

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

IN RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No. 125 EM 2019

OF THE OFFICE OF THE PHILADELPHIA  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

PETITION OF: MAUREEN FAULKNER,  
WIDOW OF DECEASED POLICE OFFICER  
DANIEL FAULKNER

**ORDER**

AND NOW, April 23, 2020, upon consideration of the various pending discovery motions, and it appearing Petitioner has now completed depositions of those persons identified in the Court's April 7, 2020 order, it is further ordered as follows:

1. That on or before April 27, 2020, Petitioner's counsel shall identify any person Counsel intends to call as a witness, and any document Counsel intends to introduce into evidence, at any hearing in this matter.
2. That on or before the close of business on May 1, 2020, Petitioner's counsel shall make available for deposition, at a time agreed on between counsel, any witness so identified, and provide copies to Respondent's counsel of any documents so identified. Recording by videotape is authorized.

3. That the confidentiality conditions governing the Petitioner's discovery detailed in the Court's April 20, 2020, order shall apply to and govern any discovery undertaken by Respondent's counsel.
4. That on or before May 5, 2020, Counsel for Petitioner and Respondent shall exchange, file under seal, and submit to the Court a pre-hearing statement containing a list of witnesses intended to be called, copies of documents intended to be introduced, and an estimate of the time required to submit the party's case. If either party intends to rely on videotape deposition testimony instead of live testimony, then a transcript of the deposition testimony shall also be included.
5. That Counsel should be prepared to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law within one day after the end of any subsequently scheduled hearing.
6. That it is the intention of the Court to finalize the time, date and location for any required hearing upon either receipt of guidance from the Supreme Court regarding holding video hearings or a recession or modification of the Supreme Court's order governing holding in-person hearings.
7. That if the exigencies of current practice limitations become problematic in complying with the schedule detailed in this order, a request for a reasonable modification will be considered.

BY THE COURT:



---

John M. Cleland, Senior Judge  
Special Master