## [J-193-1997] THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA MIDDLE DISTRICT

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,	No. 38 M.D. Appeal Docket 1997
	<ul> <li>Appeal from the Order of the Superior</li> <li>Court dated September 19, 1996, at No.</li> <li>952 Philadelphia 1995, reversing/vacating</li> <li>and remanding the Order of the</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Northumberland County Common Pleas</li> <li>Court dated February 15, 1995 at Nos. 30</li> <li>C 1989 and 31 C 1989</li> </ul>
Appellee	683 A.2d 666 (Pa. Super. 1996) SUBMITTED: October 23, 1997

## **CONCURRING OPINION**

## MR. JUSTICE ZAPPALA:

## DECIDED: JANUARY 22, 1999

I join in the majority opinion as I agree that the standard to evaluate counsel's effectiveness on direct appeal should equally apply to ineffective counsel claims under the Post Conviction Relief Act. Although I joined Justice Montemuro's opinion in <u>Commonwealth v. Buehl</u>, 540 Pa. 493, 658 A.2d 771 (1995), which held to the contrary, the protracted confusion in this area of the law convinces me that a separate standard for PCRA ineffectiveness claims is unworkable. Further, upon reflection, I am persuaded that the discrepancy in the language utilized in the PCRA and that espoused in <u>Commonwealth v. Pierce</u>, 515 Pa. 153, 527 A.2d 973 (1987), amounts to a distinction without a difference. Accordingly, I conclude that the better approach is that taken by the majority opinion.