of damages available, \$25,000. This disconnect appeared to create an unfair advantage to a defendant who appeals an arbitration award to the trial court when the defendant knows that the award on appeal will be lower than the award of the arbitrators.

To resolve this issue, the Committee proposed amending subdivision (a) to replace the \$25,000 limit with “an amount equal to the jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration of the judicial district in which the action was filed. . . .” The proposed language was intended to eliminate the disconnect between the amount of damages that may be higher in an arbitration award than what can be

elected pursuant to Rule 1311.1. In addition, the language recognizes that each judicial district sets its jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration and that not all judicial districts choose to set it to the maximum amount permitted by Section 7361.

Cross references were also proposed to be added to Section 7361(b) of the Judicial Code providing for the maximum jurisdictional limit for compulsory arbitration and to Pa.R.Civ.P. 1301 to indicate that the limit for a judicial district is set by local rule. In addition, stylistic revisions were also made.

The Committee published the proposal for comment. See 51 Pa.B. 4265 (August 7, 2021). The Committee received no comments to the proposal. Accordingly, the Committee made no further revisions to the proposal.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-809. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

Title 234—RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

[234 PA. CODE CH. 5]

Proposed Adoption of Pa.R.Crim.P. 523.1

The Criminal Procedural Rules Committee is considering proposing to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania the adoption of Pa.R.Crim.P. 523.1 for the reasons set forth in the accompanying publication report. Pursuant to Pa.R.J.A. 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 report accompanying this proposal was prepared by the Committee to indicate the rationale for the proposed rulemaking. It will neither constitute a part of the rules nor be 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:

Joshua M. Yohe, Counsel
Criminal Procedural Rules Committee
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Judicial Center
PO Box 62635
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2635
FAX: (717) 231-9521
criminalrules@pacourts.us

All communications in reference to the proposal should be received by July 5, 2022. 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 Criminal Procedural
Rules Committee*

AARON J. MARCUS,
Chair

Annex A

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

PART C(1). Release Procedures

The following text is entirely new.

(*Editor's Note:* The following rule is proposed to be added and is printed in regular type to enhance readability.)

Rule 523.1. Pretrial Detention of Minor Defendant.

(a) *Definitions.* For purposes of this rule, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) "*Adult inmate.*" An individual who has reached the age of 18 and has been arrested and is in custody for or awaiting trial on a criminal charge or is convicted of a criminal offense.

(2) "*Jail or lockup for adults.*" A secure facility that is used by the Commonwealth, unit of local government, or law enforcement authority to detain or confine adult inmates.

(3) "*Minor defendant.*" A defendant who is less than 18 years old.

(4) "*Sight or sound contact.*" Any physical, clear visual, or verbal contact that is not brief and inadvertent.

(b) *General Rule.* A minor defendant shall not be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates unless a court or issuing authority finds, after a hearing and in writing, that such detention is in the interest of justice.

(c) *Interest of Justice Exception.* To determine if it is in the interest of justice to permit a minor defendant to be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates, a court or issuing authority shall consider:

- (1) the minor defendant's age;
- (2) the minor defendant's physical and mental maturity;
- (3) the minor defendant's present mental state, including whether the minor defendant presents an imminent risk of harm to the minor defendant;
- (4) the nature and circumstances of the alleged offense;
- (5) the minor defendant's history of prior delinquent acts;
- (6) the relative ability of the available adult and juvenile detention facilities to not only meet the specific needs of the minor defendant but also to protect the safety of the public as well as other detained youth; and
- (7) any other relevant factor.

(d) *Issuing Authority.*

(1) If a minor defendant is to be detained after a bail determination and a party requests the minor defendant be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates, an issuing authority shall order the minor defendant to be so detained or have such sight or sound contact if, after considering the factors set forth in subdivision (c), the issuing authority finds permitting such detention or sight or sound contact is in the interest of justice.

(2) If, pursuant to subdivision (d)(1), a minor defendant is detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates, a court of common pleas shall hold a hearing to review the issuing authority's finding within 5 days. The court's review shall be *de novo*.

(e) *Motion.*

(1) A party may file a motion in a court of common pleas at any time requesting that a detained minor defendant be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates.

(2) When a motion is filed pursuant to subdivision (e)(1), an interest of justice hearing shall be held within 72 hours of the filing of the motion.

(3) In determining if it is in the interest of justice for the minor defendant to be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates, the court shall consider each factor enumerated in subdivision (c).

(f) *Order.*

(1) At the conclusion of either a *de novo* hearing pursuant to subdivision (d)(2) or an interest of justice hearing pursuant to subdivision (e)(2), the court shall enter an order containing the following:

(i) the court's determination whether it is in the interest of justice to detain the minor defendant in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates; and

(ii) the court's findings with respect to each factor enumerated in subdivision (c).

(2) If the court determines that it is in the interest of justice for the minor defendant to be detained in an adult facility, the order shall state that the Prison Rape Elimination Act standards for youthful inmates still apply.

(g) *Review and Limitations.* If a court determines that it is in the interest of justice to permit a minor defendant to be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates:

(1) the court shall hold a hearing not less frequently than once every 30 days to review whether it is still in the interest of justice to permit the minor defendant to be so detained or have such sight or sound contact; and

(2) the minor defendant shall not be detained in any jail or lockup for adults, or permitted to have sight or sound contact with adult inmates, for more than 180 days, unless the court, in writing, determines there is good cause for an extension or the minor defendant expressly waives this limitation.

Comment:

This rule codifies the requirements of 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(i)—(iii). See 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(13) for other exceptions to the prohibition on holding a minor defendant in a jail or lockup for adults.

An individual who is under the age of 18 years is treated as an adult for purposes of prosecution either as a result of charges being directly filed in criminal court, *see* 42 Pa.C.S. § 6302 (Definitions) (excluding certain offenses from the definition of "delinquent act"), or as a result of charges being transferred to criminal court pursuant to 42 Pa.C.S. § 6355 (Transfer to criminal proceedings).

Subdivision (e) provides for the review of an issuing authority's interest of justice determination by a court of

common pleas. An issuing authority is required to make an interest of justice determination prior to a minor defendant being detained in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates or detained in a jail or lockup for adults. Such determination would be required, for example, if an issuing authority denied a minor defendant bail at a preliminary arraignment and a party requested that the minor defendant be held in a jail for adults rather than in a secure detention facility, *see* 55 Pa. Code § 3800.5 (Definitions); and Pa.R.Crim.P. 598, Comment.

Regarding subdivision (e)(2), *see* 28 C.F.R. § 115.14 (relating to youthful inmates) and the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, 34 U.S.C. § 30301 *et seq.*

If an issuing authority or court of common pleas determines that it is not in the interest of justice for a minor defendant to be detained in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates or detained in a jail or lockup for adults, detention of the minor defendant, if any, would continue to be governed by 42 Pa.C.S. § 6327 (Place of detention).

Regarding appellate review of an interest of justice determination, *see* Pa.R.A.P. 1610 (Review of Bail Orders).

**SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
CRIMINAL PROCEDURAL RULES COMMITTEE
PUBLICATION REPORT**

Proposed Adoption of Pa.R.Crim.P. 523.1

The Criminal Procedural Rules Committee is considering proposing to the Supreme Court the adoption of Pa.R.Crim.P. 523.1. Rule 523.1 would implement the requirements of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act (“JJRA”) codified at 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B). The rule would also include a subdivision containing relevant definitions from the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (“JJDPA”), *see* 34 U.S.C. § 11103, as well as subdivisions governing procedures before an issuing authority and a court of common pleas.

The JJRA was signed into law in December of 2018. The JJRA reauthorized and substantially amended the JJDPA of 1974. Of particular interest is the JJRA’s requirement that any child under the age of 18 who is being processed through criminal proceedings must be separated by sight and sound¹ from adult inmates and may not, except under limited circumstances, be held pretrial in a jail or lockup for adults². This requirement became effective on December 21, 2021.

Pursuant to the Juvenile Act, 42 Pa.C.S. §§ 6301—6375, a child can become subject to criminal proceedings when charges are directly filed in criminal court³ or when charges are transferred to criminal court after a petition alleging delinquency has been filed⁴. In either case, if the child is not released on bail, he or she may be held in a secure detention facility⁵ but, pursuant to the amended JJDPA, not in an adult jail or within sight or sound contact of adult inmates. Section 11133(a)(11)(B)(i) of Title 34 of the United States Code codifies this prohibition.

¹ “[T]he term ‘sight or sound contact’ means any physical, clear visual, or verbal contact that is not brief and inadvertent.” 34 U.S.C. § 11103(25).

² “[T]he term ‘jail or lockup for adults’ means a secure facility that is used by a State, unit of local government, or law enforcement authority to detain or confine adult inmates.” 34 U.S.C. § 11103(22). An “adult inmate” is an individual who “has reached the age of full criminal responsibility under applicable State law; and has been arrested and is in custody for or awaiting trial on a criminal charge, or is convicted of a criminal offense[.]” 34 U.S.C. § 11103(26)(A).

³ *See* 42 Pa.C.S. § 6302 (Definitions) for offenses excluded from the definition of “delinquent act” and thus not subject to the Juvenile Act per 42 Pa.C.S. § 6303(a)(1).

⁴ *See* 42 Pa.C.S. § 6355 (Transfer to criminal proceedings).

⁵ *See* 42 Pa.C.S. § 6327(d); 55 Pa. Code § 3800.5; and Pa.R.Crim.P. 598, Comment.

Section 11133(a)(11)(B)(ii) provides an exception if a court finds that it is in the interest of justice to permit a child to be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or to have sight or sound contact with adult inmates. In determining whether such detention or sight or sound contact is in the interest of justice, a court must consider:

- (1) the age of the juvenile;
- (2) the physical and mental maturity of the juvenile;
- (3) the present mental state of the juvenile, including whether the juvenile presents an imminent risk of harm to the juvenile;
- (4) the nature and circumstances of the alleged offense;
- (5) the juvenile’s history of prior delinquent acts;
- (6) the relative ability of the available adult and juvenile detention facilities to not only meet the specific needs of the juvenile but also to protect the safety of the public as well as other detained youth; and
- (7) any other relevant factor.

34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(ii). If a court determines that it is in the interest of justice to permit a child to be held in a jail or lockup for adults or to have sight or sound contact with adult inmates, the court shall hold a hearing at least every 30 days to review that determination. 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(iii)(I). The JJRA enlarges the time to hold such hearings to 45 days in rural jurisdictions. A child may not be held in a jail or lockup for adults or have sight or sound contact with adult inmates for more than 180 days unless the court determines that there is good cause for an extension or the child waives the limitation. 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(iii)(II).

Proposed Rule 523.1 has been adapted from 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B) to implement the requirements of the JJRA. Subdivision (a) of Rule 523.1 would include definitions for “adult inmate,” “jail or lockup for adults,” “minor defendant,” and “sight or sound contact.” A minor defendant, per the proposed rule, would be defined as a defendant who is less than 18 years old. Use of the term “defendant” indicates that the minor is subject to criminal proceedings. Subdivision (b) would provide the general rule, “A minor defendant shall not be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates unless a court or issuing authority finds, after a hearing and in writing, that such detention is in the interest of justice.” To determine if such detention would be in the interest of justice, an issuing authority or common pleas judge would be required to consider the factors set forth in subdivision (c) as mandated by 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(ii), *supra*.

Subdivision (d)(1) of Rule 523.1 would require an issuing authority to make an interest of justice determination if a minor defendant is to be detained after a bail determination and a party requests the minor defendant be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates. The Comment would provide additional guidance on the circumstances necessitating an interest of justice determination by an issuing authority. If the issuing authority were to find that such detention was in the interest of justice and ordered the minor defendant so detained, a court of common pleas, pursuant to subdivision (d)(2), would be required to hold a hearing within 5 days to review the issuing authority’s finding. The court of common pleas’ review would be *de novo*.

Subdivision (e) of the rule would provide for the filing of a motion in a court of common pleas requesting “that a detained minor defendant be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates.” Proposed Rule 523.1(e)(1). Per subdivision (e)(2), when such a motion is filed, the court is required to have a hearing within 72 hours. At that hearing, the court would have to determine if it is in the interest of justice for the minor defendant to be detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates. The court would be required to consider each factor listed in subdivision (c). Proposed Rule 523.1(e)(3).

At the conclusion of either a *de novo* hearing or an interest of justice hearing, a court would be required to enter an order with the court’s determination and the court’s findings regarding each factor enumerated in subdivision (c). Proposed Rule 523.1(f)(1). Subdivision (f)(2) would require an order entered pursuant to subdivision (f) to state that “the Prison Rape Elimination Act standards for youthful inmates still apply” if the minor defendant is detained in an adult facility.

If a minor defendant is detained in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates after an interest of justice hearing, subdivision (g)(1) would require the court to review its determination once every 30 days. Subdivision (g)(2) would limit the detention of a minor defendant in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates to 180 days, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(iii)(II), “unless the court, in writing, determines there is good cause for an extension or the minor defendant expressly waives this limitation.” Proposed Rule 523.1(g)(2).

The Comment to the rule would include citations to 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11)(B)(i)—(iii), the relevant federal statute, as well as to 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(13), which provides additional exceptions to the prohibition on detaining a minor defendant in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates. The Comment would also provide citations to 42 Pa.C.S. § 6302 (Definitions) (excluding certain offenses from the definition of “delinquent act”) and 42 Pa.C.S. § 6355 (Transfer to criminal proceedings) to inform the reader of when a minor may be prosecuted as an adult in criminal court. And as subdivision (e)(2) references the Prison Rape Elimination Act, the Comment would cite 28 C.F.R. § 115.14 (relating to youthful inmates) and the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, 34 U.S.C. § 30301 *et seq.* for those unfamiliar with the requirements of the Act and how those requirements apply to youthful inmates.

The final two citations provided in the Comment are to 42 Pa.C.S. § 6327 (Place of detention), for when a minor defendant is to be detained but not in a jail or lockup for adults or in a secure facility with sight or sound contact with adult inmates, and to Pa.R.A.P. 1610 (Review of Bail Orders), for procedures when a minor defendant wishes to appeal an interest of justice determination.

The Committee invites all comments, concerns, and suggestions.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-810. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

Title 255—LOCAL COURT RULES

LUZERNE COUNTY

Order Adopting Local Rule of Civil Procedure 205.3.1 and Amending Local Rules of Civil Procedure 1144 and 1144.1; No. 00003 of 2022

Order

And Now, this 20th day of May, 2022, it is hereby Ordered and Decreed as follows:

1. The Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas of the 11th Judicial District of Pennsylvania, hereby amends, rescinds or adopts the following Luzerne County Rules of Civil Procedure, a true and correct copy of which follows, to be effective thirty (30) days after publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*:

a. Luzerne County Rule of Civil Procedure 205.3.1 is adopted; and

b. Luzerne County Rules of Civil Procedure 1144 and 1144.1 are amended and shall now read as follows;

2. Pursuant to Pa.R.J.A. 103(d) and Pa.R.C.P. 239(c), the following Luzerne County Rules of Civil Procedure shall be disseminated and published in the following matter:

a. One (1) certified copy via email to the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts;

b. Two (2) certified paper copies and one (1) electronic copy in Microsoft Word format only to bulletin@palrb.us with the Legislative Reference Bureau for publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*;

c. One (1) copy for publication on the Courts Page of the Luzerne County website, located at www.luzernecounty.org;

d. One (1) certified copy each to the Luzerne County Office of Court Administration and the Luzerne County Clerk of Judicial Records for public inspection and copying; and

e. One (1) electronic copy to the Luzerne County Law Library for publication in the *Luzerne Legal Register*.

By the Court

MICHAEL T. VOUGH,
President Judge

Rule 205.3.1. Use of Electronic Mail (Email) Addresses in Filings and Correspondence.

(a) Electronic mail addresses (email) shall be included on all filings and correspondence to the Office of Judicial Services & Records (Prothonotary), Court Administration, and the Court.

(b) Responses from Court Administration and the Court may be by email at the Court’s (and Court Administration’s) discretion, which shall be deemed the same as if the responses were sent by regular U.S. mail.

(c) In the event of an email address change, the sender or filer shall provide an updated email address to the Clerk of Judicial Records, Court Administration and, if the case is individually assigned, to the Judge to whom the matter is individually assigned, within one (1) business day.

(d) In the event a self-represented individual does not have an email address, correspondence shall be by regular mail. If the individual should get an email address, all filings and correspondence shall be updated accordingly.

CONSUMER DEBT ACTIONS**Rule 1144.1. Commencement of Consumer Debt Actions.**

(a) *Caption.* In all consumer debt actions, the caption of the complaint shall include the words "Consumer Debt Action."

(b) *Eligibility.* To be eligible to participate in the Consumer Debt Action Diversionary Program, the total debt or damages as set forth in the complaint shall not exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000.00), not inclusive of costs and interests, unless otherwise agreed to by the parties and the court. If a dispute concerning a case's eligibility for the Program occurs, then, upon Motion, the Judge in charge of the Program shall make a final determination as to eligibility for the Program on an individual basis. If a case is ineligible, it shall proceed under the normal rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules.

(c) *Filing.* In eligible consumer debt actions, plaintiff shall, simultaneously with the filing of the complaint (whether filing was completed in person to the Clerk of Judicial Records, or electronically in accordance with Luz.Co.R.C.P. No. 205.4.), email a copy of the filed complaint to the court at consumerdebtactions@luzernecounty.org.

(d) *Service.* In eligible consumer debt actions, if at least one attempt at service of the complaint is made, and service is not perfected, the plaintiff shall petition the court for alternative service within thirty (30) days after the first failed attempt at service, or the action shall be dismissed. This rule shall not apply where the plaintiff is able to perfect service within fifteen days after the first failed attempt at service. Upon completion of service, plaintiff shall, simultaneously with the filing of the certificate of service (whether filing was completed in person to the Clerk of Judicial Records, or electronically in accordance with Luz.Co.R.C.P. No. 205.4), email a copy of the filed certificate of service to the court at consumerdebtactions@luzernecounty.org.

(e) In eligible consumer debt actions, following the filing and service of the complaint, the court shall issue a practice order in substantially the format set forth in Form 12 of the Appendix to these Rules, scheduling the matter for the next available conciliation conference list and staying any pleading deadlines in the matter pending the outcome of the conciliation conference.

Rule 1144.2. Conciliation Conference in Consumer Debt Actions.

(a) The practice order shall specify the date and place of the conciliation conference and shall be forwarded by the program administrator and/or the Judge assigned to the consumer debt actions via ordinary mail to the parties.

(b) The schedule for the year shall be set by the program administrator and/or the Judge assigned to the consumer debt actions no later than September of the year prior and will be published in the Luzerne Legal Register and on the Luzerne County Court website at www.luzernecounty.org.

(c) Conciliation conferences will be conducted by the program administrator and/or Judge assigned to the consumer debt actions. Counsel for the plaintiff and the defendant, including private counsel, if any, must attend the conciliation conference in person and an authorized representative of the plaintiff must be available by phone at the conciliation conference. The representative of the

plaintiff who participates in the conciliation conference must possess the actual authority to reach a mutually acceptable resolution, and counsel for the plaintiff must discuss resolution proposals with that authorized representative in advance of the conciliation conference. Counsel for the plaintiff shall bring to the conciliation conference the contract, proof of damages, the last billing statement sent to the defendant, and written proof of any assignments of the contract.

(d) If the defendant has been served and does not appear at the conciliation conference, absent good cause shown, judgment shall be entered in favor of the plaintiff. If the plaintiff fails to appear and/or have an authorized representative available with the required documentation at the conciliation conference, absent good cause shown, the court shall dismiss the case with prejudice. Any request for continuance on the day of the conciliation conference by either party is strongly discouraged.

(e) At the conciliation conference, the parties shall be prepared to discuss and explore all available resolution options, including, but not limited to, a mutually agreed upon payment plan. In the event that the parties reach an agreement, the court will issue a consent judgment/order substantially in the format set forth in Form 13 of the Appendix to these Rules, setting forth the agreement.

(f) If an agreement is not reached by the parties at the conciliation conference, the stay of pleading deadlines will be immediately lifted and the court shall issue a scheduling order substantially in the format set forth in Form 14 of the Appendix to these Rules.

FORM 12**PRACTICE ORDER**

AND NOW this _____ day of _____, 20____, a Consumer Debt Action having been filed and served in this matter, it is hereby ORDERED, DIRECTED, and DECREED as follows:

1. A conciliation conference is set for the _____ day of _____, 20____ at _____ .m. on the third floor of the Luzerne County Courthouse, 200 North River Street, Wilkes-Barre.

2. Effective immediately, pleading deadlines are stayed pending the outcome of the conciliation conference.

3. Defendant(s) shall call Advantage Credit Counseling Service (ACCS) (888) 511-2227. ACCS will, at no charge, prepare a written budget and action plan regarding the debt involved in the above-captioned matter.

4. Plaintiff's counsel shall attend the conciliation conference in person and an authorized representative of Plaintiff must be available by phone at the conciliation conference. Counsel for Plaintiff shall bring to the conciliation conference the contract, proof of damages, the last billing statement sent to Defendant, and written proof of any assignments of the contract.

5. If DEFENDANT FAILS TO APPEAR at the conciliation conference, absent good cause shown, Plaintiff will be granted judgment in its favor.

6. If PLAINTIFF FAILS TO APPEAR and/or have an authorized representative and/or counsel available with the required documentation at the conciliation conference, absent good cause shown, the case will be dismissed with prejudice.

7. If the parties reach an agreement at the conciliation conference, the court will issue a Consent Judgment/Order setting forth the agreement. Plaintiff shall be responsible for filing the consent judgment/order with the Clerk of Judicial Records (Prothonotary). The filing fee for a consent judgment/order is set forth in the current Clerk of Judicial Records Fee Schedule.

8. If an agreement is not reached at the conciliation conference, the court shall enter a scheduling order setting forth deadlines for the timely disposition of the case.

9. Defendant may contact North Penn Legal Services for possible representation at the conciliation conference by calling 877-953-4250 to determine eligibility. If interested, Defendant is encouraged to do so as soon as possible.

10. Any failure to comply with this Order may result in a finding of contempt.

11. The Luzerne County Clerk of Judicial Services and Records (Prothonotary) is directed to serve notice of the entry hereof upon all counsel of record and/or any unrepresented party, pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 236.

BY THE COURT:
_____ J.

FORM 14

**SCHEDULING ORDER FOR CONSUMER DEBT
CASES**

AND NOW, this _____ day of _____, 20____, following the parties' participation in a conciliation conference, it is hereby ORDERED, DIRECTED, and DECREED:

1. This case is no longer in conciliation and the stay for pleading deadlines is lifted.

2. Defendant shall file a responsive pleading to the complaint within twenty (20) days of the date of this Order.

3. Any and all discovery shall be completed within sixty (60) days of the date of this Order.

4. Any dispositive motions shall be filed within ninety (90) days of the date of this Order.

5. Responses to dispositive motions are due within thirty (30) days of the filing of the dispositive motion.

6. A copy of any preliminary objections, motions, and/or responses shall be served on the undersigned simultaneously with filing.

7. If no dispositive motions are filed, Plaintiff shall file a praecipe for arbitration within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the date of this Order.

8. If dispositive motions are denied, Plaintiff shall file a praecipe for arbitration within thirty (30) days of the order/s denying the dispositive motion/s.

9. Failure by Plaintiff to praecipe for arbitration within the time set forth above shall result in dismissal of this action with prejudice, upon motion by either party and determination of the Court.

10. The Luzerne County Clerk of Judicial Services and Records (Prothonotary) is directed to serve notice of the entry hereof upon all counsel of record and/or any unrepresented party, pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 236.

BY THE COURT:
_____ J.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-811. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

Title 255—LOCAL COURT RULES

MONROE COUNTY

**Local Rule of Civil Procedure 3252.b Amended;
110 AD 2022; 5 CV 2022**

Amended Order

And Now, this 18th day of May, 2022, it is *Ordered* that Monroe County Rules of Civil Procedure (Monroe Co.R.Crim.P. 3252.b) is amended, effective thirty (30) days after publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

It Is Further Ordered that the District Court Administrator shall:

1. File one (1) electronic copy of this Rule with the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts via email to adminrules@pacourts.us.

2. File two (2) paper copies of this Order and Rule with the Legislative Reference Bureau and one (1) electronic copy in Microsoft Word format only via email to bulletin@palrb.us for publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

3. Arrange to have this Rule published on the Monroe County Bar Association website at www.monroebar.org.

4. Arrange to have this Rule, as well as all local rules, published on the 43rd Judicial District website at www.monroepacourts.us.

5. Keep this Rule, as well as all local rules of this Court, continuously available for public inspection and copying in the respective Monroe County filing office.

a. Upon request and payment of reasonable cost of reproduction and mailing, the respective filing office shall furnish to any person a copy of any local rule.

By the Court

MARGHERITA PATTI-WORTHINGTON,
President Judge

Rule 3252.b. Organization Named in Notice of Writ of Execution.

The name, address and telephone number of the organization to be set forth in the notice attached to a writ of execution shall be:

MONROE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION
FIND A LAWYER PROGRAM
913 MAIN STREET
STROUDSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 18360
Telephone (570) 424-1340
Fax (570) 424-8234

Note: This Rule was amended May 18, 2022, to reflect a new telephone number for the Monroe County Bar Association’s Find a Lawyer Program.

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-812. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

SUPREME COURT

Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 23rd Judicial District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; No. 481 Magisterial Rules Docket

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 24th day of May, 2022, upon consideration of the Petition to Reestablish the Magisterial Districts of the 23rd Judicial District (Berks County) of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* that the Petition, which provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial Districts 23-1-01, 23-1-02, 23-1-03, 23-1-05, 23-1-06, 23-2-01, 23-2-02, 23-2-03, 23-2-04, 23-3-01, 23-3-02, 23-3-03, 23-3-04, 23-3-05, 23-3-06, 23-3-07, and 23-3-09, within Berks County, to be effective immediately, is granted.

Said Magisterial Districts shall be as follows:

| | |
|--|--|
| Magisterial District 23-1-01 Magisterial District Judge Ann L. Young | Adamstown Borough Robesonia Borough Sinking Spring Borough Wernersville Borough Heidelberg Township Lower Heidelberg Township South Heidelberg Township Spring Township |
| Magisterial District 23-1-02 Magisterial District Judge Carissa L. Johnson | City of Reading, Wards 2, 3, 10, 16 |
| Magisterial District 23-1-03 Magisterial District Judge Kyle L. Scott | City of Reading, Wards 8, 9, 11, 12 |
| Magisterial District 23-1-05 Magisterial District Judge Alvin B. Robinson | City of Reading, Wards 6, 7, 15, 19 |
| Magisterial District 23-1-06 Magisterial District Judge Dean R. Patton | Laureldale Borough Muhlenberg Township |
| Magisterial District 23-2-01 Magisterial District Judge Priscilla Campos | City of Reading, Wards 1, 4, 5, 18 |
| Magisterial District 23-2-02 Magisterial District Judge Eric J. Taylor | West Reading Borough Wyomissing Borough |
| Magisterial District 23-2-03 Magisterial District Judge Sandra L. Fegley | Mount Penn Borough Saint Lawrence Borough Exeter Township Lower Alsace Township |

| | |
|---|--|
| Magisterial District 23-2-04 Magisterial District Judge David L. Yoch | Kenhorst Borough Mohnton Borough Shillington Borough Cumru Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-01 Magisterial District Judge David E. Glass | Birdsboro Borough New Morgan Borough Brecknock Township Caernarvon Township Robeson Township Union Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-02 Vacant | Bally Borough Bechtelsville Borough Boyertown Borough Colebrookdale Township Douglass Township Earl Township Hereford Township Washington Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-03 Magisterial District Judge Steven M. Chieffo | Topton Borough Alsace Township Amity Township District Township Longswamp Township Oley Township Pike Township Rockland Township Ruscombmanor Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-04 Magisterial District Judge Gail M. Greth | Fleetwood Borough Kutztown Borough Lyons Borough Maxatawny Township Richmond Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-05 Magisterial District Judge Brian K. Strand | Centerport Borough Leesport Borough Bern Township Centre Township Maidencreek Township Ontelaunee Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-06 Magisterial District Judge Kim L. Bagenstose | Hamburg Borough Lenhartsville Borough Shoemakersville Borough Albany Township Greenwich Township Perry Township Tilden Township Windsor Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-07 Magisterial District Judge Andrea J. Book | Bernville Borough Womelsdorf Borough Bethel Township Jefferson Township Marion Township North Heidelberg Township Penn Township Tulpehocken Township Upper Bern Township Upper Tulpehocken Township |
| Magisterial District 23-3-09 Magisterial District Judge Tonya A. Butler | City of Reading, Wards 13, 14, 17 |

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-813. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

SUPREME COURT

Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 26th Judicial District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; No. 483 Magisterial Rules Docket

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 24th day of May 2022, upon consideration of the Petition to Reestablish the Magisterial Districts of the 26th Judicial District (Columbia and Montour Counties) of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* that the Petition, which provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial Districts 26-3-02 and 26-3-03, within Columbia County, to be effective immediately, is granted; that the Petition, which provides for the realignment of Magisterial Districts 26-2-01 and 26-3-01, within Columbia County, to be effective October 4, 2022, is granted; and that the Petition, which provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial District 26-3-04, within Montour County, to be effective immediately, is granted.

Said Magisterial Districts shall be as follows:

| | |
|---|--|
| Magisterial District 26-2-01 Magisterial District Judge Russell L. Lawton | Town of Bloomsburg Scott Township |
| Magisterial District 26-3-01 Magisterial District Judge Doug D. Brewer | Benton Borough Millville Borough Orangeville Borough Stillwater Borough Benton Township Fishing Creek Township Greenwood Township Hemlock Township Jackson Township Madison Township Montour Township Mount Pleasant Township Orange Township Pine Township Sugarloaf Township |
| Magisterial District 26-3-02 Magisterial District Judge Richard W. Knecht | Berwick Borough Briar Creek Borough Briar Creek Township North Centre Township South Centre Township |
| Magisterial District 26-3-03 Magisterial District Judge Craig W. Long | Catawissa Borough Centralia Borough Beaver Township Catawissa Township Cleveland Township |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Conyngham Township Franklin Township Locust Township Main Township Mifflin Township Roaring Creek Township |
| Magisterial District 26-3-04 Magisterial District Judge Marvin K. Shrawder | Danville Borough Washingtonville Borough Anthony Township Cooper Township Derry Township Liberty Township Limestone Township Mahoning Township Mayberry Township Valley Township West Hemlock Township |

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-814. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

SUPREME COURT

Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 50th Judicial District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; No. 482 Magisterial Rules Docket

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 24th day of May 2022, upon consideration of the Petition to Reestablish the Magisterial Districts of the 50th Judicial District (Butler County) of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* that the Petition, which provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial Districts 50-1-01, 50-3-01, 50-3-02, 50-3-03, 50-3-04, 50-3-05, and 50-3-06, within Butler County, as they currently exist, to be effective immediately, is granted.

Said Magisterial Districts shall be as follows:

| | |
|--|--|
| Magisterial District 50-1-01 Magisterial District Judge Kevin P. O'Donnell | Butler Township |
| Magisterial District 50-3-01 Magisterial District Judge Joseph J. Nash | Harrisville Borough Portersville Borough Prospect Borough Slippery Rock Borough West Liberty Borough Brady Township Franklin Township Mercer Township Muddy Creek Township Slippery Rock Township Worth Township |

| | |
|--|--|
| Magisterial District 50-3-02 Magisterial District Judge Lewis E. Stoughton | Bruin Borough Cherry Valley Borough Chicora Borough East Butler Borough Eau Claire Borough Fairview Borough Karns City Borough Petroia Borough West Sunbury Borough Allegheny Township Center Township Cherry Township Clay Township Clearfield Township Concord Township Marion Township Donegal Township Fairview Township Oakland Township Parker Township Summit Township Venango Township Washington Township |
| Magisterial District 50-3-03 Magisterial District Judge Sue Haggerty | Saxonburg Borough Buffalo Township Clinton Township Jefferson Township Middlesex Township Penn Township Winfield Township |
| Magisterial District 50-3-04 Magisterial District Judge Kevin J. Flaherty | Seven Fields Borough Cranberry Township |
| Magisterial District 50-3-05 Magisterial District Judge William T. Fullerton | Butler City |
| Magisterial District 50-3-06 Magisterial District Judge Amy M. Marcinkiewicz | Callery Borough Connoquenessing Borough Evans City Borough Mars Borough Valencia Borough Zelienople Borough Adams Township Connoquenessing Township Forward Township Harmony Borough Jackson Township Lancaster Township |

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-815. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]

SUPREME COURT

Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 51st Judicial District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; No. 480 Magisterial Rules Docket

Order

Per Curiam

And Now, this 24th day of May 2022, upon consideration of the Petition to Reestablish the Magisterial Districts of the 51st Judicial District (Adams County) of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is hereby *Ordered and Decreed* that the Petition, which provides for the reestablishment of Magisterial Districts 51-3-01, 51-3-02, 51-3-03 and 51-3-04, within Adams County, to be effective immediately, is granted.

Said Magisterial Districts shall be as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Magisterial District 51-3-01 Magisterial District Judge Matthew R. Harvey | Gettysburg Borough Straban Township |
| Magisterial District 51-3-02 Magisterial District Judge Christopher A. Snyder | Bonneauville Borough Littlestown Borough McSherrystown Borough Conewago Township Germany Township Mount Joy Township Mount Pleasant Township Union Township |
| Magisterial District 51-3-03 Magisterial District Judge Tony J. Little | Abbottstown Borough East Berlin Borough New Oxford Borough York Springs Borough Berwick Township Hamilton Township Huntington Township Latimore Township Oxford Township Reading Township Tyrone Township |
| Magisterial District 51-3-04 Magisterial District Judge Mark D. Beauchat | Arendtsville Borough Bendersville Borough Biglerville Borough Carroll Valley Borough Fairfield Borough Butler Township Cumberland Township Franklin Township Freedom Township Hamiltonban Township Highland Township Liberty Township Menallen Township |

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 22-816. Filed for public inspection June 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m.]