IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA MIDDLE DISTRICT

RALPH GILBERT, GLORIA GILBERT, MICHELLE TORGERSON, EDWIN TORGERSON, MELDA BITTORF, BEVERLY COX, WILLIAM COX, KIMBERLY MILES, CLEA FOCKLER,

JOHN FOCKLER, LINDA ECKERT, SCOTT ECKERT, WILLIAM STRINE, KENNY JASINSKI, DENNIS JASINSKI, KATHRYN JASINSKI, JOSEPH

JASINSKI, PATRICIA UNVERZAGT, MEGAN JACOBS, BARBARA UNVERZAGT, DONNA PARR, JEFF FODEL, WENDY FODEL, JENNIFER

JASINSKI, JOHN JASINSKI, JUDY

QUEITZSCH, JEAN FRY, RICK MCSHERRY, JOHN FREESE, DONNA LYNN FREESE, JEFF VAN VOORHIS, SUSAN LEE FOX, TERRENCE

FANCHER AND DONNA FANCHER,

: No. 358 MAL 2014

: Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the

: Order of the Superior Court

Respondents

٧.

SYNAGRO CENTRAL, LLC, SYNAGRO : MID-ATLANTIC, GEORGE PHILLIPS, HILLTOP FARMS AND STEVE TROYER, :

Petitioners

<u>ORDER</u>

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 9th day of October, 2014, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is

GRANTED. The issue is:

Did the Superior Court incorrectly interpret the Pennsylvania [RTFA] by requiring a jury trial to determine that the land application of biosolids falls within the Act's definition of a "normal agricultural operation," which was contrary to the Act and this Court's precedent that statutes of repose and statutory interpretation present questions of law for resolution by courts, not juries?