

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, : Nos. 1463 and 1481 Disciplinary Docket
Petitioner : No. 3
v. : Nos. 15 and 177 DB 2009
DANIEL SCOTT PERRINE, : Attorney Registration No. 94302
Respondent : (Philadelphia)

ORDER

PER CURIAM:

AND NOW, this 2nd day of November, 2011, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendations of the Disciplinary Board dated June 3, 2011, it is hereby

ORDERED that Daniel Scott Perrine is disbarred from the Bar of this Commonwealth and he shall comply with all the provisions of Rule 217, Pa. R.D.E.

It is further ORDERED that respondent shall pay costs to the Disciplinary Board pursuant to Rule 208(g), Pa. R.D.E.

A True Copy John A. Vaskov, Esquire
As Of 11/2/2011

Attest: 
Deputy Notary
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL : Nos. 1463 & 1481 Disciplinary Docket No. 3
Petitioner :
v. : Nos. 15 & 177 DB 2009
: Attorney Registration No. 94302
DANIEL SCOTT PERRINE :
Respondent : (Philadelphia)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUSTICES
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA:

Pursuant to Rule 208(d)(2)(iii) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania ("Board") herewith submits its findings and recommendations to your Honorable Court with respect to the above-captioned Petition for Discipline.

I. HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

By Order of April 21, 2009, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania referred the conviction of Daniel Scott Perrine for the crime of indirect criminal contempt to Office of Disciplinary Counsel pursuant to Rule 214(g), Pa.R.D.E.

By Order of February 9, 2010, the Supreme Court referred the conviction of Mr. Perrine for the crimes of contraband and flight to avoid apprehension, trial or punishment to the Disciplinary Board pursuant to Rule 214(f)(1), Pa.R.D.E. for consolidation with the prior conviction matter.

On April 5, 2010, Office of Disciplinary Counsel filed a Petition for Discipline against Respondent setting forth Respondent's alleged misconduct in the conviction matters as well as alleged misconduct involving client neglect. Respondent failed to file an Answer to Petition.

A disciplinary hearing was held on July 27, 2010 before a District I Hearing Committee comprised of Chair Michael B. Pullano, Esquire, and Members Walter S. Jenkins, Esquire, and Marie-Louise G. Perri, Esquire. Respondent did not appear.

Following the submission of a brief by Petitioner, the Hearing Committee filed a Report on January 21, 2011, concluding that Respondent violated the Rules contained in the Petition for Discipline and recommending that he be disbarred from the practice of law.

No Briefs on Exception were filed with the Board.

This matter was adjudicated by the Disciplinary Board at the meeting on April 13, 2011.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following findings of fact:

1. Petitioner, whose principal office is located at Pennsylvania Judicial Center, Suite 2700, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17106-2485, is invested pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 207, with the power and duty to investigate all matters involving alleged misconduct of an attorney admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to prosecute all disciplinary proceedings.

2. Respondent is Daniel Scott Perrine. He was born in 1977 and was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 2005. His former

registered office address is 223 S. Sartain St., Philadelphia PA 19107. He is subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

3. Respondent has no history of discipline in Pennsylvania.

4. By Supreme Court Order effective May 3, 2009, Respondent was placed on inactive status for failing to complete his Continuing Legal Education credits.

5. On December 8, 2008, Respondent entered a plea of guilty in the Court of Common Pleas of Dauphin County to the crime of Indirect Criminal Contempt, and was sentenced to pay fines, costs and restitution. This conviction was referred to Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

6. By Supreme Court Order effective June 27, 2009, Respondent was placed on Emergency Temporary Suspension.

7. On July 22, 2009, Respondent entered a plea of guilty in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County to the crimes of Contraband (Controlled Substance), and Flight to Avoid Apprehension, Trial or Punishment. This conviction was referred to the Disciplinary Board and was consolidated with the prior conviction.

Indirect Criminal Contempt Conviction

8. Respondent was retained to represent Robert K. Thomas on criminal charges pending in Dauphin County.

9. Mr. Thomas' criminal trial was scheduled for May 19, 2008, before the Honorable Lawrence F. Clark, Jr.

10. Respondent received notice that Mr. Thomas' criminal trial was scheduled for May 19, 2008.

11. Respondent failed to file a motion with Judge Clark stating that Respondent would not be able to appear on May 19, 2008, and requesting a continuance of the scheduled trial.

12. On May 19, 2008, Respondent failed to appear before Judge Clark for Mr. Thomas' criminal trial. Mr. Thomas was not able to proceed to trial.

13. By Order dated May 19, 2008, Judge Clark issued a Rule to Show Cause against Respondent to show cause as to why Respondent should not be held in contempt of court for his failure to appear on May 19, 2008. The Rule was returnable at 9:00 a.m. on May 22, 2008.

14. Respondent received a copy of the Rule to Show Cause.

15. Respondent failed to appear at 9:00 a.m. on May 22, 2008 for the scheduled Rule to Show Cause hearing.

16. At approximately 9:05 a.m. on May 22, 2008:

(a) the Commonwealth requested that a bench warrant be issued against Respondent for his failure to appear at the Rule to Show Cause hearing; and

(b) Judge Clark granted the Commonwealth's motion and issued a bench warrant to take Respondent into custody for a hearing on charges of criminal contempt.

17. As a result of Respondent's failure to appear at the May 22, 2008 Rule to Show Cause hearing, Judge Clark continued Mr. Thomas' criminal matter until the week of December 15, 2008.

18. On May 22, 2008, Respondent was served with Judge Clark's bench warrant and taken into custody.

19. On May 23, 2008, Respondent had a bail hearing on charges of criminal contempt.

20. Bail was set at \$10,000 cash, which Respondent posted and he was released from custody.

21. On December 8, 2008, Respondent appeared at a hearing before the Honorable Joseph H. Kleinfelter, during which he entered a plea of guilty to criminal contempt and was sentenced to a fine of \$1,000, restitution of \$118.62, and payment of court costs.

Contraband and Flight to Avoid Apprehension Convictions

22. At approximately 5:15 p.m. on October 24, 2007, Respondent went to Curran-Fromhold Correctional Facility (CFCF), 7901 State Road, Philadelphia PA 19136. The purpose was for an official inmate visit. Prior to this visit, Respondent had been at the Philadelphia Detention Center visiting an inmate.

23. When Respondent entered CFCF, he had in his possession a glass vial containing crack cocaine.

24. Respondent knew that cocaine was contraband and was not allowed inside CFCF, and he also knew that it was a crime to attempt to bring a controlled substance into a correctional facility.

25. Before Respondent was permitted to visit an inmate at CFCF, he was informed that he had to submit to a search of his person and possessions, which Respondent agreed to.

26. Corrections Officer Arthur Green searched Respondent's briefcase and found a small glass vial containing a white chunky substance.

27. Officer Green confiscated the vial.

28. Respondent informed Officer Green that the substance inside was cocaine and that it was given to him by one of Respondent's clients.

29. The Philadelphia Police Department was notified and subsequent testing of the glass vial proved positive for cocaine.

30. Respondent was placed under arrest and charged with Contraband and Knowing and Intentional Possession of a Controlled Substance.

31. As a result of Respondent's conduct, he was banned from the grounds of the Philadelphia Prison System.

32. On April 16, 2008, Respondent had a preliminary hearing scheduled before the Honorable Marsha H. Neifeld in the Municipal Court of Philadelphia County. Respondent waived his hearing and Judge Neifeld held Respondent for court on all charges.

33. On April 29, 2008, the Attorney General's Office filed a two-count information charging Respondent with Contraband and Knowing and Intentional Possession of a Controlled Substance.

34. The Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas scheduled a pretrial listing of Respondent's criminal case for November 20, 2008.

35. Respondent received notice that there was a November 20, 2008 pretrial listing of his case, but failed to appear for the listing.

36. On November 25, 2008, the Honorable Joan A. Brown issued a bench warrant for Respondent to appear.

37. On December 3, 2008, Respondent was arrested and placed in protective custody and his case was continued for a status listing on December 23, 2008.

38. On December 23, 2008, Judge Brown set Respondent's bail; on December 24, 2008, Judge Brown ruled that Respondent should be placed on house arrest when released from custody; on December 30, 2008, Judge Brown ordered that Respondent be placed on electronic monitoring house arrest upon his release; on January 5, 2009, Respondent made payment of bail; and on January 6, 2009, Judge Brown ordered that Respondent be allowed to leave his house to go to work from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

39. On March 16, 2009, the Honorable Rose DeFino Nastasi denied Respondent's motion for Discharge from the Electronic Monitoring Program and listed Respondent's case for a scheduling conference on March 30, 2009.

40. On March 25, 2009, Respondent cut his electronic monitoring bracelet and fled to Washington, D.C.

41. On March 30, 2009, Respondent failed to appear for a scheduled listing of his criminal case and the Honorable John J. O'Grady, Jr. issued a bench warrant for Respondent's arrest.

42. On April 10, 2009, Respondent was arrested in Arlington, Virginia and placed in custody.

43. On April 20, 2009, Respondent refused to waive his extradition hearing on the charges pending in Pennsylvania.

44. On May 22, 2009, an extradition hearing was held in Arlington, Virginia and Respondent was ordered extradited to Pennsylvania.

45. On June 5, 2009, charges were filed in Philadelphia County against Respondent for Flight to Avoid Apprehension, Trial or Punishment, and Default in Required Appearance.

46. On June 30, 2009, Respondent had a preliminary hearing scheduled before the Honorable Charles B. Smith in the Municipal Court of Philadelphia. Respondent waived his hearing and he was held for court on all charges.

47. On July 22, 2009, Respondent appeared before Judge Smith and entered a plea of guilty to Contraband and Flight to Avoid Apprehension, Trial or Punishment.

48. Respondent was sentenced on the charge of Contraband to 13 to 26 months' imprisonment at a State Correctional Institution and payment of costs and fees of \$540. On the charge of Flight to Avoid Apprehension, Respondent was sentenced to five years of probation, to run consecutive to the Contraband charge and payment of costs and fees.

49. The crime of Contraband to which Respondent pled guilty is punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years and a fine of \$25,000.

50. The crime of Flight to Avoid Apprehension, Trial or Punishment to which Respondent pled guilty is punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of seven years and a fine of \$15,000.

Client Neglect Charges

51. On September 11, 2007, Desmond A. Keels filed a Notice of Appeal Nunc Pro Tunc to the Superior Court.

52. On September 14, 2007, the trial court appointed Respondent to represent Mr. Keels.

53. On September 14, 2007, Respondent filed an Entry of Appearance with the Superior Court on behalf of Mr. Keels.

54. By Per Curiam Order dated October 22, 2007, the Superior Court directed Respondent to comply with Pa.R.A.P. 3517 and file a docketing statement by November 1, 2007, and advised Respondent that his failure to do so by November 1, 2007 would lead to an order dismissing Mr. Keels' appeal.

55. Respondent received the Superior Court's Order.

56. Respondent failed to file a docketing statement by November 1, 2007.

57. By Per Curiam Order dated November 5, 2007, the Superior Court dismissed Mr. Keels' appeal due to Respondent's failure to comply with Pa.R.A.P. 3517, directed Respondent to file, within ten days of the Order a certification with the Court stating that Mr. Keels had been notified of the dismissal of the appeal, and instructed the trial court to withhold Respondent's counsel fees pertaining to the appeal.

58. On July 3, 2008, Respondent filed a Notice of Appearance in the criminal matter of Maurice Ray Dupree with the United States District Court of the Eastern District.

59. On July 29, 2008, Magistrate Judge Carol Wells entered an order setting Mr. Dupree's detention hearing for August 1, 2008.

60. On July 29, 2008, the Deputy Clerk sent Respondent via Federal Express, United States Mail and e-mail, the detention hearing notice.

61. Respondent received a copy of the Detention Hearing Notice.

62. Respondent failed to appear for Mr. Dupree's August 1, 2008 Detention Hearing.

63. As a result of Respondent's failure to appear for the hearing, Judge Wells appointed the Defender Association to represent Mr. Dupree.

64. On January 29, 2008, Respondent filed a Notice of Appearance on behalf of Roberck Suon in a criminal matter in the United States District Court for the Eastern District.

65. On July 16, 2008, the Honorable J. Curtis Joyner entered an Order scheduling Mr. Suon's sentencing hearing for July 30, 2008.

66. On July 30, 2008, Respondent failed to appear for Mr. Suon's sentencing hearing. Mr. Suon advised the court that he had spoken to Respondent the previous week, and the court continued the sentencing until it could determine what happened to Respondent.

67. On August 26, 2008, Judge Joyner entered an Order rescheduling Mr. Suon's sentencing hearing for September 2, 2008.

68. The court sent Respondent notice of the hearing, which Respondent received.

69. On September 2, 2008, Respondent failed to appear for the sentencing hearing and the court continued the sentencing until new counsel could be obtained.

70. On October 15, 2007, Shikia Jones was held for court on drug-related charges in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County.

71. Respondent was appointed to represent Ms. Jones.

72. On October 7, 2008, the Honorable Earl W. Trent granted a defense request for a continuance and listed Ms. Jones' case for a waiver trial on November 25, 2008.

73. Respondent received notice that Ms. Jones' trial was continued until November 25, 2008.

74. Respondent failed to appear for his client's waiver trial on November 25, 2008.

75. As a result of Respondent's failure to appear, Judge Trent appointed the Defender Association to represent Ms. Jones.

76. On or about March 12, 2009, Respondent agreed to represent Shaheed K. Butler in a criminal matter for a fee of \$1,000.

77. Respondent received \$200 to represent Mr. Butler and gave Mr. Butler a receipt for the \$800 balance.

78. Respondent failed to file an Entry of Appearance in Mr. Butler's matter.

79. Respondent failed to write to Mr. Butler, visit Mr. Butler in jail, or communicate in any way with Mr. Butler about the status of his matter.

80. Respondent failed to advise Mr. Butler that Respondent was placed on inactive status and failed to refund the unearned fee upon the termination of representation.

81. On December 15, 2009, the Pennsylvania Lawyers Fund for Client Security awarded \$560 to Mr. Butler for his claim against Respondent.

82. On January 2, 2009, Respondent received \$1,500 to represent Michael Trainor in a criminal matter and \$750 to represent Lauren Trainor in a civil complaint against the City of Philadelphia arising from the arrest of her husband.

83. Respondent gave his clients written fee agreements setting forth the terms of Respondent's representation.

84. Respondent failed to enter his written appearance in Mr. Trainor's criminal case.

85. From time to time, Mrs. Trainor would attempt to contact Respondent via telephone, text messaging and e-mail.

86. Respondent failed to return Mrs. Trainor's messages, and failed to provide her with information regarding the status of her and her husband's legal matters.

87. On March 25, 2009, Respondent left Philadelphia, abandoning his law practice and legal clients.

88. Respondent failed to advised the Trainors that he was placed on inactive status, and he failed to refund the unearned fee upon the termination of representation.

89. On March 10, 2010, the Pennsylvania Lawyers Fund for Client Security awarded \$2,250 to Mrs. Trainor for her claim against Respondent.

90. Respondent failed to appear at the disciplinary hearing held on July 27, 2010.

91. Respondent failed to cooperate with Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

92. Judgments have been entered against Respondent for nonpayment of rent, failure to represent his clients, and nonpayment of court fees.

93. Respondent's 2008-2009 Attorney Registration Statement falsely stated that Respondent maintained an IOLTA Account at Parke Bank.

94. Respondent sent vexatious and unsupported correspondence to the Central Intelligence Agency and White House accusing the CIA of wrongdoing.

95. Respondent's correspondence to the CIA and White House included correspondence concerning a rogue CIA agent who was controlling his thoughts, making him do illegal acts, causing him pain, preventing him from sleeping, and interfering with his legal work.

96. Respondent failed to inform the Secretary of the Board that he had been convicted of two "serious crimes" as defined by Pa.R.D.E. 214(i).

97. Respondent failed to comply with Local Rules of Civil Procedure, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Rule 83.6, Rule II, and inform the Court that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court had temporarily suspended Respondent from the practice of law.

98. Respondent failed to comply with Local Rules of Civil Procedure, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Rule 83.6, Rule I, and inform the Court that Respondent had been convicted of two "serious crimes", the definition of which includes "any felony."

99. Respondent's crimes, guilty plea, conviction and sentence generated substantial negative publicity in the Philadelphia area.

III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By his conduct as set forth above, Respondent violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct and Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement:

1. RPC 1.3 - A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

2. RPC 1.4(a)(3) - A lawyer shall keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter.

3. RPC 1.4(a)(4) - A lawyer shall promptly comply with reasonable requests for information.

4. RPC 1.16(d) - Upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, such as giving

reasonable notice to the client, allowing time for employment of other counsel, surrendering papers and property to which the client is entitled and refunding any advance payment of fee or expense that has not been earned or incurred. The lawyer may retain papers relating to the client to the extent permitted by other law.

5. RPC 8.4(b) - It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects.

6. RPC 8.4(c) - It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.

7. RPC 8.4(d) - It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.

8. Pa.R.D.E. 203(b)(1) - Conviction of a crime, which under Enforcement Rule 214 (relating to attorneys convicted of crimes) may result in suspension, shall be grounds for discipline.

IV. DISCUSSION

This matter is before the Disciplinary Board for consideration of the charges against Respondent contained in the Petition for Discipline filed on April 5, 2010. The Petition sets forth allegations of misconduct in three separate matters.

Charge I involves Respondent's failure to appear for multiple listings of his client's criminal case and his conviction of indirect criminal contempt. Charge II involves Respondent's arrest and conviction for taking a vial containing cocaine residue into a correctional facility, failing to appear for scheduled court listings of his criminal case, cutting his home detention ankle bracelet and fleeing the jurisdiction to avoid prosecution. Charge

III involves Respondent's neglect of multiple client matters, including his failure to communicate with his clients, draft pleadings, appear for scheduled hearings, file necessary court papers, pursue his clients' cases and refund unearned fees upon termination of his representation. Respondent failed to respond to the Petition for Discipline and by operation of Rule 208(b)(3), the factual allegations contained in the Petition are deemed admitted.

A disciplinary hearing was convened on these matters on July 27, 2010. Respondent failed to appear at the hearing, despite proper and repeated notice. Petitioner introduced into evidence 35 exhibits, which establish the facts and rule violations set forth in the Petition for Discipline. Petitioner further introduced 21 exhibits, which establish substantial aggravating factors. The Board concludes that Petitioner met its burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence that is clear and satisfactory, that Respondent violated the Rules of Professional Conduct and Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement as charged in the Petition for Discipline. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Grigsby, 425 A. 2d 730 (Pa. 1981). For the reasons set forth below, the Board recommends that Respondent be disbarred from the practice of law in Pennsylvania.

Respondent engaged in serial neglect of the matters of six clients, abandoned his clients' cases, committed crimes and engaged in flight to avoid prosecution for a crime. Precedent suggests that an attorney who engages in serial neglect of client matters often receives a suspension of one year and one day. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Howard Goldman, 157 DB 2003, 1040 Disciplinary Docket No. 3 (Pa. Aug. 30, 2005) (neglect of four client matters, failure to communicate with clients and failure to promptly surrender unearned fee). If an attorney also abandons his clients' cases, then the discipline is more severe, ranging from a two year suspension to disbarment. Office of

Disciplinary Counsel v. Robert Vedatsky, No. 121 DB 1994, 281 Disciplinary Docket No. 3 (Pa. Dec. 30, 1996) (two year period of suspension after attorney received fees from clients but failed to provide promised services, communicate with clients, surrender files and return unearned fees; attorney abandoned law office and made himself unavailable to clients); Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Kenneth J. Roe, No. 64 DB 1998, 461 Disciplinary Docket No. 3 (Pa. July 30, 2003) (disbarment for attorney who closed his office and left the area without providing a new address for clients, the courts and the Disciplinary Board; took fees and failed to do any work or return unearned fees; failed to cooperate or participate in disciplinary proceeding).

Similarly, an attorney's commission of a crime and subsequent flight to avoid prosecution for that crime increases discipline to the severe end of the spectrum. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. O'Kickj, 34 Pa. D. & C. 4th 236 (1996) (Supreme Court disbarred attorney who was convicted of bribery and related offenses, fled the Commonwealth after he exhausted his appeals, and remained a fugitive at the time of his disciplinary hearing).

Viewed collectively, Respondent's misconduct establishes that he is unfit to practice law and must be disbarred. The record also contains many serious aggravating factors further demonstrating that Respondent is not fit to practice law. Analysis of these factors leaves little doubt that, in order to fulfill the goal of the disciplinary system to protect the public and maintain the integrity of the legal profession, Respondent must be disbarred. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Keller, 506 A. 2d 872 (Pa. 1986).

The aggravating factors include Respondent's failure to appear at the disciplinary hearing or participate in any manner in the proceedings against him. This is a significant aggravating factor. In re Anonymous No. 101 DB 92, 23 Pa. D. & C. 4th 168 (1994). It may be inferred from the failure to participate that an attorney has no interest in

preserving his license to practice law. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Robert S. Fisher, No. 52 DB 2005, 1169 Disciplinary Docket No. 3 (Pa. Sept. 19, 2006). Respondent failed to report his criminal conviction to the Board and to the federal court, and made false statements in his annual registration statement for 2008-2009. Additionally, there is evidence of Respondent's strange and disturbing correspondence to the CIA and White House, which reveals his utter lack of fitness. These plentiful aggravating factors strongly support a recommendation for disbarment.

Disbarment is an extreme sanction which must be imposed only in the most egregious cases, because it represents a termination of the license to practice law without a promise of its restoration at any future time. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Keller, supra. Disbarment has been determined to be appropriate in cases involving the type of misconduct exhibited in the instant case. Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Najma Al-Rashid, 34 Pa. D. & C. 4th 32 (1996); Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Floyd Paul Jones, Nos. 133 DB 2003 and 1 DB 2004, 878 Disciplinary Docket No. 3 (Pa. March 11, 2005).

Respondent has absolutely failed to conform to the ethics of his profession, and is guilty of conduct which is illegal and deceitful. The Board recommends that Respondent be disbarred.

V. RECOMMENDATION

The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously recommends that the Respondent, Daniel Scott Perrine, be Disbarred from the practice of law in this Commonwealth.

It is further recommended that the expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of this matter are to be paid by the Respondent.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

By: 

Stewart L. Cohen, Board Vice-Chair

Date: June 3, 2011

Board Member Jefferies did not participate in the adjudication.