

1 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
2 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
3 JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

4 In re: Conduct of Supreme Court Justice Rolf Larsen

5 \*\*\*

6 Stenographic record of hearing held in  
7 Room 140, Main Capitol, Harrisburg,  
8 Pennsylvania

9 Friday, April 22, 1994, 11:00 a.m.

10 SUBCOMMITTEE ON COURTS

11 Hon. Frank Dermody, Chairman, Subcommittee Chairman  
12 Hon. Daniel Clark, Subcommittee Co-Chairman  
13 Hon. Thomas Caltagirone, Chairman, Judiciary Committee  
14 Hon. Jeffrey Piccola, Co-Chairman, Judiciary Committee  
15 Hon. Gregory Fajt, Member  
16 Hon. Michael Gruitza, Member  
17 Hon. Babette Josephs, Member  
18 Hon. Dennis O'Brien, Member  
19 Hon. Chris Wogan, Member

20 Counsel Present:

21 John P. Moses, Special Counsel  
22 J. Clayton Undercofler, Special Counsel  
23 David R. Moffett, Special Counsel  
24 Enid Stebbins, Esquire  
25 William Andring, Counsel to Judiciary Committee  
Mary Woolley, Counsel to Judiciary Committee

26 Staff Present:

27 David Krantz, Executive Director  
28 Margaret Tracarico, Secretary to the Committee  
29 Karon Haring, Secretary to Mr. Dermody  
30 Richard Scott, Esquire  
31 Karon Dalton, Esquire  
32 Mary Beth Marschik, Research Analyst  
33 Hugh Mallet  
34 David Vandegrift  
35 Thomas Andrews

Reported by:  
Emily R. Clark, RPR

	I N D E X	
	SPEAKERS	PAGE
1		
2		
3	Hon. Frank Dermody	3
4	Hon. Daniel Clark	15
5	Hon. Thomas Caltagirone	17
6	Hon. Jeffrey Piccola	18
7	Hon. Greg Fajt	20
8	Hon. Mike Gruitza	21
9	Hon. Dennis O'Brien	22
10	Hon. Babette Josephs	28
11	* * * * *	
12		
13	Roll Call Vote, page 29	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1           CHAIRMAN DERMODY: I would like to call to order  
2 this meeting, this voting meeting of the subcommittee on  
3 courts.

4           Karon, would you please call the roll.

5           MS. HARING: Dermody?

6           CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Here.

7           MS. HARING: Fajt.

8           REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Here.

9           MS. HARING: Gruitza.

10          REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Here.

11          MS. HARING: Josephs.

12          REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Here.

13          MS. HARING: Caltagirone.

14          REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Here.

15          MS. HARING: Clark?

16          CO-CHAIRMAN CLARK: Here.

17          MS. HARING: O'Brien?

18          (No audible response.)

19          MS. HARING: Wogan?

20          REPRESENTATIVE WOGAN: Here.

21          MS. HARING: Piccola?

22          REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Here.

23          CHAIRMAN DERMODY: We have a quorum.

24                 I would like to read a statement before we get  
25 started here this morning.

1           This is a sad and serious day in the history of  
2 this great Commonwealth. Our purpose here today is to  
3 consider a recommendation to the Judiciary Committee that they  
4 pass a resolution including Articles of Impeachment against a  
5 Supreme Court justice. Fortunately, our deliberations have  
6 been defined by a fair and independent investigation conducted  
7 by this subcommittee and special counsel.

8           The last time this House was asked to consider  
9 such a matter was in 1811, when Judge Thomas Cooper, a Common  
10 Pleas judge, had Articles of Impeachment filed against him.  
11 Never before has a justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court  
12 been subject to Articles of Impeachment.

13           As a lawyer and a citizen, I am saddened by the  
14 task confronting us. However, I am consoled to some extent by  
15 the deliberate bipartisan and fair conduct of my colleagues on  
16 this subcommittee.

17           My life as a lawyer and a legislator was molded by  
18 my belief that the process of justice was fair, always fair.  
19 My life as a lawyer and a legislator was molded by a belief  
20 that this system of justice was concerned with what issues are  
21 before it, it was based on what issues are before it, not who  
22 is before it, before the court.

23           This investigation has revealed serious  
24 misbehavior in office by a judge of our highest court, Justice  
25 Rolf Larsen. That court's unacceptable behavior from an

1 individual who enjoys one of our highest offices cannot and  
2 will not be tolerated by the citizens of Pennsylvania.

3 I call on my colleagues on this subcommittee to  
4 once again display their courage by joining in my recommended  
5 report to the Judiciary Committee, and that recommendation is  
6 that the Judiciary Committee report the following Articles of  
7 Impeachment to the full House of Representatives, a resolution  
8 impeaching Rolf Larsen, Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme  
9 Court, for misbehavior in office.

10 Be it resolved that Rolf Larsen, a Justice of the  
11 Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, be  
12 impeached for misbehavior in office, and that the following  
13 Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the Senate.

14 Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House of  
15 Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the  
16 names of itself, and all of the people of Pennsylvania,  
17 against Rolf Larsen, a Justice of the Supreme Court of  
18 Pennsylvania, in maintenance and support of its impeachment  
19 against him for misbehavior in office.

20 Article I. From at least 1980, and continuing  
21 into 1991, Justice Larsen instructed his office staff to track  
22 certain petitions for allowance of appeal to the Supreme Court  
23 of Pennsylvania, so that the petitions could be specially  
24 handled by the justice and his staff. These petitions were  
25 put on a special list and tracked, not because of the legal

1 issues presented, but because the attorneys involved were  
2 friends of and made political contributions to Justice  
3 Larsen.

4           Contrary to his ordinary practice, Justice Larsen  
5 would have papers relating to petitions on the special list  
6 brought to his attention as soon as they came into his office,  
7 and would demand to be notified when allocatur reports in such  
8 cases assigned to other justices were received by his office.  
9 In certain cases, he would write allocatur reports or counter  
10 reports recommending allowance or denial of appeal, according  
11 to the positions espoused by the attorneys who were his  
12 friends and political contributors. In others, he would join  
13 or oppose the recommendation of other justices, according to  
14 the positions espoused by the attorneys who were his friends  
15 and political contributors.

16           In some instances, Justice Larsen would take  
17 affirmative steps to cause a petition to be granted through  
18 the allocatur process, which is not in public view, and would  
19 then recuse himself when the same case was heard on the  
20 merits, because of his association with an attorney involved  
21 in the case.

22           By such conduct, Justice Larsen abused his  
23 judicial discretion, acted on account of selected private  
24 interests, and failed to act in a fair and impartial manner  
25 with respect to all litigants seeking to have appeals heard

1 before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

2           Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
3 impeachable offense warranting removal from and  
4 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
5 this Commonwealth.

6           Article II. Richard Gilardi, Esquire, once a  
7 friend and political supporter of Justice Larsen, represented  
8 parties in two cases in which petitions for allowance of  
9 appeal were pending before the Supreme Court in early 1988.  
10 The cases were Buttermore versus Aliquippa Hospital and  
11 Driscoll versus Carpenters District Council of Western  
12 Pennsylvania.

13           In early 1988, Gilardi met Justice Larsen and  
14 requested that Justice Larsen, contrary to his ordinary  
15 practice, personally review the pending petitions and briefs  
16 in opposition. At Judge Larsen's direction, Gilardi came to  
17 Judge Larsen's chambers and gave Justice Larsen copies of the  
18 cover pages from the Buttermore and Driscoll cases. On each  
19 cover page, as requested by Justice Larsen, Gilardi indicated  
20 in writing the position that Gilardi was advocating. On the  
21 cover sheet for the Buttermore case, in which Gilardi's client  
22 was opposing allowance of appeal, Gilardi wrote the word  
23 "no." On the cover sheet for the Driscoll case, in which  
24 Gilardi's client was seeking allowance of appeal, Gilardi  
25 wrote the word "yes."

1           In Buttermore, Larsen recommended denial of  
2 appeal, consistent with the position being advocated by  
3 Gilardi. In Driscoll, Justice Larsen voted to join in Justice  
4 McDermott's recommendation that appeal be allowed, again, in  
5 accordance with the position advocated by Gilardi.

6           By encouraging an improper ex parte contact by  
7 Attorney Gilardi, at a time when Gilardi had cases pending  
8 before the Supreme Court, and by taking steps to benefit  
9 Gilardi's position in those cases, Justice Larsen abused his  
10 judicial discretion, acted on account of selected private  
11 interests, and failed to act in a fair and impartial manner  
12 with respect to all litigants seeking to have appeals heard  
13 before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

14           Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
15 impeachable offense, warranting removal from office and  
16 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
17 this Commonwealth.

18           Article III. On April 19th and 20th, 1993, July  
19 19th, 1993, and September 9th, 1993, Justice Larsen testified  
20 before the Ninth Statewide Investigating Grand Jury in  
21 connection with Grand Jury Notice No. 9. In the course of his  
22 testimony, Justice Larsen, while under oath to tell the truth,  
23 the whole truth and nothing but the truth, did knowingly and  
24 contrary to that oath, make false statements which were  
25 intended to mislead the grand jury.



1                   One false statement was, in substance, that  
2 Justice Larsen never discussed with Richard Gilardi, Esquire,  
3 two pending petitions for allowance of appeal in which Gilardi  
4 represented a party in early 1988.

5                   A second false statement was, in substance, that  
6 Attorney Gilardi never delivered to Judge Larsen's chambers  
7 the cover sheets from the Buttermore and Driscoll petitions  
8 for allowance of appeal in early 1988 or at any other time.

9                   Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
10 impeachable offense warranting removal from office and  
11 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
12 this Commonwealth.

13                   Article IV. On or about May 30th, 1986, Justice  
14 Larsen initiated a private ex parte meeting with Judge Eunice  
15 Ross of the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas in her  
16 chambers on May 30th, 1986, regarding a civil court case then  
17 pending before Judge Ross. In the meeting, Justice Larsen  
18 provided information from an alleged undisclosed source which  
19 was potentially beneficial to a litigant in the matter who was  
20 represented by Attorney James Ashton, a friend of Justice  
21 Larsen.

22                   Justice Larsen disregarded accepted channels of  
23 communication in providing the information ex parte to Judge  
24 Ross, raising an appearance of impropriety, detrimental to  
25 public confidence in the judiciary.

1           Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
2 impeachable offense warranting removal from office and  
3 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
4 this Commonwealth.

5           Article V. On October 14th, 1992, the  
6 Pennsylvania Supreme Court adopted the recommendation of the  
7 Judicial Inquiry and Review Board that Justice Larsen be  
8 publicly reprimanded for the improper ex parte communication  
9 with Judge Eunice Ross on or about May 30th, 1986. Justice  
10 Stephen A. Zappala and Justice Ralph J. Cappy voted in favor  
11 of the Order, while Justice Nicholas P. Papadakos dissented.

12           On or about November 24th, 1992, and December  
13 15th, 1992, Justice Larsen, acting pro se, filed a petition  
14 and supplemental petition for disqualification and recusal of  
15 Justices Cappy and Zappala, alleging that they and other  
16 individuals had engaged in various forms of criminal and other  
17 misconduct. Justice Larsen verified that the allegations of  
18 each petition were true and correct, and subject to the  
19 Pennsylvania statute prohibiting unsworn falsification to  
20 authorities.

21           The following sworn allegations in the petitions  
22 by Justice Larsen were made in bad faith, with reckless  
23 disregard for the truth:

24           1. That Justice Zappala received kickbacks for  
25 directing bond work to his brother's underwriting firm,

1 and was being investigated for this conduct.

2 2. That Justice Zappala met ex parte with  
3 litigants in the Port Authority and PLRB cases, and  
4 guided those matters through the Supreme Court in a  
5 special manner.

6 3. That Attorney John Doherty attempted to suborn  
7 perjury by Nikolai Zdrale, and was rewarded by Justices  
8 Zappala and Cappy for doing so by appointment to the  
9 position of chief disciplinary counsel.

10 4. That Justice Cappy deliberately engineered the  
11 reconsideration of Nikolai Zdrale's out-of-time petition  
12 in the appeal of his conviction for attempted murder to  
13 the Supreme Court.

14 5. That Justice Zappala commandeered a vehicle  
15 and attempted to run Justice Larsen down.

16 By such conduct, Justice Larsen misused the legal  
17 process in an attempt to obtain a reversal of his own  
18 reprimand for judicial misconduct. Justice Larsen  
19 deliberately made serious and damaging allegations without a  
20 reasonable basis to believe the truth of those allegations at  
21 the time they were made. Justice Larsen could not later  
22 supply credible evidence to support the allegations when given  
23 the opportunity to do so. The allegations were made in a  
24 public filing, designed to bring his fellow justices on the  
25 Supreme Court of Pennsylvania into disrepute, and have

1 undermined public confidence in the integrity of the court  
2 system of the Commonwealth.

3           Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
4 impeachable offense warranting removal from office and  
5 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
6 this Commonwealth.

7           Article VI. From at least 1981 and continuing  
8 into 1993, Justice Larsen regularly obtained certain  
9 anti-anxiety and anti-depressant drugs for his own use by  
10 having one of his physicians, Dr. Earl Humphreys, issue  
11 prescriptions for the drugs in the names of members of Judge  
12 Larsen's staff. The drugs included Valium, Diazepam, Ativan  
13 and Serax, all Schedule IV controlled substances under the  
14 Controlled Substances, Drug, Device and Cosmetics Act. At  
15 Judge Larsen's direction, the staff members would pick up the  
16 drugs at a pharmacy, then give the drugs to Justice Larsen for  
17 his own use. Payment for the drugs would be made under the  
18 staff member's taxpayer-funded employee benefit plan.

19           Justice Larsen misused the prominence and  
20 authority of his position as a Supreme Court justice to  
21 influence court employees to participate in an unlawful  
22 conspiracy to conceal his prescription drug use, exposing  
23 them, as well as Dr. Humphreys, to potential prosecution under  
24 Pennsylvania's criminal laws and other serious consequences.  
25 A 12-person jury in Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas

1 found Justice Larsen guilty of felony conspiracy charges  
2 beyond a reasonable doubt.

3           Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
4 impeachable offense warranting removal from office and  
5 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
6 this Commonwealth.

7           Article VII. Justice Larsen, who as a  
8 Pennsylvania Supreme Court justice took an oath to defend the  
9 Constitutions of the United States and the Commonwealth of  
10 Pennsylvania, and to discharge the duties of his office with  
11 fidelity, and who is bound to uphold the integrity of the  
12 judiciary, to avoid impropriety and the appearance of  
13 impropriety, and to perform the duties of his office  
14 impartially, did, through actions including:

15           A, maintaining a system to specially track  
16 selected petitions for allowance of appeal in cases in  
17 which counsel to one of the parties was a friend of  
18 Judge Larsen's;

19           B, improperly meeting ex parte with attorney  
20 Richard Gilardi, and giving preferential treatment to  
21 petitions for allowance of appeal in two cases in which  
22 one of the parties was represented by Mr. Gilardi;

23           C, falsely testifying before the Grand Jury that  
24 the ex parte contact with Richard Gilardi concerning two  
25 pending petitions for allowance of appeal never took

1 place;

2 D, initiating an improper ex parte meeting with  
3 Judge Eunice Ross, in a matter involving a friend who  
4 was counsel to a party in a case pending before Judge  
5 Ross;

6 E, deliberately misusing the legal process in  
7 making unfounded allegations of criminal and judicial  
8 misconduct against Justices Cappy and Zappala; and,

9 F, misusing his position as a Supreme Court  
10 justice to induce court employees to engage in criminal  
11 misconduct, did undermine confidence in the integrity  
12 and impartiality of the judiciary, and betray the trust  
13 of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,  
14 thereby bringing disrepute on the courts of the  
15 Commonwealth, and rendering Justice Larsen unfit to  
16 continue to serve as a justice of the Supreme Court of  
17 Pennsylvania.

18 Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an  
19 impeachable offense warranting removal from office and  
20 disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under  
21 this Commonwealth.

22 Is there a motion to recommend the Articles of  
23 impeachment?

24 CO-CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Chairman, first, I would  
25 ask that Representative O'Brien's name be added to the roll.

1 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Let the record reflect  
2 Representative O'Brien's presence.

3 CO-CHAIRMAN CLARK: I move the foregoing  
4 resolution before the committee.

5 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Is there a second?

6 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: There is a second.

7 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Seconded by Chairman  
8 Caltagirone, the motion made by Representative Clark.

9 Are there any statements? I believe several  
10 members would like to make statements who have comments and  
11 remarks. We'll start with Representative Clark.

12 CO-CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 It's important today to consider what these  
14 proceedings can do and what these proceedings cannot do.  
15 First, these proceedings can inform the citizens of the  
16 Commonwealth, our judiciary, and members of the Pennsylvania  
17 bar, that the conduct which Justice Larsen engaged in is  
18 unacceptable, will not be condoned and is action to which this  
19 committee can and will attach consequences. We hope our  
20 action will begin a process which upholds the integrity of the  
21 judiciary, and restores the confidence in a fair and impartial  
22 judicial system.

23 What these proceedings cannot do is assure the  
24 citizens of the Commonwealth and members of the Pennsylvania  
25 bar and judiciary, that such conduct will not occur again.

1 And therefore, we cannot restore their complete faith and  
2 confidence in the Pennsylvania court system. These  
3 proceedings cannot give that assurance because of the secrecy  
4 with which our Supreme Court conducts its proceedings, and  
5 because of the unwritten practices and procedures followed by  
6 our Supreme Court.

7           This committee's work is a reaction to Judge  
8 Larsen's conduct, and further steps must be taken by the  
9 legislature and the Supreme Court to assure the citizens of  
10 the Commonwealth and members of the Pennsylvania bar that such  
11 conduct cannot and will not occur in the future.

12           Let's focus on Judge Larsen's conduct: Special  
13 case handling, misleading a grand jury, attacking the  
14 reputation and integrity of fellow Supreme Court justices,  
15 attempting to influence lower court case outcomes, and using  
16 employees for improper purposes. It truly has made our  
17 Supreme Court less effective, less efficient, and has brought  
18 the Supreme Court into disrepute within the Commonwealth as  
19 well as within the nation. Once again, Pennsylvania has  
20 gained national notoriety for the wrong reasons.

21           We need to continually work, not only to attach  
22 consequences to the actions of Justice Larsen, but also to  
23 take the steps necessary to see that such actions cannot and  
24 will not occur in the future. Thank you.

25           CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Chairman Caltagirone?



1                   REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Mr.  
2 Chairman.

3                   As we all know, these proceedings have reached  
4 historic proportions. They've been historic not only in the  
5 importance of the matter, information and recommendation  
6 before us, but also because we in the House last embarked on  
7 such proceedings 183 years ago. I do not then exaggerate when  
8 I state that we step into new, complicated and extremely  
9 weighted and rough legal terrain. I thus feel that it's  
10 extremely warranted and justified to thank the members of the  
11 Subcommittee on Courts for completing an exceptional job.  
12 You've done extremely well in leading us into this  
13 investigation and in making your recommendation.

14                   I especially wish to thank Special Counsel John  
15 Moses, Clayton Undercofler, David Moffitt and Hugh Mallet for  
16 the professional and judicious manner in assisting the  
17 subcommittee in its investigation and reaching its  
18 recommendation. The members of the special counsel  
19 meticulously researched all the information and conducted a  
20 thorough investigation of the facts. Therefore, the work of  
21 the subcommittee and the special counsel also has become  
22 historic. It will be referred to, if the need ever arises  
23 again in the future.

24                   I must state that I, as majority chairman of the  
25 House Judiciary Committee, accept the recommendations of the

1 subcommittee, and upon the completion of the vote, however it  
2 turns out today, and if it does turn out the way I personally  
3 anticipate, I will convene a full committee meeting at 10:00  
4 a.m. on May the 13th to continue these most historic  
5 deliberations.

6           Although these proceedings are historic, I do not  
7 relish the choices and duties that I as chairman and we as a  
8 committee must face and tackle. I do take great pride in the  
9 diligence that the subcommittee and its staff has shown. I  
10 can assure everyone that such diligence, judiciousness and  
11 professionalism will continue throughout the process.

12           Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13           CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Thank you.

14           Chairman Piccola?

15           REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16           I consider this vote today to be among the most  
17 important that I have ever cast as a member of the House of  
18 Representatives. The members of this subcommittee have  
19 probably spent more time preparing for this vote than any  
20 other they will ever cast.

21           When we were sworn into office, we take a oath to  
22 uphold the Constitution and the laws of the Commonwealth of  
23 Pennsylvania. Justices of the Supreme Court take the same  
24 oath, and they are charged with the responsibility of applying  
25 those laws and the Constitution to the citizens of

1 Pennsylvania with impartiality.

2           The evidence supporting the alleged conduct of  
3 Justice Larsen is overwhelming. That conduct is no longer  
4 alleged conduct. This subcommittee has done an exemplary job  
5 of producing and verifying this evidence. There is no  
6 contradictory evidence, and Justice Larsen has voluntarily  
7 chosen not to address it before this subcommittee.

8           Therefore, the question we must answer is whether  
9 Judge Larsen's conduct rises to the level of misbehavior in  
10 office for which impeachment is warranted. In my view, it  
11 clearly does. All of the Articles of Impeachment are  
12 supportable by the evidence, and the conduct of Justice Larsen  
13 far exceeds the conduct necessary for the House of  
14 Representatives to impeach, and the Senate to convict.

15           I am most disturbed by the conduct set forth in  
16 Article I, and I am pleased that this subcommittee has ranked  
17 it number 1. For any judge to give special consideration or  
18 special favors to litigants that come before them, based on  
19 the personal or political relationships between that judge and  
20 their attorneys, strikes at the very heart of our judicial  
21 system. I would recommend that every judge at every level  
22 take notice of this Article.

23           If our judicial system is to have the respect and  
24 confidence of the people, judges must not only avoid  
25 impropriety, they must avoid the appearance of impropriety.

1           The current system of electing our appellate court  
2 judges created the circumstances under which much of the  
3 improper conduct of Justice Larsen arose. The election system  
4 must be replaced with a system of merit selection of our  
5 appellate court judges.

6           Justice Larsen's conduct merits impeachment, and I  
7 shall vote in the affirmative.

8           Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9           CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Representative Fajt?

10          REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11          I too, would like to lend my comments to the fact  
12 that these hearings have been extremely fair, extremely  
13 impartial, and I think that all of us on the subcommittee owe  
14 a debt of gratitude to Chairman Dermody and Chairman Clark for  
15 their conduct of these hearings, and a special thanks to the  
16 special counsel on both sides.

17          I think all of us here are cognizant of the  
18 personal problems of Justice Rolf Larsen that have come out in  
19 these hearings. I want to go on record as saying that because  
20 of those personal problems, that makes this decision that we  
21 are about to make today, all the more difficult. However, we  
22 cannot overlook the six counts that have been set forth before  
23 us of impropriety by Justice Rolf Larsen. These counts simply  
24 cannot be overlooked.

25          We owe the citizens of the Commonwealth an

1 integrity above and beyond reproach of its Supreme Court and  
2 all of its court, and I think today that I personally will be  
3 sending a message to the citizens of the Commonwealth that  
4 that kind of conduct that we've seen here in these  
5 subcommittee hearings will not be tolerated by anyone who is  
6 entrusted in a position such as Justice Rolf Larsen.

7 I plan on voting in the affirmative on the  
8 resolution.

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Representative Gruitza?

11 REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 I would just state briefly that when this  
13 subcommittee was first convened and we began looking into the  
14 matters that ultimately became incorporated in this report,  
15 that as a member of the subcommittee I came with a very open  
16 mind, with an attitude that I would require that a certain  
17 burden of proof be met before I would be willing to vote in  
18 favor of such a serious remedy, the remedy of impeachment for  
19 impropriety in office.

20 Having gone through this process, I feel that that  
21 burden has clearly been met, that the evidence is compelling  
22 and overwhelming against Justice Larsen. But I think that the  
23 evidence has been demonstrated that it is compelling and  
24 overwhelming, and I think we've been shown through the various  
25 transcripts and the witnesses that have been interviewed that

1 the burden has been met to justify moving forward with an  
2 impeachment.

3 I would add to what Representative Fajt said, that  
4 this thing has been made personally a little more difficult  
5 because I do believe, personally, in some respects, that much  
6 of this could have been avoided, perhaps, had certain matters  
7 been handled differently in terms of some of the conditions  
8 that Justice Larsen was dealing with.

9 I think that any physician in the state has an  
10 obligation to his patient, also, to conduct the business of  
11 his office as a physician in a manner that complies with the  
12 Code of Professional Responsibility and the regulations that  
13 apply to that very important profession, and I think it's  
14 regrettable that perhaps much of this has occurred because of  
15 the treatment that the justice received or the lack thereof.

16 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Thank you, Representative  
17 Gruitza.

18 Representative O'Brien?

19 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 We have come to a critical crossroad in a long,  
21 sad saga which has severely damaged public confidence in the  
22 dispensation of justice by the highest court in our state. It  
23 has also prompted the public to examine us in the House of  
24 Representatives and on this committee to see how responsibly  
25 and properly we fulfill the task imposed upon us by Article

1 VI, Section 6 of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

2 It is hard to believe that the investigative phase  
3 of this story started six years ago in 1988, with the Judicial  
4 Review Board inquiry. That investigation resulted in the  
5 Supreme Court reprimand that set off an astonishing chain  
6 reaction of events which have both fascinated and repelled the  
7 public, and which has led to a serious crisis of confidence in  
8 our governing institutions at the state level.

9 Since that reprimand, the Commonwealth has  
10 experienced a grand jury investigation into serious charges  
11 that Justice Larsen leveled against some of his colleagues on  
12 the court, and which were found to be baseless.

13 We have seen a Grand Jury investigation of Judge  
14 Larsen's own conduct, which led to the filing of criminal  
15 charges by the Attorney General, and a guilty verdict on two  
16 counts of conspiracy related to the fraudulent receipt of  
17 psychotropic drugs for personal treatment. It has also led to  
18 the institution of an impeachment inquiry by our committee and  
19 subcommittee at the direction of the House of  
20 Representatives.

21 Despite the guilty verdict, however, neither the  
22 judicial disciplinary system nor the criminal justice system  
23 has been able to come to grips with the most serious charges  
24 leveled against Justice Larsen. These charges cannot be left  
25 to hang in the air unresolved. We need some official tribunal

1 and a procedure to decide whether these charges should be  
2 dismissed for lack of merit, or whether they are valid and  
3 deserving of punishment. Either outcome, if credible, would  
4 help restore public confidence in the judiciary.

5           The one thing we cannot do is to ignore charges  
6 which have seriously shaken the public's belief in our highest  
7 court as their guarantor of justice and of equal treatment  
8 under the law.

9           Although we are called upon to vote on a number of  
10 very serious charges against Justice Larsen today, I believe  
11 the most serious one centers on significant evidence gathered  
12 by this committee that Justice Larsen has systemically abused  
13 his power as a Supreme Court justice to give improper  
14 advantages to lawyers who are his friends and political  
15 supporters. This strikes at the very heart of everything we  
16 believe in about justice and the rule of law.

17           As I review those charges, I'm especially troubled  
18 by the evidence that Justice Larsen had created a  
19 comprehensive system to assure that his friends and political  
20 supporters received preferential treatment from him when their  
21 cases came before the court on appeal. The testimony from  
22 long-time secretaries and law clerks indicate that this  
23 pattern of special treatment was widespread and that it  
24 persisted over many years. The testimony of such credible  
25 witnesses as Barbara Roberts, Mickey Lydon, Dale Walker and



1 other law clerks and secretaries is far too convincing to  
2 ignore. The evidence of Judge Larsen's relationship with the  
3 attorneys involved in these cases reinforces this conclusion.

4 This charge strikes at the very heart of an  
5 important Constitutional right all Pennsylvanians are supposed  
6 to enjoy. Article I, Section 11 of the Pennsylvania  
7 Constitution states that all courts shall be open, and every  
8 man for an injury done him in his lands, goods, person or  
9 reputation, shall have remedy of due process of law, and right  
10 and justice administered without sale, denial or delay.

11 When people get an advantage in court because  
12 their lawyer has a connection with the judge, they are  
13 deprived of one of the most precious and important of all  
14 rights in a Constitutional democracy, the right to have their  
15 case decided fairly and properly within the law. When the  
16 public becomes aware of this perversion of justice and it sees  
17 no evidence of corrective action, people are bound to form a  
18 perception that they will receive similar treatment before  
19 some other judge.

20 Only by demonstrating to the public that we will  
21 deal forcefully with such systemic miscarriages of justice,  
22 can we hope to restore their confidence in the rule of law.  
23 If people come to believe that they cannot receive justice in  
24 our courts, or if their confidence in the rule of law is lost,  
25 we will lose an important part of what makes us an orderly,

1 successful democratic society.

2 I believe that this charge, more than any other,  
3 compels us to resort to a procedure which has not been  
4 successfully invoked in this Commonwealth since 1811.  
5 However, it should not be overlooked that this is only one of  
6 many charges. This subcommittee has uncovered significant  
7 evidence that Justice Larsen has made reckless and bad faith  
8 allegations, under oath, of criminal misconduct against  
9 colleagues on the court which have further served to erode  
10 public confidence in our courts. Moreover, there is also  
11 substantial evidence of a variety of other improprieties  
12 involving conflicts of interest, fraud and false statements  
13 under oath.

14 One of the most disturbing things that has come to  
15 the attention of the subcommittee is the allegation that  
16 Justice Larsen directed his secretary to alter a will in order  
17 to enrich himself at the expense of an estate. However, this  
18 charge is not before us today.

19 Fortunately, Article VI of the Pennsylvania  
20 Constitution creates a safety valve which gives our system an  
21 opportunity to repair some of the damage which has been  
22 created by this sorry episode. The impeachment process was  
23 designed to deal with those types of misbehavior in office  
24 which, for whatever reason, cannot be fully and effectively  
25 handled through the criminal justice system or the judicial

1 disciplinary process alone. It is an important way of  
2 exposing behavior, casting judgment and imposing penalties  
3 upon prominent public officials whose conduct cannot be  
4 adequately dealt with through more traditional remedies.  
5 Sometimes, it may be the only way to lance an infected wound  
6 which threatens to poison our governing institutions.

7 I believe that is what we are faced with today.  
8 Under this process, the House of Representatives will decide  
9 whether or not there is sufficient evidence of misbehavior in  
10 office to warrant referral of specific charges for trial and  
11 conviction by our colleagues in the State Senate.

12 As I cast my vote today, I do so with the  
13 recognition that it is not our mission to make the final  
14 judgment of guilt or innocence on these charges. That is the  
15 task of the Senate. Instead, I will consider two things as I  
16 cast my vote: First, do the charges constitute the type of  
17 misbehavior in office which warrant referral for a trial by  
18 the Senate; second, is there sufficient evidence to refer  
19 those charges for trial by the Senate.

20 In applying those standards to the massive volume  
21 of testimony and other evidence presented over the course of  
22 the past few days, I have concluded that there is sufficient  
23 evidence of misbehavior in office to justify a full-scale  
24 trial in the Senate. Accordingly, I will vote to recommend  
25 impeachment to the full committee and to the entire House of

1 Representatives on those charges before us today.

2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Thank you, Representative  
4 O'Brien.

5 Representative Josephs?

6 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 I want to add my thanks to the special counsel and  
8 to the subcommittee chair people, and also to our full  
9 committee chair people.

10 I want to also say that this is a very sad day. I  
11 don't think I can add much to what my colleagues have said,  
12 except that I think the message that we're delivering today is  
13 also for ourselves. We also, as people who hold the public  
14 trust as representatives, have a high standard of behavior to  
15 which to we must conform, and we must always remember that  
16 ourselves.

17 I hope that more good will come out of this  
18 regrettable experience than we are feeling today, feeling bad  
19 and feeling very serious about it, and we'll just end up being  
20 a better government, all of us, executives and legislature and  
21 judiciary, from this exposure about what can go wrong and how  
22 seriously wrong.

23 I will be voting also for these Articles.

24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Representative Clark has made a

1 motion to recommend the Articles of Impeachment. That motion  
2 has been seconded by Representative Caltagirone. We'll now  
3 have a vote.

4 Karon, would you please call the roll?

5 MS. HARING: Dermody?

6 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Yes.

7 MS. HARING: Fajt?

8 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Yes.

9 MS. HARING: Gruitza?

10 REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Yes.

11 MS. HARING: Josephs?

12 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Aye.

13 MS. HARING: Caltagirone?

14 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Yes.

15 MS. HARING: Clark?

16 CO-CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes.

17 MS. HARING: O'Brien?

18 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Yes.

19 MS. HARING: Wogan?

20 REPRESENTATIVE WOGAN: Yes.

21 MS. HARING: Piccola?

22 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Yes.

23 MS. HARING: The vote is nine with zero nays.

24 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: The recommendation will be that  
25 the Judiciary Committee report the Articles of Impeachment to

1 the full House of Representatives.

2 We also have the original copy of the Articles  
3 that the members will be requested to sign, and I'm going to  
4 pass those to the members right now.

5 (Recommended Articles of Impeachment were signed.)

6 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Let the record reflect that the  
7 recommendation containing the Articles of Impeachment has been  
8 signed by all the members of the subcommittee, the majority  
9 chairman of the committee and the minority chairman of the  
10 committee, and this recommendation will be now referred to the  
11 full committee.

12 Chairman Caltagirone, is there a motion you would  
13 like to make?

14 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: I would like to make  
15 a motion, Mr. Chairman, and I move that the Subcommittee on  
16 Courts will issue subpoenas for the production of all  
17 documents relating to the Estate of Jesse Holmes, including  
18 documents in the possession and control of S. Michael Streib,  
19 Esquire, Justice Rolf Larsen, or any official or employee of  
20 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or any political subdivision  
21 thereof, and that the chairman of the subcommittee is  
22 authorized to execute and issue such subpoenas.

23 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Is there a second to the  
24 motion?

25 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Second the motion, Mr.

1 Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Seconded by Representative  
3 Piccola.

4 Are there any votes in opposition to the motion to  
5 issue the subpoenas?

6 (No audible response.)

7 CHAIRMAN DERMODY: Let the record show a unanimous  
8 vote in favor of issuing the subpoenas, and the subpoenas will  
9 be issued.

10 At this time I would also like to direct special  
11 counsel to send a copy of the subcommittee's recommendations  
12 to the Judiciary Committee containing the Articles of  
13 Impeachment to William Costopoulos, counsel for Justice Rolf  
14 Larsen.

15 This subcommittee will now be recessed to the call  
16 of the chair.

17 (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at  
18 11:47 a.m.)

19 \* \* \* \* \*

20

21

22

23

24

25

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings, and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same.

*Emily R. Clark*

Emily Clark, CP, CM  
Registered Professional Reporter

NOTARIAL SEAL  
EMILY R. CLARK, Notary Public  
Harrisburg, Dauphin County  
My Commission Expires July 7, 1997

The foregoing certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.





**House of Representatives**  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
HARRISBURG

**A RESOLUTION IMPEACHING ROLF LARSEN**  
**JUSTICE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT**  
**FOR MISBEHAVIOR IN OFFICE**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COURTS**

**Frank Dermody, Chairman, Subcommittee**  
**Daniel Clark, Minority Chairman, Subcommittee**  
**Thomas Caltagirone, Chairman, House Judiciary Committee**  
**Jeffrey E. Piccola, Minority Chairman, House Judiciary Committee**  
**Gregory Fajt, Member**  
**Michael Gruitza, Member**  
**Babette Josephs, Member**  
**Dennis M. O'Brien, Member**  
**Christopher Wogan, Member**

**April 22, 1994**

**A RESOLUTION IMPEACHING ROLF LARSEN, JUSTICE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT, FOR MISBEHAVIOR IN OFFICE**

**BE IT RESOLVED, that Rolf Larsen, a Justice of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, be impeached for misbehavior in office, and that the following Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the Senate:**

**Articles of Impeachment Exhibited by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the Names of Itself and All of the People of Pennsylvania, Against Rolf Larsen, a Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in Maintenance and Support of Its Impeachment Against Him for Misbehavior in Office.**

**Article I**

**From at least 1980 and continuing into 1991, Justice Larsen instructed his office staff to track certain petitions for allowance of appeal to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, so that the petitions could be specially handled by the Justice and his staff. These petitions were put on a special list and tracked not because of the legal issues presented, but because the attorneys involved were friends of and made political contributions to Justice Larsen.**

**Contrary to his ordinary practice, Justice Larsen would have papers relating to petitions on the special list brought to his attention as soon as they came into his office, and would demand to be notified when allocatur reports in such cases assigned to other justices were received by his office. In certain cases, he would write allocatur reports or counter-reports recommending allowance or denial of appeal according to the position espoused by the attorneys who were his friends and political contributors. In others, he would join or**

oppose the recommendation of other justices, according to the position espoused by the attorneys who were his friends and political contributors. In some instances, Justice Larsen would take affirmative steps to cause a petition to be granted through the allocatur process (which is not in the public view) and would then recuse himself when the same case was heard on the merits because of his association with an attorney involved in the case. By such conduct, Justice Larsen abused his judicial discretion, acted on account of selected private interests, and failed to act in a fair and impartial manner with respect to all litigants seeking to have appeals heard before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

## Article II

Richard Gilardi, Esquire, once a friend and political supporter of Justice Larsen, represented parties in two cases in which petitions for allowance of appeal were pending before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in early 1988. The cases were Buttermore v. Aliquippa Hospital, 579 W.D. Alloc. Dkt. 1987, and Driscoll v. Carpenters District Council of Western Pennsylvania, 79 W.D. Alloc. Dkt. 1988. In early 1988, Gilardi met Justice Larsen and requested that Justice Larsen, contrary to his ordinary practice, personally review the pending petitions and the briefs in opposition. At Justice Larsen's direction, Gilardi came to Justice Larsen's chambers and gave Justice Larsen copies of the cover pages from the Buttermore and Driscoll cases. On each cover page, as requested by Justice Larsen,

Gilardi indicated in writing the position that Gilardi was advocating. On the coversheet for the Buttermore case, in which Gilardi's client was opposing allowance of appeal, Gilardi wrote the word "NO." On the coversheet for the Driscoll case, in which Gilardi's client was seeking allowance of appeal, Gilardi wrote the word "YES." In Buttermore, Larsen recommended denial of appeal, consistent with the position being advocated by Gilardi. In Driscoll, Justice Larsen voted to join in Justice McDermott's recommendation that appeal be allowed, again in accordance with the position advocated by Gilardi.

By encouraging an improper ex parte contact by Attorney Gilardi at a time when Gilardi had cases pending before the Supreme Court, and by taking steps to benefit Gilardi's position in those cases, Justice Larsen abused his judicial discretion, acted on account of selected private interests, and failed to act in a fair and impartial manner with respect to all litigants seeking to have appeals heard before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

### Article III

On April 19-20, 1993, July 19, 1993, and September 9, 1993, Justice Larsen testified before the Ninth Statewide Investigating Grand Jury in connection with Grand Jury Notice No. 9. In the course of his testimony, Justice Larsen, while under oath to tell the

truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, did knowingly and contrary to that oath make false statements which were intended to mislead the Grand Jury.

One false statement was, in substance, that Justice Larsen never discussed with Richard Gilardi, Esquire, two pending petitions for allowance of appeal in which Gilardi represented a party in early 1988.

A second false statement was, in substance, that Attorney Gilardi never delivered to Justice Larsen's chambers the cover sheets from the Buttermore and Driscoll petitions for allowance of appeal in early 1988 or at any other time.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

#### Article IV

On or about May 30, 1986, Justice Larsen initiated a private ex parte meeting with Judge Eunice Ross of the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas in her chambers on May 30, 1986, regarding a civil court case then pending before Judge Ross. In the meeting, Justice Larsen provided information from an alleged undisclosed source which was potentially beneficial to a litigant in the matter who was represented by Attorney James Ashton, a friend of Justice Larsen.

Justice Larsen disregarded accepted channels of communication in providing the information ex parte to Judge Ross, raising an appearance of impropriety detrimental to public confidence in the judiciary.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

#### Article V

On October 14, 1992, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court adopted the recommendation of the Judicial Inquiry and Review Board (JIRB) that Justice Larsen be publicly reprimanded for the improper ex parte communication with Judge Eunice Ross on or about May 30, 1986. Justice Stephen A. Zappala and Justice Ralph J. Cappy voted in favor of the Order, while Justice Nicholas P. Papadakos dissented. On or about November 24, 1992 and December 15, 1992, Justice Larsen, acting pro se, filed a petition and supplemental petition for disqualification and recusal of Justices Zappala and Cappy, alleging that they and other individuals had engaged in various forms of criminal and other misconduct. Justice Larsen verified that the allegations of each petition were true and correct, and subject to the Pennsylvania statute prohibiting unsworn falsification to authorities. The following sworn allegations in the petitions by Justice Larsen were made in bad faith, with a reckless disregard for the truth:

1. That Justice Zappala received kickbacks for directing bond work to his brother's underwriting firm, and was being investigated for this conduct.
2. That Justice Zappala met ex parte with litigants in the Port Authority and PLRB cases and guided those matters through the Supreme Court in a special manner.

3. That Attorney John Doherty attempted to suborn perjury by Nikolai Zdrale, and was rewarded by Justices Zappala and Cappy for doing so by appointment to the position of Chief Disciplinary Counsel.
4. That Justice Cappy deliberately engineered the reconsideration of Nikolai Zdrale's "out-of-time" petition in the appeal of his conviction for attempted murder to the Supreme Court.
5. That Justice Zappala commandeered a vehicle and attempted to run Justice Larsen down.

By such conduct, Justice Larsen misused the legal process in an attempt to obtain a reversal of his own reprimand for judicial misconduct. Justice Larsen deliberately made serious and damaging allegations without a reasonable basis to believe the truth of those allegations at the time they were made. Justice Larsen could not later supply credible evidence to support the allegations when given the opportunity to do so. The allegations were made in a public filing designed to bring his fellow justices on the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania into disrepute, and have undermined public confidence in the integrity of the court system of the Commonwealth.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

#### Article VI

From at least 1981 and continuing into 1993, Justice Larsen regularly obtained certain anti-anxiety and anti-depressant drugs for his own use by having one of his physicians, Dr. Earl Humphreys, issue prescriptions for the drugs in the names of members of Justice Larsen's staff. The drugs included valium, diazepam, ativan, and serax, all

Schedule IV controlled substances under the Controlled Substances, Drug, Device, and Cosmetics Act. At Justice Larsen's direction, the staff members would pick up the drugs at a pharmacy, then give the drugs to Justice Larsen for his own use. Payment for the drugs would be made under the staff members' taxpayer-funded state employee benefit plan.

Justice Larsen misused the prominence and authority of his position as a Supreme Court Justice to influence court employees to participate in an unlawful conspiracy to conceal his prescription drug use, exposing them, as well as Dr. Humphreys, to potential prosecution under Pennsylvania's criminal laws and other serious consequences. A twelve-person jury in Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas found Justice Larsen guilty of felony conspiracy charges beyond a reasonable doubt.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

#### Article VII

Justice Larsen, who as a Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice took an oath to defend the Constitutions of the United States and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity, and who is bound to uphold the integrity of the judiciary, to avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety, and to perform the duties of his office impartially, did, through actions including --

a. maintaining a system to specially track selected petitions for allowance of appeal in cases in which counsel to one of the parties was a friend of Justice Larsen;



b. improperly meeting ex parte with Attorney Richard Gilardi, and giving preferential treatment to petitions for allowance of appeal in two cases in which one of the parties was represented by Mr. Gilardi;

c. falsely testifying before the grand jury that the ex parte contact with Richard Gilardi concerning two pending petitions for allowance of appeal never took place;

d. initiating an improper ex parte meeting with Judge Eunice Ross, in a matter involving a friend who was counsel to a party in a case pending before Judge Ross;

e. deliberately misusing the legal process in making unfounded allegations of criminal and judicial misconduct against Justices Zappala and Cappy; and

f. misusing his position as a Supreme Court Justice to induce court employees to engage in criminal misconduct;

undermine confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and betray the trust of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, thereby bringing disrepute on the courts of the Commonwealth, and rendering Justice Larsen unfit to continue to serve as a Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

Wherefore, Justice Rolf Larsen is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.



**House of Representatives**  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
HARRISBURG

AND NOW, this 22nd day of April 1994, we, the undersigned members of the Subcommittee on Courts of the Judiciary Committee of the PA House of Representatives, do by our signature, hereby acknowledge our vote and recommendation, that the Judiciary Committee adopt the foregoing Resolution Impeaching Rolf Larsen, Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, for Misbehavior in Office, and so report to the Judiciary Committee.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Dermody, Chairman  
Subcommittee on Courts

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel Clark, Minority Chairman  
Subcommittee on Courts

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas Caltagirone, Chairman  
House Judiciary Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey E. Piccola, Minority Chairman  
House Judiciary Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory Fajt, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dennis M. O'Brien, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Gruitza, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher Wogan, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Babette Josephs, Member