

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

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| COZEN O'CONNOR, | : | No. 376 EAL 2013 |
| | : | |
| Petitioner | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the |
| | : | Order of the Commonwealth Court |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| CITY OF PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF | : | |
| ETHICS AND CITY OF PHILADELPHIA | : | |
| AND THE HONORABLE ROBERT A. | : | |
| BRADY AND FRIENDS OF BOB BRADY, | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| Respondents | : | |

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 6th day of January, 2014, the Petition for Allowance of Appeal is **GRANTED**. The issues, as framed by Petitioner, are:

1. Should this Court grant review of the Commonwealth Court's holding that, contrary to settled rules of statutory construction, post-election fundraising and/or debt forgiveness to retire a candidate's ballot challenge legal defense costs obligation that accrued in 2007 and was specifically not precluded, is nonetheless regulated as a "contribution" under Philadelphia's 2007 campaign finance law?
2. Should this Court grant review of the Commonwealth Court's holding that, while incurring ballot challenge litigation legal defense costs was not a regulated "expenditure" under the applicable 2007 campaign finance law, postelection liquidation of the resulting debt is nonetheless regulated by that law?

3. Should this Court grant review of the Commonwealth Court's holding that legal fees incurred by a political campaign for the purpose of defending against ballot challenge litigation and preserving the candidate's right to appear on the ballot, and not to influence the outcome of a covered election, are regulated under Philadelphia's 2007 campaign finance law?

4. Should this Court grant review of the Commonwealth Court's holding that Cozen O'Connor may not seek a declaration covering all means available to liquidate the legal fees debt at issue—including through fundraising by the former candidate not subject to contribution limits—where this Court held previously, without limitation, that the Firm has standing to pursue this relief on the merits?

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