## [J-14A-Q-2015] [OAJC: Stevens, J.] IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA MIDDLE DISTRICT

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 86 MAP 2014

٠

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2363 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02348, dated July

25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 87 MAP 2014

. NO. 07 WAL 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2364 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02349, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 88 MAP 2014

110.001070 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2365 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

: Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02338, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

٧.

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 89 MAP 2014

•

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2367 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02339, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 90 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2369 EDA 2012, dated July : 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02340, dated July

25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

Appellant

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 91 MAP 2014

•

: Appeal from the Order of the Superior: Court, at No. 2371 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

: Chester County Court of Common Pleas.

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02337, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

٧.

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 92 MAP 2014

.

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2373 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02336, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 93 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2374 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02350, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 94 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2375 EDA 2012, dated July : 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02343, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 95 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2376 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

: Chester County Court of Common Pleas.

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02347, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

٧.

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 96 MAP 2014

.

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2378 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02346, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No.

: No. 97 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2379 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

: Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02345, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

٧.

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 98 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2381 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

: Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02344, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

٧.

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 99 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2382 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02342, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee :

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 100 MAP 2014

:

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2383 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02341, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 101 MAP 2014

. . .

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2384 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

v. : Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02332, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

٧.

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

TERRA TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC, : No. 102 MAP 2014

Appellant : Appeal from the Order of the Superior

: Court, at No. 2386 EDA 2012, dated July

: 31, 2013, Affirming the Order of the

: Chester County Court of Common Pleas,

: Civil Division, at No. 10-02335, dated July

: 25, 2012

RIVER STATION LAND, L.P.,

: ARGUED: March 11, 2015

Appellee

## **CONCURRING OPINION**

MR. JUSTICE EAKIN DECIDED: September 29, 2015

[J-14A-Q-2015] [OAJC: Stevens, J.] - 5

I agree that absent some other impropriety, the docket number assigned to an otherwise proper complaint is not determinative of the complaint's validity.

There is merit to the view the term and number on the lien and complaint must be distinct. The Mechanics Lien Law clearly anticipates a mechanics' lien docket, see 49 P.S. § 1507, which, ipso facto, means a distinct docket for that purpose. Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 1656(2) requires the complaint to include "the court and number and the date of filing of the claim and a copy thereof as an exhibit" — further support there is a distinction between the complaint and the "court and number" of the filed claim. Pa.R.C.P. 1656(2). Moreover, although it appears to speak based on practical experience rather than precedent, Tully Drilling Company v. Shenkin, 597 A.2d 1230 (Pa. Super. 1991), enumerates separate dockets, files, and numbers. See id., at 1232. Accordingly, the trial court's decision to require separate docket numbers has at least facial support.

Yet, while there is contemplation of separate docketing, there is no <u>mandate</u> of separate docketing. Such an absence violates neither statute nor Rule, and <u>Tully</u>'s pronouncement constitutes <u>dicta</u>. Thus, what happened here violates no law. However, the absence of illegality leaves the question of whether the repetition of docket numbers was somehow prejudicial to appellee. If it implied the complaint was not an effort to enforce the claim, such might be the case, but the notice to plead, which appellant included with each complaint, makes that implication a nullity.

The record reveals the mechanics' lien claims were entered on the "regular" civil docket, with a designation of "MJ" after the number. See, e.g., Case Summary Report, 100 MAP 2014, 9/21/12, at 1. The subsequent complaints were docketed on the same civil docket. See, e.g., id., at 3. While this administrative fact may be inconsistent with the contemplation of the statute and Rules, it is a fact nonetheless. Therefore, as both

the complaints and claims would be discoverable by a search of the single civil docket, there appears no purpose or value to assigning a different number to the complaint. Instead, the key is whether the complaints were valid, and the record shows they were.

[J-14A-Q-2015] [OAJC: Stevens, J.] - 7