IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA EASTERN DISTRICT

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,	: No. 147 EAL 2017
Respondent v.	 Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Order of the Superior Court
	:
RICHARD A. CHAMBERS,	
Petitioner	:

<u>ORDER</u>

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 6th day of September 2017, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal

is **GRANTED**. The issues, as stated by petitioner are:

- (1) Is not the Superior Court's holding in a published opinion that a defendant can be liable for the underlying conduct of another by virtue of being a co-conspirator inconsistent with the plain language of the governing statute, 18 Pa.C.S. § 306, which provides for accomplice liability only, and with this Court's decision in *Commonwealth v. Knox*, 105 A.3d 1194 (Pa. 2014)?
- (2) Did not the Superior Court erroneously analyze accomplice liability, and incorrectly conclude that the evidence was sufficient to convict on that theory?
- (3) Did not the Superior Court err in concluding that the evidence was sufficient to convict Appellant of conspiracy to assault the victim with Mace under 18 Pa.C.S. § 903, since he neither intended nor agreed to commit this crime?