

**[J-13A-2025 and J-13B-2025]
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
EASTERN DISTRICT**

IN THE INTEREST OF: R.B., A MINOR	:	No. 67 EAP 2024
	:	
APPEAL OF: F.H., MOTHER	:	Appeal from the Order of the Superior Court at No. 230 EDA 2024 entered on September 6, 2024, affirming the Order of the Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas at No. CP-51-DP-0001180-2017 entered on December 28, 2023.
	:	
	:	SUBMITTED: February 4, 2025
IN THE INTEREST OF: S.B., A MINOR	:	No. 68 EAP 2024
	:	
APPEAL OF: F.H., MOTHER	:	Appeal from the Order of the Superior Court at No. 231 EDA 2024 entered on September 6, 2024, affirming the Order of the Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas at No. CP-51-DP-0001305-2017 entered on December 28, 2023
	:	
	:	SUBMITTED: February 4, 2025

ORDER

PER CURIAM

DECIDED: March 20, 2025

AND NOW, this 20th day of March, 2025, the order of the Superior Court is **REVERSED**. See *In re A.J.R.-H.*, 188 A.3d 1157, 1167-70 (Pa. 2018) (holding that documentary evidence was inadmissible under the business records exception to the hearsay rule, see Pa.R.E. 803(6), where an agency witness testified regarding the process of obtaining documents from third parties, but “[n]o witness stated that she was

able to speak to the mode of . . . the documents' preparation, [or] testify that the documents were created at or near the time of the documented event or conversation, or made in the regular practice of the activity”).