

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

MARIA AND ROBERT BRADY, JR.,	:	No. 1019 MAL 2013
	:	
Respondents	:	
	:	Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Order of
v.	:	the Superior Court
	:	
	:	
	:	
WILLIAM M. URBAS, D.P.M.,	:	
	:	
Petitioner	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 16TH day of July, 2014, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is **GRANTED, LIMITED TO** the issue set forth below. The issue, as stated by Petitioner, is:

Did the Superior Court of Pennsylvania err in adopting a blanket prohibition on evidence of a surgeon’s communication to the plaintiff of potential risks and complications of planned surgery in a medical malpractice case, not involving a separate battery claim for lack of informed consent, and in failing to afford sufficient deference to the trial judge’s determination of relevance and denial of a new trial, when the trial judge presented a reasonable explanation for his decision?