

SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Brown v. Penn Jersey Certified Concrete, Inc.; Oakman v. Penn Jersey Certified Concrete, Inc.; Reed v. Penn Jersey Certified Concrete, Inc.; Thomas v. Penn Jersey Certified Concrete, Inc.

Brown v. Penn Jersey Certified Concrete · No. Nos. 87, 88, 89, and 90 EM 2018 · Decided August 9, 2018

SUMMARY

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania considered consolidated emergency applications to stay proceedings pending disposition of petitions for review in matters involving construction and concrete companies. On August 9, 2018, the court denied the applications; Justice Mundy did not participate.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam
JURISDICTION	Pennsylvania
DECIDED	August 9, 2018
DOCKET	Nos. 87, 88, 89, and 90 EM 2018
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The petitioners filed emergency applications to stay proceedings pending disposition of petitions for review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published per curiam order; no substantive legal rule or analysis is stated.
PARTIES	Constructural Dynamics, Inc., t/a Silvi Concrete Products, Inc., Penn Jersey Certified Concrete, Inc., Alta Industrial Properties, Inc., d/b/a Silvi Concrete of Logan, Inc. v. Shanika Lakiyah Brown, individually and as parent of A.B., minor, Shawn Oakman, Pamela Reed, Karen Thomas, Bridgestone Americas Tire Operations, LLC, Richard Pierson Construction Co., Inc., McCarthy Tire Service Company of New York, Inc.

TOPICS

[appellate procedure](#)[appellate jurisdiction](#)[civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

appellate procedure

civil procedure

construction law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the emergency applications to stay proceedings pending disposition of petitions for review should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The emergency applications to stay proceedings were denied.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive factual discussion. The identified applicants sought to stay ongoing proceedings pending disposition of petitions for review. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania denied the emergency applications.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Four emergency applications to stay proceedings were presented to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania while petitions for review were pending. The court denied the applications.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied