FAYETTE LEGAL JOURNAL

VOL. 83

FEBRUARY 22, 2020

NO. 8



FAYETTE LEGAL JOURNAL

The FAYETTE LEGAL JOURNAL is published weekly by the Fayette County Bar Association, 45 East Main Street, Suite 100, Uniontown, Pennsylvania 15401, 724-437-7994. Legal advertisements should be submitted online at www.fcbar.org no later than 12:00 noon on Friday for publication the following Saturday. No date of publication is promised, however. Legal notices are published exactly as submitted by the advertiser. Copyright 2001 Fayette County Bar Association. All rights reserved.

Co-Editors: Garnet L. Crossland and Melinda Deal Dellarose

Cover Design by Marvin R. Mayle, 207 Lick Hollow Road, Hopwood, PA

FAYETTE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION Board of Directors

President: Louise D. Monaghan President Elect: Gretchen A. Mundorff Vice-President: Charles O. Zebley, Jr. Secretary: Timothy J. Witt Treasurer: Vincent J. Roskovensky, II Past President: James E. Higinbotham, Jr.

Executive Director: Garnet L. Crossland

ETHICS HOTLINE

The Ethics Hotline provides free advisory opinions to PBA members based upon review of a member's prospective conduct by members of the PBA Committee on Legal Ethics and Professional Responsibility. The committee responds to requests regarding, the impact of the provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct or the Code of Judicial Conduct upon the inquiring member's proposed activity. All inquiries are confidential.

Call (800) 932-0311, ext. 2214.

Directors Jennifer M. Casini Rachel A. Clark Jeremy J. Davis Benjamin F. Goodwin Robert A. Gordon Sheryl R. Heid Margaret Zylka House Wendy L. O'Brien Douglas S. Sholtis

Lawyers Concerned for Lawyers

Our assistance is confidential, non-judgmental, safe, and effective

To talk to a lawyer today, call: 1-888-999-1941 717-541-4360

ESTATE NOTICES

Notice is hereby given that letters testamentary or of administration have been granted to the following estates. All persons indebted to said estates are required to make payment, and those having claims or demands to present the same without delay to the administrators or executors named.

Third Publication

WILLIAM ALLEN, a/k/a WILLIAM L.

ALLEN, late of North Union Township, Fayette County, PA (3)

Personal Representative: Tania Bosley c/o Davis and Davis 107 East Main Street Uniontown, Pa 15401 Attorney: Gary J. Frankhouser

DAVID YALE CURTIS, late of Acme, Fayette County, PA (3)

Executor: Dean Scott Jones 67 Spruce Peak Road Acme, PA 15610 c/o 1227 South Braddock Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15218 *Attorney*: Kathleen Schneider

Second Publication

KATHERINE T. BEAL, a/k/a KATHERINE

TERESA BEAL, late of Springfield Township, Fayette County, PA (2) Executor: Jack B. Armstrong 1140 Valley View Drive Scottdale, PA 15683 c/o 231 South Main Street, Suite 402 Greensburg, PA 15601 Attorney: Marilyn Gaut

LEAH KATHRYN CAUSER, late of

Normalville, Fayette County, PA (2) Executor: Stanley R. Geary c/o John & John 96 East Main Street Uniontown, PA 15401 Attorney: Simon B. John

FRANCES MARIE DURITSKY, a/k/a FRANCES M. DURITSKY, late of

Uniontown, Fayette County, PA (2) Personal Representative: Theresa Wright c/o Davis and Davis 107 East Main Street Uniontown, PA 15401 Attorney: Gary J. Frankhouser

JOHN M. MCGAW, III, late of Merrittstown,

Fayette County, PA (2) *Administratrix*: Melissa K. Hixon 121 Dinwiddie Drive New Kensington, PA 15068

DIANE MONGALIER, late of Springhill Township, Fayette County, PA (2) *Executor*: Gary Mongalier c/o 2944 National Pike Road, Box 245 Chalk Hill, PA 15421 *Attorney*: Charles C. Gentile

FLORENCE P. RICHARDSON, late of

Menallen Township, Fayette County, PA (2) *Executrix*: Dolores F. Bell c/o 51 East South Street Uniontown, Pa 15401 *Attorney*: Webster & Webster

ELIZABETH M. SAVARINO, late of

Washington Township, Fayette County, PA (2) Co-Executors: Nancy A. Weinman 346 Sportsmen Road Hunker, PA 15639 George R. Savarino 1109 Williams Drive Belle Vernon, PA 15012 c/o 823 Broad Avenue Belle Vernon, PA 15012 Attorney: Mark E. Ramsier

First Publication

MARY ALICE DROBNY, late of Georges

Township, Fayette County, PA (1) *Executors*: Joseph M. Braya and Frank Balawender c/o 9 Court Street Uniontown, PA 15401 *Attorney*: Vincent J. Roskovensky, II

ANNABELLE DZURNAK, a/k/a

ANNABELLE A. DZURNAK, late of Uniontown, Fayette County, PA (1) Personal Representatives: David W. Dzurnak & Mark A. Dzurnak c/o Watson Mundorff & Sepic, LLP 720 Vanderbilt Road Connellsville, PA 15425 Attorney: Timothy J. Witt

BETTY L. EUTSEY, late of Connellsville,

Fayette County, PA (1) *Executrix*: Janet Morris c/o 815 A Memorial Boulevard Connellsville, PA 15425 *Attorney*: Margaret Zylka House

ALLEN KOVACH, a/k/a ALLEN J.

KOVACH, late of Brownsville, Fayette County, PA (1)

Administratrix: Ilona Kovach 193 Hancock Road Brownsville, PA 15417 c/o Conti Law 986 Brodhead Road Moon Township, PA 15108 Attorney: Michele Conti

JEAN MALINSKY, late of Masontown,

Fayette County, PA (1) *Executrix*: Deborah L. Malinsky 344 W. Church Avenue Masontown, PA 15461 c/o 6 South Main Street Washington Trust Building, Suite 214 Washington, PA 15301 *Attorney*: Joseph Brodak

JIMMIE R. MCGINNIS, late of German

Township, Fayette County, PA (1) *Personal Representative*: Nancy J. Priselac c/o Riverfront Professional Center 208 South Arch Street, Suite 2 Connellsville, PA 15425 *Attorney*: Richard A. Husband

PHILLIP M. SHIPLEY, a/k/a PHILLIP M.

SHIPLEY, late of North Union Township, Fayette County, PA (1) Personal Representative: William W. Cobert, Sr. c/o George & George, LLP 92 East Main Street Uniontown, PA 15401 Attorney: G.T. George

JAMES A. ULMER, late of Uniontown,

Fayette County, PA (1) Personal Representative: Eleanor C. Ulmer c/o Watson Mundorff & Sepic, LLP 720 Vanderbilt Road Connellsville, PA 15425 Attorney: Timothy J. Witt

LEGAL NOTICES

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF FAYETTE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL ACTION – LAW No. 2579 of 2019, G.D. PRESIDENT JUDGE JOHN F. WAGNER, JR.

IN RE: CHANGE OF NAME OF ANTOINETTI CLARA SALVATORE

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that on November 18, 2019 the petition of Antoinetti Clara Salvatore was filed in the above named Court, requesting an Order to change the name of Antoinetti Clara Salvatore to Antoinette Salvatore.

The Court has fixed March 6, 2020 at 1:30P.M. in Courtroom Number 2, Fayette County Courthouse, Uniontown, Pennsylvania as the time and place for a hearing on the merits of said Petition, when and where all interested parties may appear and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of said Petition should not be granted.

Michelle L. Kelley, Esquire 92 East Main Street, Ste. 24 Uniontown, Pa. 15401 (724) 439-2553 IN RE: Polito, Dominick Jr. Case No. 15-22764-GLT Chapter 7

Real Property: Debtor's one-third interest in 112 Paull Street, Hopwood, PA 15445 Tax Map #25-54-0035 Date of Sale: 3/5/2020 @ 10:30 a.m. Courtroom A. 54th Floor 600 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Objections due by: 2/21/2020 Initial Offer: \$12,500.00 Higher and better offers will be considered at the hearing Hand money required: \$2,000.00 (Cash or Certified Funds) Contact: Robert H. Slone 223 South Maple Avenue Greensburg, PA 15601 Ph #(724) 834-2990 For More Information: robertslone223@gmail.com www.pawb.uscourts.gov/easi.htm

Robert H. Slone, Esquire Bankruptcy Trustee 223 South Maple Avenue Greensburg, PA 15601 Ph #(724) 834-2990

IN RE: ADOPTION OF BRI'LEIGH PISHKO

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF FAYETTE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA ORPHANS' COURT DIVISION NO. 6 ADOPT 2020

NOTICE

TO: Unknown Father

A petition has been filed asking the Court to put an end to all rights you have to your child, Bri'Leigh Pishko. The court has set a hearing to consider ending your rights to your child. That hearing will be held in Courtroom No. 4 of the Fayette County Courthouse, Uniontown, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, on April 2, 2020, at 1:30 PM. You are warned that even if you fail to appear at the scheduled hearing, the hearing will go on without you and your rights to your child may be ended by the court without your being there.

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE HEARING BY A LAWYER. YOU SHOULD TAKE THIS PAPER TO YOUR LAWYER AT ONCE. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A LAWYER OR CANNOT AFFORD ONE, GO TO OR TELEPHONE THE OFFICE SET FORTH BELOW TO FIND OUT WHERE YOU CAN GET LEGAL HELP. THIS OFFICE CAN PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT HIRING A LAWYER.

IF YOU CANNOT AFFORD TO HIRE A LAWYER, THIS OFFICE MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT AGENCIES THAT MAY OFFER LEGAL SERVICES TO ELIGIBLE PERSONS AT A REDUCED FEE OR NO FEE.

PENNSYLVANIA BAR ASSOCIATION 100 SOUTH STREET PO BOX 186 HARRISBURG PA 17108 (800) 932-0311

Registers' Notice

Notice by JEFFREY L. REDMAN, Register of Wills and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Orphans' Court Division of the Court of Common Pleas

Notice is hereby given to heirs, legatees, creditors, and all parties in interest that accounts in the following estates have been filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Orphans' Court Division of the Court of Common Pleas as the case may be, on the dates stated and that the same will be presented for confirmation to the Orphans' Court Division of Fayette County on

Monday, March 2, 2020, at 9:30 A.M.

Estate Number	Estate Name	Accountant
2616-0351	EDWARD E. SUCHEVITS	Carol Ferencak, Administratrix DBNCTA

Notice is also hereby given that all of the foregoing Accounts will be called for Audit on Monday, March 16, 2020, at 9:30 A.M.

in Courtroom No. 5 of the **Honorable Joseph M. George Jr.** or his chambers, 3rd Floor, Courthouse, Uniontown, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, at which time the Court will examine and audit said accounts, hear exceptions to same or fix a time therefore, and make distribution of the balance ascertained to be in the hands of the Accountants.

JEFFREY L. REDMAN Register of Wills and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Orphans' Court Division (2 of 2)

JUDICIAL OPINION

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF FAYETTE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL DIVISION

Donald Koffler,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
V.	:	
State Farm Fire & Casualty Company	:	
and Robert Confer,	:	No. 1154 of 2019
Defendant,	:	Honorable Linda R. Cordarc

OPINION

CORDARO, J.

January 31, 2019

Defendants filed Preliminary Objections to Plaintiffs Complaint on August 21, 2019. Defendants raised seven Preliminary Objections. Oral Argument on the matter was held on November 15, 2019.

Defendants First and Second Preliminary Objections are related and will be addressed together. Defendants' First Preliminary Objection states that "Plaintiff cannot state a claim for breach of contract against Mr. Confer and that claim should be dismissed." Defendants' Second Preliminary Objection states that "Plaintiff cannot state a claim for bad faith against Mr. Confer and that claim should be dismissed." After reviewing the Complaint, this Court finds that the Complaint states a claim for breach of contract and a claim for bad faith against Defendant State Farm only.

The Complaint alleges four Counts: Breach of Contract, Insurance Bad Faith, Negligence, and a violation of the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law. The first three counts each use the singular "Defendant" and clearly refer to Defendant State Farm only. See Complaint at ¶38: "Defendant State Farm breached its explicit contractual duty to insure the covered loss." See also, Complaint at ¶39: "...Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant to recover damages pursuant to the insurance policy." Count Three refers to the Defendants in the plural, but then states that "Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant, State Farm, to recover damages... " Complaint at ¶ 67. Count Four, however, dearly refers to both State Farm and Bob Confer and states that "Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, Bob Confer and State Farm, to recover [damages]... " Complaint at ¶77. Because the Complaint does not state a claim for breach of contract or bad faith against Mr. Confer, Defendants' First and Second Preliminary Objections are SUSTAINED.

Defendants' Third Preliminary Objection states that "Plaintiff cannot rely on allegations concerning conduct in the sale of an insurance policy in order to state a claim for bad faith, and these allegations in support of the bad faith claim should be dismissed/ stricken."

In support of their argument, Defendants cite Toy v. Metropolitan Life ins. Co., 928 A.2d 186 (Pa. 2007). In Toy, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that the "Bad Faith Statute" does not provide relief to an insured who alleges that an insurer engaged in unfair or deceptive practices in soliciting the purchase of a policy. Id. at 199-200; see also 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8371.

The holding in Toy is distinguishable from the case at hand. Here, Plaintiff alleges that he purchased a residential property in 2009. That property included a house and an appurtenant structure. At the time Plaintiff purchased the property, the appurtenant structure was occupied by a tenant who continued to live there after Plaintiff purchased the property. After closing the sale, Plaintiff contacted Robert Confer, a State Farm agent, in order to insure the property. Mr. Confer conducted an inspection of the property and was made aware of the presence of the tenant in the appurtenant structure.

Plaintiff then purchased a Homeowners Policy from State Farm. The Declaration Page, attached as Exhibit B to the Complaint, shows that the Dwelling is covered up to \$37,180. The Homeowners Policy, attached as Exhibit C to the Complaint, states under the Coverages Section, Subsection "Dwelling Extension," that"[w]e cover other structures on the residence premises," but "[w]e do not cover other structures... rented or held for rental to a person not a tenant of the dwelling, unless used solely as a private garage."

Plaintiff alleges that on June 5, 2018, the appurtenant structure sustained "considerable wind and water damage." Complaint at ¶15. Plaintiff then alleges that State Farm sent an adjuster to the property, and that on September 8, 2018, State Farm contacted Plaintiff to notify him that the appurtenant structure was not covered under the policy because it was occupied by a tenant.

Unlike in Toy, Plaintiff's allegations of bad faith do not arise from the solicitation of the purchase of a policy due to fraud or deceptive practices. Rather, Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants failed to issue a policy that properly insures the subject property, and are now rejecting a claim that should have been covered under the Policy.

The Bad Faith Statute does not define the term "bad faith," but courts have held that bad faith "encompasses a \vi.de variety of objectionable conduct..." Greene v. United Services Auto. Ass'n, 936 A.2d 1178, 1187-88 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2007). If Plaintiff can prove that State Farm issued a policy knowing that it would deny coverage, and accepted premium payments despite this knowledge, that could potentially fall under the wide variety of objectionable conduct that constitutes bad faith. Defendants' Third Preliminary Objection is OVERRULED.

Defendants' Fourth Preliminary Objection states that "State Farm and Mr. Confer do not owe a fiduciary duty to Plaintiff and those allegations should be dismissed/ stricken."

"While cases involving fiduciary relationships are necessarily fact specific, they usually involve some special vulnerability in one person that creates a unique opportunity for another person to take advantage to their benefit." Yenchi v. Ameriprise Financial, Inc., 161 A.3d 811, 821 (Pa. 2017). The Pennsylvania Supreme Court in Yenchi presents an extensive analysis of situations where a fiduciary relationship may be established such as when there is "overmastering influence' on one side or 'weakness, dependence, or trust, justifiably reposed' on the other side'... "Id. at 823 (citing eToll, Inc. v. Elias/Savion Advertising, Inc., 811 A.2d 10, 23 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2002)). The Yenchi Court further notes, "[f]iduciary duties do not arise 'merely because one party relies on and pays for the specialized skill of the other party."' Id. at 822 (citing eToll, Inc. at 23). Even though the question of the existence of a fiduciary relationship is fact specific, a party asserting the existence of a fiduciary relationship must still adduce facts that could possibly establish such a relationship.

Here, Plaintiff alleges that he "reasonably relied upon the skill and expertise of [State Farm and Mr. Confer when purchasing insurance]. Complaint at Paragraph 14. Plaintiff then asserts that Defendant State Farm "violated its fiduciary [duty] by acting in bad faith... " Complaint at Paragraph 57. There are no other facts alleged in the Complaint regarding the existence of a fiduciary duty.

This Court finds that the Complaint fails to allege any facts that would even potentially give rise to the establishment of a fiduciary relationship between State Farm or Mr. Confer and Plaintiff. Absent from the Complaint are any facts alleging how such a fiduciary relationship was created such as an overwhelming influence on the part of Defendants or a special vulnerability on the part of Plaintiff. The purchase of insurance and reliance on another's expertise alone, even if proven to be true, is insufficient to establish a fiduciary relationship between the parties. Defendants' Fourth Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED.

Defendants' Fifth Preliminary Objection states that "Plaintiff cannot recover contractual benefits for his bad faith claim." This Court disagrees.

Both parties cite to the Pennsylvania "Bad Faith Statute" in support of their arguments. That statute states:

In an action arising under an insurance policy, if the court finds that the insurer has acted in bad faith toward the insured, the court may take all of the following actions:

(1) Award interest on the amount of the claim from the date the claim was made by the insured in an amount equal to the prime rate of interest plus 3%.

- (2) Award punitive damages against the insurer.
- (3) Assess court costs and attorney fees against the insurer.

42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8371. Defendants argue that the Statute does not provide for an award of damages for contractual damages, and that therefore the Plaintiff should be barred by seeking such under the Bad Faith Statute. However, in Pennsylvania, "[b]ad faith will be shown where an insurer has for a frivolous or unfounded reason refused to pay the proceeds of a policy to its insured." Hollock v. Erie Insurance Exchange, 842 A.2d 409, 416 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2004). By its very definition, an insurer who acts in bad faith must also have denied a valid claim, which would be a breach of contract. The appropriate remedy would be for a plaintiff to recover the contractual benefits, plus any of the additional remedies enumerated by Section 8371, i.e., interest, punitive damages, court costs, and attorney fees.

Defendants also argue that the request for contractual benefits under the bad faith claim should be stricken from the Complaint because "the damages are duplicative of those sought for his contract claim." Defendants' Preliminary Objections at Page 6.

An injured party cannot recover twice for the same injury. B.G. Balmer & Co., Inc. v. Frank Crystal & Company, Inc., 148 A.3d 454 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2016) (citing D'Adamo v. Erie Ins. Exch., 4 A.3d 1090, 1096 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2010)). However, the election of remedies doctrine will prevent Plaintiff from recovering duplicative damages under both a claim for breach of contract and bad faith:

[T]he substantive application of the election of remedies doctrine operates to bar windfall judgments or otherwise duplicative recoveries resulting from a single injury; although such inconsistent remedies may be pleaded and pursued in litigation, damages calculated pursuant to only one theory may be recovered.

Gamesa Energy USA, LLC v. Ten Penn Ctr. Assocs., L.P., 217 A.3d 1227, 1239-40 (Pa. 2019) (citing Schwartz v. Rockey, 932 A.2d 885, 892-94 (Pa. 2007)).

In essence, Plaintiff may not recover the same damages twice for the same breach of contract, but Plaintiff need not elect under which doctrine he will pursue remedies at this stage in the proceedings. Defendants' Fifth Preliminary Objection is therefore OVERRULED.

Defendants' Sixth Preliminary Objection states that "Plaintiff cannot recover punitive damages or attorney's fees for negligence." Plaintiff agrees to withdraw this claim. As a result, Defendants' Sixth Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED.

Defendants' Seventh Preliminary Objection states that "Plaintiff cannot recover punitive damages under the [Uniform Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law]."

The general purpose of the Uniform Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, or UTPCPL, "is to protect the public from fraud and unfair or deceptive business practices." Need v. Bavarian Motors, Inc., 882 A.2d 1022, 1029 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2005) (Internal citation omitted). The relevant Section of the Act states:

(a) Any person who purchases or leases goods or services primarily for personal, family or household purposes and thereby suffers any ascertainable loss of money or property, real or personal, as a result of the use or employment by any person of a method, act or practice declared unlawful by section 3 of this act, may bring a private action to recover actual damages or one hundred dollars (\$100), whichever is greater. The court may, in its discretion, award up to three times the actual damages sustained, but not less than one hundred dollars (\$100), and may provide such additional relief as it deems necessary or proper. The court may award to the plaintiff, in addition to other relief provided in this section, costs and reasonable attorney fees.

73 P.S. § 201-9.2 (Internal footnote omitted).

For Defendants' alleged violation of the UTPCPL, Plaintiffs Complaint specifically demands judgment "to recover treble actual damages as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred to date, punitive damages, and any such other and further relief as is just and proper." Plaintiffs first argument in opposition to Defendants' Seventh Preliminary Objection is that punitive damages are allowed under Schwartz v. Rockey, 932 A.2d 885 (Pa. 2007).

Plaintiffs first argument mischaracterizes the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's decision in Schwartz. The Schwartz Court recognizes that "the trebling of damages obviously has a strong punitive dynamic." Id. at 897. The Court also concludes that, "the courts' discretion to treble damages under the UTPCPL should not be closely constrained by the common-law requirements associated with the award of punitive damages." Id. at 898. However, nowhere in the Schwartz decision does the Supreme Court hold that punitive damages can be recovered under the UTPCPL in addition to treble damages.

Plaintiffs second argument is that punitive damages are allowed under the UTPCPL under the category of "such additional relief as [the Court] deems necessary or proper." However, this argument is flawed as well, because established caselaw specifically precludes recovery of punitive damages under the UTPCPL: "although the Act does allow the Court to impose up to treble damages for actual damage sustained, it does not otherwise confer a right to punitive damages." McCauslin v. Reliance Finance Co., 751 A.2d 683, 685 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2000).

Plaintiffs arguments are both "without merit. Plaintiff is limited to requesting damages that are explicitly permitted under the UTPCPL. Defendants' Seventh Preliminaly Objection is SUSTAINED.

In accordance with Pa.R.C.P. 1028(e), Plaintiff has the right to plead over within 20 days after notice of this Order.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of January, 2020, in consideration of Defendants' Preliminary Objections to Plaintiffs Complaint, and after Oral Argument on the matter, it is hereby ORDERED and DIRECTED that the Preliminary Objections are SUSTAINED in part and DENIED in part, for the reasons contained in the accompanying Opinion.

Defendants' First Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED. The Complaint does not assert a claim for breach of contract against Defendant Robert Confer.

Defendants' Second Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED. The Complaint does not assert a claim for bad faith against Defendant Robert Confer.

Defendants' Third Preliminary Objection is OVERRULED. Plaintiffs allegations about facts occurring before the policy was issued may be used to support a claim for bad faith.

Defendants' Fourth Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED. The Complaint does not plead facts that could establish a fiduciary relationship between Defendants and Plaintiff.

Defendants' Fifth Preliminary Objection is OVERRULED. There is no caselaw that precludes an insured from recovering contractual benefits under 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8371.

Defendants' Sixth Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED. Plaintiff withdrew his request for punitive damages and attorney's fees for his negligence claim.

Defendants' Seventh Preliminary Objection is SUSTAINED. Established caselaw specifically precludes recovery of punitive damages under the Uniform Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law.

In accordance with Pa.R.C.P. 1028(e) Plaintiff has the right to plead over within 20 days after notice of this Order.

BY THE COURT: Linda R. Cordaro, Judge

ATTEST: Prothonotary



Pennsylvania Bar Institute

UPCOMING CLE

For more information and to register: www.pbi.org | 1-800-932-4637

Upcoming live simulcast and video replay continuing legal education courses at the Fayette County Bar Association Office, 45 East Main Street, Suite 100, Uniontown.

Registration:	http://www.pbi.org/fayette-county		
March 4	Civil Litigation Update 9:00 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. 5 substantive/1 ethics		
March 24	Handling the Workers' Comp Case 9:00 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. 5 substantive/1 ethics		
March 26	Elder Law Update 2019 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. 3 substantive		
March 31	The Binders on Pennsylvania Evidence 2020 1:00 p.m. to 4:15 p.m. 3 substantive		
April 3	Litigation Blunders, Bloopers and Boons 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. 4 substantive/2 ethics		
April 7	Securing Electronic Communications, Email Etiquette and Ethics 9:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. 2 substantive/1 ethics		
April 14	Sheriff's Sales in Pennsylvania 2020 9:00 a.m. to 1:15 p.m. 3 substantive/1 ethics		
April 23	Personal Injury Law Conference 2019 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. 5 substantive/1 ethics		
April 27	A Day on Ethics 2020 9:00 a.m. to 4:20 p.m. 6 ethics		
April 29	Legal Issues in an Age of Aging 2020 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. 5 substantive/1 ethics		

LUNCH & LEARN SERIES

FCBA LUNCH & LEARN SERIES

The Fayette County Bar Association's next presentation in its Lunch & Learn Series will be:

- Date: Wednesday, March 18th from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
- Location: Courtroom No. 1 of the Fayette County Courthouse

• Discussion topics: Issues in Bank Fraud and Safeguarding your IOLTA Account, Online Wire Transfers for Closings & Electronic Notifications

• Presenters: Daniel Flynn, Fraud Investigations Manager, Karla Strosnider, Operational Risk Manager, and Jacquie Stanley, Senior Vice President and Regional Manager of Commercial Services, all of United Bank.

CLE Credit

1.5 hours of Substantive CLE credit for the program. The fees are as follows:

Members of the FCBA

- No charge for attendance without CLE Credit
- \$10 fee for attendance with CLE Credit

Attorneys admitted to practice in Pennsylvania after January 1, 2012

• No charge for attendance with CLE Credit

Non-members of the FCBA

- \$10 fee for attendance without CLE Credit
- \$40 fee for attendance with CLE Credit

** All fees to be paid at the door ** A light lunch will be provided.

RSVP

If interested in attending, please call Cindy at the Bar office at 724-437-7994 or by email to cindy@fcbar.org on or before Monday, March 16th.





& ASSOCIATES



www.gislaw.com

700 Grant Bldg., 310 Grant St., Pgh., PA 15219