

[J-140-2006]
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
EASTERN DISTRICT

CAPPY, C.J., CASTILLE, NEWMAN, SAYLOR, EAKIN, BAER, BALDWIN, JJ

MIA E. MAYER	:	No. 84 EM 2006
	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Emergency Application for Extraordinary
	:	Relief, Stay and Writ of Prohibition
RAY F. GARMAN, III	:	
	:	
	:	
PETITION OF: WAVERLY DEANS	:	SUBMITTED: July 7, 2006
	:	
	:	

CONCURRING OPINION

MR. JUSTICE CASTILLE

DECIDED: August 4, 2006

The Per Curiam Opinion tracks the standard governing issuance of a Writ of Prohibition as I set it forth in my Dissenting Opinion in Public Defender's Office of Venango County v. Venango County Court of Common Pleas, 893 A.2d 1275, 1282-1291 (Pa. 2006) (Castille, J., dissenting). Because the Per Curiam Opinion explains why this Court's exercise of jurisdiction under that standard is appropriate, and explains why prohibition must issue, I join. I view the exercise of jurisdiction in Venango County as aberrational.