IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA EASTERN DISTRICT

SCF CONSULTING, LLC,	: No. 347 EAL 2016
Petitioner v.	 Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Order of the Superior Court
BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE,	
Respondent	

<u>ORDER</u>

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 1st day of February, 2017, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is **GRANTED**, **LIMITED TO** the issue set forth below. Allocatur is **DENIED** as to all remaining issues. The issue, as stated by Petitioner, is:

Whether the Trial Court and Superior Court erred in sustaining [Respondent's] demurrer to all [c]ounts of [Petitioner's] Complaint, where, even assuming *arguendo* that the Compensation Plan was in violation of R.P.C. 5.4, Pennsylvania law, public policy and the interests of justice require such an agreement to be enforced because an attorney must not be shielded from liability, nor financially rewarded for violating the Rules of Professional Conduct[?]

Justice Mundy did not participate in the consideration or decision of this matter.