

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

RALPH GILBERT, GLORIA GILBERT,	: No. 358 MAL 2014
MICHELLE TORGERSON, EDWIN	:
TORGERSON, MELDA BITTORF,	:
BEVERLY COX, WILLIAM COX,	: Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the
KIMBERLY MILES, CLEA FOCKLER,	: Order of the Superior Court
JOHN FOCKLER, LINDA ECKERT,	:
SCOTT ECKERT, WILLIAM STRINE,	:
KENNY JASINSKI, DENNIS JASINSKI,	:
KATHRYN JASINSKI, JOSEPH	:
JASINSKI, PATRICIA UNVERZAGT,	:
MEGAN JACOBS, BARBARA	:
UNVERZAGT, DONNA PARR, JEFF	:
FODEL, WENDY FODEL, JENNIFER	:
JASINSKI, JOHN JASINSKI, JUDY	:
QUEITZSCH, JEAN FRY, RICK	:
MCSHERRY, JOHN FREESE, DONNA	:
LYNN FREESE, JEFF VAN VOORHIS,	:
SUSAN LEE FOX, TERRENCE	:
FANCHER AND DONNA FANCHER,	:

Respondents

v.

SYNAGRO CENTRAL, LLC, SYNAGRO	:
MID-ATLANTIC, GEORGE PHILLIPS,	:
HILLTOP FARMS AND STEVE TROYER,	:

Petitioners

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 9th day of October, 2014, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is

GRANTED. The issue is:

Did the Superior Court incorrectly interpret the Pennsylvania [RTFA] by requiring a jury trial to determine that the land application of biosolids falls within the Act’s definition of a “normal agricultural operation,” which was contrary to the Act and this Court’s precedent that statutes of repose and statutory interpretation present questions of law for resolution by courts, not juries?