

Uzoma N. Nkwonta\*  
Christopher D. Dodge\*  
Marcos Mocine-McQueen\*  
Robert Golan-Vilella (PA 326187)  
**ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**  
250 Massachusetts Ave. NW,  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 968-4490  
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498  
unkwonta@elias.law  
cdodge@elias.law  
mmcqueen@elias.law  
rgolanvilella@elias.law

Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)  
**THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN**  
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (267) 242-5014  
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300  
adam@boninlaw.com

*\* Pro hac vice application  
forthcoming*

---

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF  
BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

---

David McCormick; Republican  
National Committee; and Republican  
Party of Pennsylvania,

*Petitioners,*

v.

Bucks County Board of Elections,

*Respondent.*

Civil Division

No. 2024-07228

Election Appeal

---

**APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE OF  
DSCC AND BOB CASEY FOR SENATE, INC.**

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. On November 12, 2024, Respondent Bucks County Board of Elections (the “Board”) determined that it would count 404 absentee and mail-in ballots (collectively, “mail ballots”) that were returned in an outer return envelope with a missing or incorrect handwritten date on the pre-printed voter declaration.

2. The Board’s decision was correct. The ballots at issue were undisputedly cast by qualified Pennsylvania voters and timely received by the Board. To have refused to count those ballots on the sole basis of a missing or incorrect handwritten date would have violated the Free and Equal Elections Clause of the Pennsylvania Constitution. *See* Pa. Const. art. I, § 5. Indeed, the Commonwealth Court has expressly concluded as much in two successive, well-reasoned opinions. *See Baxter v. Phila. Bd. of Elections*, No. 1305 C.D. 2024, 2024 WL 4614689 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 30, 2024), *stay issued*, 2024 WL 4650792 (Pa. Nov. 1, 2024) (Mem.); *Black Pol. Empowerment Project v. Schmidt*, No. 283 M.D. 2024, 2024 WL 4002321 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Aug. 30, 2024), *vacated on other grounds*, 322 A.3d 221 (Pa. 2024) (Mem.).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> These decisions were stayed and vacated, respectively, for procedural reasons unrelated to the Commonwealth Court’s repeated conclusion, on the merits, that it would be “unconstitutional” to reject a qualified voter’s ballot due to the date requirement. *Baxter*, 2024 WL 4614689, at \*18; *Black Pol. Empowerment Project*, 2024 WL 4002321, at \*1, \*35 (same).

3. Petitioners David McCormick, the Republican National Committee, and the Republican Party of Pennsylvania ask this Court to turn a blind eye to those serious constitutional concerns and issue an order that would disenfranchise lawful Pennsylvania voters. With apparent indifference to these consequences and the fundamental voting rights of Pennsylvania voters, Petitioners have brought this appeal under 25 P.S. § 3157, asking this Court to reverse the Board’s decision and disenfranchise hundreds of Pennsylvanians who no one disputes are qualified to vote. *See* Pet. for Review in the Nature of a Statutory Appeal 12.

4. Notably, this position is a sharp reversal for Mr. McCormick, who in 2022 argued *precisely the opposite* in litigation surrounding that year’s primary election. Then, Mr. McCormick warned that “qualified voters [would] be disenfranchised” if county boards refused to count mail ballots “simply because the voters failed to handwrite a date on the exterior mailing envelope.” Mot. for Immediate Special Injunction & Supporting Mem. of Law 3, *Dave McCormick for U.S. Senate v. Chapman*, No. 286MD2022 (Pa. Commw. Ct. May 24, 2022). He correctly noted that the date requirement “serves no purpose” and that to enforce it would “serve[] only one purpose—to gratuitously disenfranchise qualified Pennsylvania voters who have cast otherwise valid ballots on a timely basis.” *Id.* at 9, 13.

5. Proposed Intervenors DSCC and Bob Casey for Senate, Inc. (the “Casey Campaign”) are, respectively, the Democratic Party’s national senatorial committee and the organized political campaign in support of Bob Casey Jr. for the office of U.S. Senator for Pennsylvania in the November 2024 general election. Petitioners ask this Court to discard numerous ballots in an election for which Senator Casey is a candidate and in which the vote count is still being determined. As explained more fully below, Proposed Intervenors thus have a legally enforceable interest in this suit that entitles them to intervene in this matter under Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 2327, and none of the factors that could prevent their intervention under Rule 2329 are present.

6. Accordingly, Proposed Intervenors respectfully request that the Court grant this application for leave to intervene and allow them to intervene as respondents in this action.

### **INTERESTS OF PROPOSED INTERVENORS**

7. DSCC is the Democratic Party’s national senatorial committee, as defined by 52 U.S.C. § 30101(14). Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party across the country, including in Pennsylvania, to the U.S. Senate. DSCC works to accomplish its mission by, among other things, assisting state parties throughout the country, including in Pennsylvania, and mobilizing and supporting voters. DSCC has spent millions of dollars in contributions and expenditures to

persuade and mobilize voters to support U.S. Senate candidates who affiliate with the Democratic Party, including Senator Casey. If Petitioners obtain the relief they seek, DSCC will suffer injury both because Democratic voters will be disenfranchised and Senator Casey’s reelection efforts will be harmed.

8. The Casey Campaign is the duly organized political campaign in support of the election of Bob Casey Jr. to the office of U.S. Senator for Pennsylvania in the November 2024 general election. Senator Casey is the Democratic Party candidate for U.S. Senate in Pennsylvania and a sitting U.S. Senator. The Casey Campaign has a core interest in ensuring that its supporters’ votes are counted and that Senator Casey is re-elected to the U.S. Senate. If Petitioners are successful in their attempt to compel the Board to discount mail ballots solely because they lack a correct handwritten date on the voter declaration pre-printed on the outer envelope, they will unlawfully disenfranchise supporters of Senator Casey, harming the Casey Campaign by impairing Senator Casey’s electoral prospects.

## **GROUND ON WHICH INTERVENTION SHOULD BE GRANTED**

### **I. Proposed Intervenors are entitled to intervene under Rule 2327.**

9. Pursuant to Rule 2327 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure, “[a]t any time during the pendency of an action, a person not a party thereto shall be permitted to intervene therein” if “the determination of such action may affect any

legally enforceable interest of such person whether or not such person may be bound by a judgment in the action.” Pa.R.C.P. 2327(4).

10. Courts routinely allow political candidates to intervene in appeals from county board decisions about whether to count ballots in races in which those candidates are competing. *See, e.g., In re Canvass of Absentee & Mail-in Ballots of Nov. 3, 2020 Gen. Election*, 241 A.3d 1058, 1069 (Pa. 2020) (noting trial court’s grant of motion to intervene by candidate in appeal challenging county board’s decision to count mail ballots); *In re Six Ballots in the 2024 Gen. Primary Election*, No. 629 C.D. 2024, 2024 WL 3290384, at \*1–2 (Pa. Commw. Ct. July 3, 2024) (same). Political party committees have also been allowed by courts to intervene in similar cases, including the DSCC in litigation over the precise date requirement at issue in this matter. *See Pa. State Conf. of NAACP Branches v. Sec’y Commonwealth of Pa.*, No. 23-3166, Doc. 129 (3d Cir. Jan. 3, 2024) (granting DSCC intervention).

11. This Court should do the same. Proposed Intervenors plainly have a powerful and legally enforceable interest in this action. This suit is being brought by Senator Casey’s opponent in the 2024 general election and seeks to have ballots discarded in that very race. If Petitioners’ suit succeeds, supporters of Senator Casey who are unquestionably qualified to vote and who did in fact vote for him in the 2024 general election will be disenfranchised. That, in turn, directly harms Senator Casey’s electoral prospects. Proposed Intervenors are therefore entitled to intervene

in this action to advance their interests and the interests of Senator Casey’s supporters under Rule 2327.

**II. None of the exceptions to granting intervention apply here.**

12. Where a proposed intervenor “com[es] within one of the classes described in Rule 2327,” the grant of intervention “is mandatory, unless one of the grounds for refusal of intervention enumerated in Rule 2329 is present.” *Shirley v. Pa. Legis. Reference Bureau*, 318 A.3d 832, 853 (Pa. 2024) (quoting *In re Pa. Crime Comm’n*, 309 A.2d 401, 408 n.11 (Pa. 1973)).

13. Rule 2329 provides three grounds upon which “an application for intervention may be refused.” Pa.R.C.P. 2329. First, if the proposed intervenor’s “claim or defense . . . is not in subordination to and in recognition of the propriety of the action.” Pa.R.C.P. 2329(1). Second, if “the interest of the [proposed intervenor] is already adequately represented.” Pa.R.C.P. 2329(2). And third, if the proposed intervenor “has unduly delayed in making application for intervention or the intervention will unduly delay, embarrass or prejudice the trial or the adjudication of the rights of the parties.” Pa.R.C.P. 2329(3).

14. Because none of these circumstances apply, this Court should grant this application to intervene.

15. *First*, Proposed Intervenors’ defense is “in subordination to and in recognition of the propriety of the action.” Pa.R.C.P. 2329(1). “The general rule is

that an intervenor must take the suit ‘as he finds it.’” *Commonwealth ex rel. Chidsey v. Keystone Mut. Cas. Co.*, 76 A.2d 867, 870 (Pa. 1950) (cleaned up). Proposed Intervenors take this suit as they find it, and simply ask that this Court deny Petitioners any relief.

16. *Second*, Proposed Intervenors’ interests are not adequately represented in this action. As explained above, Proposed Intervenors have interests that will be directly affected by this action, including interests in the enfranchisement of Senator Casey’s supporters and the threat that this suit poses to his competitive prospects in the 2024 general election. *See supra* § I. No other party provides “representation to a satisfactory or acceptable extent” of these interests, *Shirley*, 318 A.3d at 853 (citing dictionary definition). Petitioners, including Senator Casey’s opponent, have asked this Court to throw out the very same ballots that Proposed Intervenors seek to ensure are counted, and thus it is plain that Petitioners do not represent Proposed Intervenors’ interests.

17. The named Respondent, the Bucks County Board of Elections, also does not adequately represent Proposed Intervenors’ interests. The Board’s stake in this lawsuit is defined solely by its statutory duties to conduct elections. *See, e.g.*, 25 P.S. § 2642 (powers and duties of boards of elections); *id.* § 3146.8(g)(3) (adjudication of absentee and mail-in ballots). In contrast, Proposed Intervenors’ interest in this litigation is defined by their interest in supporting Senator Casey’s



electoral prospects—a goal the Board simply does not share—and advocating for the enfranchisement of his supporters—a goal the Board may share only insofar as consistent with its statutory duties. Permitting private entities, like Proposed Intervenors, to intervene is particularly warranted where, as here, the original respondent is a government entity (like the Board) with positions that “are necessarily colored by its view of the public welfare rather than the more parochial views of a proposed intervenor whose interest is personal to it[.]” *Kleissler v. U.S. Forrest Serv.*, 157 F.3d 964, 972 (3d Cir. 1998) (citing *Conservation L. Found. of New England v. Mosbacher*, 966 F.2d 39, 44 (1st Cir. 1992), and *Mausolf v. Babbitt*, 85 F.3d 1295, 1303 (8th Cir. 1996)).

18. *Third*, this intervention is timely. Proposed Intervenors have promptly sought intervention, with this Application coming just the day after the filing of the Petition for Review, and Proposed Intervenors will abide by any deadlines set by the Court in this matter.

19. Alternatively, even if one of the Rule 2329 circumstances were to apply, this Court should exercise its discretion to permit Proposed Intervenors to intervene. *Cf. Shirley*, 318 A.3d at 853 (noting that, where a proposed intervenor satisfies Rule 2327, a court has discretion to allow intervention even if one of the grounds present in Rule 2329 is present); *Larock v. Sugarloaf Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.*, 740 A.2d 308, 313 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1999) (similar). Proposed Intervenors’

clear and direct interests in this urgent and time-sensitive matter amply justify intervention irrespective of any finding the Court may make as to the factors enumerated in Rule 2329.

### **STATEMENT OF THE DEFENSE ASSERTED**

20. The Board's decision to count 404 mail ballots was correct and should be upheld, because to refuse to count those ballots would have violated the Free and Equal Elections Clause of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

\* \* \*

WHEREFORE, Proposed Intervenors respectfully request that this Honorable Court enter an order granting this Application for Leave to Intervene and entering the attached Proposed Answer. Proposed Intervenors further respectfully request that they be provided with the opportunity to submit a memorandum of law in advance of any hearing or decision in this matter.

Dated: November 15, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Adam C. Bonin*

---

Uzoma N. Nkwonta\*  
Christopher D. Dodge\*  
Marcos Mocine-McQueen\*  
Robert Golan-Vilella (PA 326187)  
**ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**  
250 Massachusetts Ave. NW,  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 968-4490  
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498  
unkwonta@elias.law  
cdodge@elias.law  
mmcqueen@elias.law  
rgolanvilella@elias.law

Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)  
**THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN**  
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (267) 242-5014  
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300  
adam@boninlaw.com

*\* Pro hac vice application  
forthcoming*

*Counsel for Proposed Intervenors DSCC and Bob Casey for Senate, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH CASE RECORDS PUBLIC  
ACCESS POLICY**

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Case Records Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

/s/ Adam C. Bonin  
Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on November 15, 2024, I caused a true and correct copy of this document to be served on all counsel of record via PACFile.

/s/ Adam C. Bonin  
Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)

## VERIFICATION

I verify that the fact averments made in the foregoing Application for Leave to Intervene are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. I understand that false statements made therein are subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 relating to unsworn falsification and authorities.

*Christie Roberts*

Dated: November 15, 2024

---

Christie Roberts  
Executive Director, DSCC

**VERIFICATION**

I verify that the fact averments made in the foregoing Application for Leave to Intervene are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. I understand that false statements made therein are subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 relating to unsworn falsification and authorities.

*Tiernan Donohue*

Dated: November 15, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tiernan Donohue  
Campaign Manager, Bob Casey for Senate, Inc.

Uzoma N. Nkwonta\*  
Christopher D. Dodge\*  
Marcos Mocine-McQueen\*  
Robert Golan-Vilella (PA 326187)  
**ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**  
250 Massachusetts Ave. NW,  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 968-4490  
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498  
unkwonta@elias.law  
cdodge@elias.law  
mmcqueen@elias.law  
rgolanvilella@elias.law

Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)  
**THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN**  
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (267) 242-5014  
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300  
adam@boninlaw.com

*\* Pro hac vice application  
forthcoming*

---

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF  
BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

---

David McCormick; Republican  
National Committee; and Republican  
Party of Pennsylvania,

*Petitioners,*

v.

Bucks County Board of Elections,

*Respondent.*

Civil Division

No. 2024-07228

Election Appeal

---

**PROPOSED ANSWER**

---

Proposed Intervenor-Respondents DSCC and Bob Casey for Senate, Inc. (“Proposed Intervenor”), by and through their attorneys, submit the following Proposed Answer to Petitioners’ Petition for Review of the decision of the Bucks County Board of Elections on November 12, 2024, to count undated or misdated mail ballots in the November 5, 2024 General Election. Proposed Intervenor respond to the allegations in the Petition as follows:

1. Proposed Intervenor admit the allegations in Paragraph 1.
2. Paragraph 2 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.
3. Paragraph 3 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.
4. Paragraph 4 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.
5. Proposed Intervenor deny that the Bucks County Board of Elections voted to count 405 undated or misdated mail ballots; the video recording of the Board’s November 12, 2024 meeting, which Petitioners cite in Paragraph 16 of their



Petition, demonstrates the Board voted on 404 undated or misdated ballots.<sup>1</sup>

Paragraph 5 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the remaining allegations.

6. Paragraph 6 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations.

7. Paragraph 7 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations.

8. Paragraph 8 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations.

9. Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations in Paragraph 9.

10. Paragraph 10 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bucks County Meeting Portal, Board of Elections - November 12, 2024, at 1:21:30-1:22:00, <https://buckscompa.portal.civicclerk.com/event/505/media>.

## JURISDICTION

11. Paragraph 11 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required.

## PARTIES

12. Proposed Intervenors admit that Petitioner David McCormick is the Republican Party candidate for U.S. Senate. Proposed Intervenors deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 12.

13. Proposed Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 13.

14. Proposed Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 14.

15. Proposed Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 15.

## DECISION OF THE BOARD AT ISSUE

16. Proposed Intervenors admit that at a public meeting on November 12, 2024, the Bucks County Board of Elections voted to count undated or misdated mail ballots. Paragraph 16 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required.

17. Proposed Intervenors admit that Petitioners objected to the Board's decision to count undated and misdated ballots and now appeal that decision.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

18. Proposed Intervenors admit that the General Assembly amended the Election Code in 2019 to permit all Pennsylvanians to vote by mail without any

excuse. Paragraph 18 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required.

19. Paragraph 19 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required.

20. Paragraph 20 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations.

21. Proposed Intervenors admit that litigants have filed lawsuits seeking invalidation of the date requirement. Paragraph 21 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations.

22. Proposed Intervenors admit that litigants have argued that the date requirement violates the materiality provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Paragraph 22 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the remaining allegations.

23. Proposed Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 23.

24. Proposed Intervenors admit that litigants filed a King's Bench petition seeking to invalidate the date requirement, and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court

issued an order on October 5, 2024, that contains the quoted text. Paragraph 24 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required.

25. Paragraph 25 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations.

26. Proposed Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 26.

27. Proposed Intervenors deny that the Board voted to count 405 mail ballots that were undated or misdated; the video recording of the Board's November 12, 2024 meeting, which Petitioners cite in Paragraph 16 of their Petition, demonstrates the Board voted on 404 undated or misdated ballots. Paragraph 27 otherwise contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenors deny the remaining allegations.

28. Proposed Intervenors admit that Petitioners objected to the Board's decision to count undated and misdated ballots.

### **GROUND FOR APPEAL**

29. Proposed Intervenors deny the allegations in Paragraph 29.

30. Paragraph 30 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.

31. Paragraph 31 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.

32. Paragraph 32 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.

33. Paragraph 33 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.

34. Paragraph 34 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.

35. Paragraph 35 contains mere characterizations, legal contentions, and conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations.

36. Proposed Intervenor deny the allegations in Paragraph 36.

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Proposed Intervenors deny that Petitioners are entitled to any relief.

## **GENERAL DENIAL**

Proposed Intervenors deny every allegation in the Compliant that is not expressly admitted herein.

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

1. Petitioners' claim is barred because they seek relief inconsistent with the Pennsylvania Constitution's Free and Equal Elections Clause.
2. Petitioners' claim is barred by the doctrine of judicial estoppel.

Dated: November 15, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Adam C. Bonin

---

Uzoma N. Nkwonta\*  
Christopher D. Dodge\*  
Marcos Mocine-McQueen\*  
Robert Golan-Vilella (PA 326187)  
**ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**  
250 Massachusetts Ave. NW,  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 968-4490  
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498  
unkwonta@elias.law  
cdodge@elias.law  
mmcqueen@elias.law  
rgolanvilella@elias.law

Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)  
**THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN**  
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (267) 242-5014  
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300  
adam@boninlaw.com

*\* Pro hac vice application  
forthcoming*

*Counsel for Proposed Intervenors DSCC and Bob Casey for Senate, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH CASE RECORDS PUBLIC  
ACCESS POLICY**

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Case Records Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

/s/ Adam C. Bonin  
Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on November 15, 2024, I caused a true and correct copy of this document to be served on all counsel of record via PACFile.

/s/ Adam C. Bonin  
Adam C. Bonin (PA 80929)