

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIDDLE DISTRICT**

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| MARIA AND ROBERT BRADY, JR., | : | No. 1019 MAL 2013 |
| | : | |
| Respondents | : | |
| | : | Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Order of |
| v. | : | the Superior Court |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| WILLIAM M. URBAS, D.P.M., | : | |
| | : | |
| Petitioner | : | |

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 16TH day of July, 2014, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is **GRANTED, LIMITED TO** the issue set forth below. The issue, as stated by Petitioner, is:

Did the Superior Court of Pennsylvania err in adopting a blanket prohibition on evidence of a surgeon's communication to the plaintiff of potential risks and complications of planned surgery in a medical malpractice case, not involving a separate battery claim for lack of informed consent, and in failing to afford sufficient deference to the trial judge's determination of relevance and denial of a new trial, when the trial judge presented a reasonable explanation for his decision?