

**NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION – SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P 65.37**

DAWN CROCKFORD AND KEITH  
CROCKFORD, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS  
PARENTS AND NATURAL GUARDIANS OF  
B.C., A MINOR

Appellants

v.

NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL CO.

Appellee

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 931 MDA 2012

Appeal from the Judgment Entered of April 26, 2012  
In the Court of Common Pleas of Luzerne County  
Civil Division at No(s): 3762-C of 2004

BEFORE: FORD ELLIOTT, P.J.E., WECHT, J., and COLVILLE, J.\*

CONCURRING MEMORANDUM BY WECHT, J.: **FILED JUNE 06, 2013**

I concur in the learned Majority's decision to affirm in this case. Unlike the Majority, I do not believe that Appellants have waived their argument by failing (in the Majority's view) to provide legal analysis or appropriate citation (see Majority Memorandum at 3). I believe that Appellants have advanced an argument that is legally sufficient to enable a merits review. Upon such review, I do, however, concur in the Majority's result, given our highly deferential standard of review in cases where a trial court has denied

---

\* Retired Senior Judge assigned to the Superior Court.

a weight of the evidence challenge made to a jury verdict. *See generally* Commonwealth v. Widmer, 744 A.2d 745 (Pa. 2000).