

[J-93-2001]
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
WESTERN DISTRICT

MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY OF THE CITY	:	14 WAP 2001
OF MONONGAHELA AND THE CITY OF	:	
MONONGAHELA,	:	Appeal from the Order of the
	:	Commonwealth Court entered August 29,
Appellants	:	2000, at No. 1720 C.D. 1999, reversing
	:	the order of the Court of Common Pleas of
	:	Allegheny County entered June 17, 1999
v.	:	at No. GD-99-00708.
	:	
	:	
CARROLL TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY AND:	:	
THE TOWNSHIP OF CARROLL,	:	ARGUED: September 10, 2001
	:	
Appellees	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM

DECIDED: JANUARY 22, 2002

And now, this 22nd day of January, 2002, the order of the Commonwealth Court is **AFFIRMED**. We specifically state that we do not adopt the rationale of the Commonwealth Court. See Commonwealth v. Tilghman, 673 A.2d 898, 904 (Pa. 1996). Furthermore, we note that it appears that 42 Pa.C.S. § 7319(3), read in conjunction with 42 Pa.C.S. § 7304(a), dictates that venue for appeals from arbitration awards lies with the trial court that initially ordered the parties to proceed to arbitration. However, the issue of the applicability of § 7319(3) to this matter was waived via a concession made by Appellees before the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County. See Allegheny County CCP, slip op. dated 1/25/1999, at 12. Thus, we are unable to explore the parameters of § 7319(3) by way of a full opinion.

Former Chief Justice Flaherty did not participate in the decision of this case.