IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Bethlehem Landfill Company, Appellant	:	
v.	:	
Lower Saucon Township, Lower Saucon Township Council, Priscilla Deleon, Laura Ray, and Victoria Opthof-Cordaro in their official capacities as elected councilpersons for Lower Saucon Township, and Steven Goudsouzian in his official capacity as Lower Saucon Township Solicitor	:	No. 737 C.D. 2025 Argued: October 13, 2026

BEFORE: HONORABLE ANNE E. COVEY, Judge
HONORABLE STACY WALLACE, Judge
HONORABLE MARY HANNAH LEAVITT, Senior Judge

OPINION BY
JUDGE COVEY FILED: November 6, 2026

Bethlehem Landfill Company (BLC) appeals from the Northampton County Common Pleas Court's (trial court) May 14, 2025 order (as amended May 15, 2025) overruling in part, and sustaining in part with leave to file an amended complaint, Lower Saucon Township's (Township),[1] the Township's Council's (Council), the Township's councilpersons Priscilla deLeon's (deLeon), Laura Ray's (Ray), and Victoria Opthof-Cordaro's (Opthof-Cordaro) (collectively, Township Defendants), and the Township's solicitor Steven Goudsouzian's (Solicitor) (collectively, Appellees) Preliminary Objections to BLC's Complaint for Sunshine Act Violation and Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief against the Township,

[1] The Township is a second class township. On November 6, 1973, the citizens of the Township voted to adopt an optional plan of government pursuant to the Home Rule Charter and Optional Plans Law, 53 Pa.C.S. §§ 2901-3171, and to be governed under the Council-Manager plan beginning January 5, 1976.

the Council, and the Township Defendants and Solicitor in their official capacities (Complaint). BLC presents five issues for this Court's review: (1) whether this Court has jurisdiction over this appeal; (2) whether the trial court erred by dismissing Counts IV and V of BLC's Complaint; (3) whether the trial court erred by dismissing Counts I, II, and III of the Complaint when it was not clear and free from doubt that BLC failed to state a claim therein; (4) whether the trial court erred by dismissing Counts I, II, and III of the Complaint with prejudice based on an improper determination that the Township Defendants' alleged secret vote was properly ratified on May 1, 2024; and (5) whether the trial court erred by dismissing Counts I, II, and III of the Complaint with prejudice as moot based on its finding that the BLC failed to appeal from the Council's May 1, 2024 ratification motion. After review, this Court quashes the appeal.

Background

BLC owns and operates a municipal solid waste landfill located in the Township at 2335 Applebutter Road, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania (Landfill).[2] deLeon was a Township resident and Council president. Ray was a Township resident and Council Vice President. Opthof-Cordaro was a Township resident and Council member. Solicitor was the Township's appointed municipal solicitor.

In the process of obtaining federal, state, and local approvals necessary to effectuate a planned expansion of the Landfill (Landfill Expansion), BLC requested that the Township rezone 275.7 acres of Township land (the Property), including the proposed Landfill Expansion area from the Township's Rural Agricultural (RA) zoning designation to the Light Industrial (LI) zoning designation. In addition, because the Property encompassed in the Landfill Expansion was

[2] BLC is a Texas business corporation organized and existing under Delaware law.

encumbered by two separate instruments in favor of the Township filed with the Northampton County Recorder of Deeds at Volume 1994-6, Page 10281 and Volume 1994-6, Page 102074 (collectively, 1994 Recorded Documents), that would preclude development of the Landfill Expansion on certain portions of the Property, BLC also requested that the Township release or terminate the 1994 Recorded Documents to allow for the Landfill Expansion.

On August 14, 2023, Bruce and Ginger Petrie, Andrew and Tina-Louise Krasnansky, Robert and Elizabeth Blasko, and Robert and Cynthia McKellin (collectively, the Petrie Plaintiffs) filed a complaint in the trial court seeking the following declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against the Township and BLC: (1) a declaration that because the Property is subject to what is commonly referred to as the Donated or Dedicated Property Act (DDPA),[3] BLC may not utilize it for purposes inconsistent with the 1994 Recorded Documents without approval of the trial court's Orphans' Court division (Orphans' Court);[4] (2) a declaration that the Township is subject to the DDPA and may not rezone the Property in a manner inconsistent with the 1994 Recorded Documents without Orphans' Court approval; (3) an injunction enjoining the Township from adopting proposed Ordinance No. 2023-05, that would change the Property's zoning designation from RA to LI and change a landfill and waste disposal facility use from one permitted by special exception to one permitted by right in the LI Zoning District, without Orphans' Court approval; and (4) an injunction enjoining the Township from terminating the 1994 Recorded Documents (Petrie Litigation).[5] The Township and BLC jointly defended the Petrie Litigation.

---

[3] Act of December 15, 1959, P.L. 1772, 53 P.S. §§ 3381-3386.

[4] Under the DDPA, the Orphans' Court has jurisdiction over donated property held by a municipality in public trust for use as a public facility. *See* Section 4 of the DDPA, 53 P.S. § 3384.

[5] The Petrie Plaintiffs initiated the Petrie Litigation at trial court Docket No. C-48-CV-2023-6089.

On August 30, 2023, Council - then consisting of Jason Banonis (Banonis), Mark Inglis (Inglis), Sandra Yerger (Yerger), Thomas Carocci (Carocci) and deLeon - took three actions related to the Landfill Expansion. First, Council, by a 4-1 vote - with all members, except for deLeon, voting in favor - authorized the release of the 1994 Recorded Documents in exchange for grants of new and entirely separate conservation easements from BLC on two properties formerly subject to the 1994 Recorded Documents, as well as on other surrounding properties, totaling approximately 193 acres of land. Second, Council, by a 3-2 vote - with Banonis, Inglis, and Carocci in favor, and deLeon and Yerger opposed - adopted Ordinance No. 2023-05, thereby changing the Property's zoning designation from RA to LI and allowing a landfill and waste disposal facility use as one permitted by right in the LI Zoning District. Third, Council, by a 4-1 vote - with all members, except deLeon, voting in favor - adopted and approved an Amended and Restated Host Community Agreement[6] with BLC. Thereafter, BLC filed with the Township its *Phase V Preliminary Land Development & Lot Consolidation Plan* seeking approval for Landfill Expansion onto portions of the Property (Preliminary Land Development Plan). On December 6, 2023, Council, by 3-2 vote - with Banonis, Inglis, and Carocci in favor, and deLeon and Yerger opposed - granted conditional approval of the Preliminary Land Development Plan.

In the November 7, 2023 municipal election, Township residents re-elected deLeon, and elected Ray and Opthof-Cordaro to replace Inglis and Yerger on Council. Before Ray and Opthof-Cordaro took office on January 2, 2024, Opthof-Cordaro made clear her intention to reverse Council's position on the Landfill Expansion and to have the Township join with the Petrie Plaintiffs in the Petrie Litigation in *opposing* the Landfill Expansion. Although the Township and

[6] The record does not further describe the Amended and Restated Host Community Agreement.

BLC filed joint preliminary objections to the complaint in the Petrie Litigation, after the Petrie Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint in January 2024, the Township neither joined BLC's preliminary objections to the amended complaint, nor filed an answer to the amended complaint. Instead, on April 15, 2024, Solicitor filed a brief joining the Petrie Plaintiffs and intervenors' preliminary objections to BLC's preliminary objections (Joinder Brief). *See* Reproduced Record (R.R.) at 155a-156a.

At Council's April 17, 2024 meeting, Banonis and Carocci confirmed that Council had not, either in public or in executive session, voted on the Township's position change in the Petrie Litigation, nor did Council vote to authorize or direct Solicitor to file the Joinder Brief. Thus, BLC objected to the Township's reversal in policy and filing of the Joinder Brief, arguing that either the Township Defendants took official action not voted upon at a public meeting in violation of the Sunshine Act, or Solicitor acted without Council's permission, which was beyond his power under Section 5-12 of the Code of the Township of Lower Saucon (Township Code).[7]

At Council's May 1, 2024 meeting, Banonis and Carocci again confirmed that Council had not voted on the Township's realignment in the Petrie Litigation, either in public or in executive session, before Solicitor filed the Joinder Brief. Nevertheless, Council considered a motion to authorize Solicitor to ratify the Township's Joinder Brief in the Petrie Litigation (Ratification Motion). Before Council voted on the Ratification Motion, BLC declared that because the Ratification Motion was not on Council's May 1, 2024 meeting agenda, and no motion had been made to include it before the meeting commenced, Council's vote thereon would further violate the Sunshine Act. Therefore, BLC objected to Council's adoption of the Ratification Motion and demanded that Opthof-Cordaro

[7] https://ecode360.com/6772414 (last visited Nov. 5, 2026).

recuse herself from voting on Landfill Expansion issues generally, and the Ratification Motion in particular, due to her obvious bias and pecuniary conflicts of interest.[8] Opthof-Cordaro refused to recuse herself, and Council passed the Ratification Motion by a vote of 3-2, with Opthof-Cordaro, Ray, and deLeon in favor, and Banonis and Carocci opposed.

On May 15, 2024, BLC filed the Complaint in the trial court: (1) alleging that Appellees violated the Sunshine Act by taking official action to reverse the Township's position in the Petrie Litigation at a meeting that was not open to the public (Count I); (2) claiming that Appellees violated the Sunshine Act by depriving the public of the statutory prior notice of its vote on the Ratification Motion (Count II); (3) seeking a declaration that the Joinder Brief in the Petrie Litigation was null and void because Solicitor filed it without the express permission of a Council majority (Count III); (4) seeking a declaration that Opthof-Cordaro has conflicts of interest that preclude her from voting on matters related to the Landfill Expansion (Count IV); (5) seeking an injunction preventing Opthof-Cordaro from participating in any future Council vote relating to the Landfill Expansion (Count V); and (6) alleging a promissory estoppel claim against Appellees regarding the Township's previous promise to release the 1994 Recorded Documents (Count VI). *See* R.R. at 4a-159a. Regarding Counts I and II, BLC asked the trial court to declare Council's Joinder Brief null and void, require the Township to rescind the Joinder Brief, and enjoin the Township from re-filing it or otherwise taking action to reverse the

[8] In the Complaint, BLC declared: Opthof-Cordaro campaigned on her position against the Landfill Expansion; she is the founder and spokesperson for Citizens for Responsible Development, a grassroots Landfill opposition group; she raised funds to fight the Landfill Expansion; her parents own property they claimed in separate litigation challenging the validity of Ordinance No. 2023-05 would be negatively affected by the Landfill Expansion; and she conducted legal work on her parents' behalf alongside their counsel, Gary Asteak, Esquire, in that litigation. BLC claimed that Opthof-Cordaro's parents have since withdrawn from that litigation so that she would not have a conflict of interest in voting on Landfill Expansion matters.

Township's position in the Petrie Litigation, and any other pending litigation involving the Landfill Expansion, until such time as Council votes to do so in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

On June 4, 2024, Solicitor filed Preliminary Objections to the Complaint pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure (Civil Rule) 1028(a)(4), Pa.R.Civ.P. 1028(1)(4) (legal insufficiency of a pleading (demurrer)) and, in the alternative, Civil Rule 1028(a)(3), Pa.R.Civ.P. 1028(a)(3) (insufficient specificity in a pleading). *See* R.R. at 161a-330a. Specifically, relative to Counts I and II, Solicitor claimed that BLC did not allege that Solicitor voted on or took other official action relative to the Joinder Brief, and a majority of Council granted him the authority to file the Joinder Brief. Regarding Count III, Solicitor asserted that BLC is not entitled to declaratory judgment against Solicitor where BLC states that claim in the alternative (i.e., it was operative only if a majority of Council did not authorize him to file the Joinder Brief), since declaratory relief requires an actual controversy rather than a mere possibility. Concerning Count VI, Solicitor averred that BLC has failed to allege a single fact that he, in his capacity as Solicitor, made any promise to which BLC seeks enforcement thereof.

The Township Defendants also filed Preliminary Objections to the Complaint on June 4, 2024, pursuant to Civil Rule 1028(a)(4), Pa.R.Civ.P. 1028(1)(4) (legal insufficiency of a pleading (demurrer)), seeking to dismiss Complaint Counts I, II, IV, V, and VI. *See* R.R. at 331a-342a. In particular, the Township Defendants declared that since Council met with Solicitor in an executive session regarding the Township's Landfill Expansion litigation strategy and later cured any alleged violation by later holding an open vote on the matter at a public meeting, BLC failed to assert a valid Sunshine Act violation claim against them in Counts I and II of the Complaint. The Township Defendants further contended that BLC failed in Counts IV and V of the Complaint to plead facts and present the legal

elements necessary to maintain conflict of interest claims against Opthof-Cordaro and/or enjoin her from voting on Landfill matters, as she does not have a conflict of interest, and recusal from future voting was premature. Lastly, the Township Defendants asserted that in Count VI, BLC failed to plead the factual predicates and legal elements necessary to maintain a claim for promissory estoppel. On June 24, 2024, Township Defendants and Solicitor filed their supporting briefs. *See* R.R. at 343a-508a, 509a-519a. That same day, the BLC filed its responses in opposition to Appellees' Preliminary Objections and, on August 9, 2024, filed its supporting memorandum of law. *See* R.R. at 520a-663a. The trial court heard argument on Appellees' Preliminary Objections on October 15, 2024.[9]

On May 14, 2025, the trial court sustained the Township Defendants' Sunshine Act violation demurrers (Counts I and II) with prejudice and sustained Solicitor's demurrer seeking to dismiss the declaratory judgment action (Count III) with prejudice on the basis that since BLC did not appeal from the Township Defendants' action on the Ratification Motion, the issues it raised in Complaint Counts I, II, and III were moot. The trial court also sustained the Township Defendants' demurrer seeking to dismiss BLC's declaratory judgment and injunctive relief claims related to Opthof-Cordaro's alleged conflicts of interest

[9] On April 28, 2025, because Opthof-Cordaro declined to recuse herself from participating in Landfill Expansion matters, and she continued to move to authorize Solicitor to take action that changed the Township's previous legal position on the Landfill Expansion, BLC presented a Motion for a Special and Preliminary Injunction in the trial court's motions court (PI Motion). *See* R.R. at 737a-767a. That same day, the Township Defendants filed an answer and new matter opposing the PI Motion. *See* R.R. at 768a-788a. The trial court denied BLC's request for an emergency special injunction, but directed BLC to have a trial court judge assigned to hear the preliminary injunction portion of the PI Motion. *See* R.R. at 789a-790a. On May 1, 2025, the trial court assigned a presiding judge. On May 9, 2025, the trial court issued a rule for Appellees to show cause why BLC was not entitled to a preliminary injunction. *See* R.R. at 792a-797a. On May 13, 2025, Solicitor filed an answer and new matter opposing the PI Motion. *See* R.R. at 798a-813a. The trial court scheduled a hearing on the PI Motion for June 12, 2025. However, in the interim, the trial court issued its May 14, 2025 order (amended on May 15, 2025) regarding Appellees' Preliminary Objections that rendered the PI Motion moot.

(Counts IV and V) without prejudice, stating: "Opthof-Cordaro's involvement in this litigation, i.e.[,] what, if any, legal work was performed and/or funds were raised and expended, remains unclear." Trial Ct. May 14, 2025 Order at 16 (emphasis omitted). However, because it was "not clear and free from doubt that BLC would be unable to state a claim" against Opthof-Cordaro and "BLC may allege facts that may state a claim" against her, *id*. at 17 n.3, the trial court permitted BLC to file an amended complaint "with respect to Count [IV] and Count [V]" within 20 days. *Id*. at 17; *see also* R.R. at 835a, 838a. Finally, the trial court overruled Township Defendants' demurrer to Count VI concluding that it could not state that it was free and clear from doubt at this stage of the proceedings that BLC will be unable to prove facts sufficient to establish a claim for promissory estoppel. The trial court added: "However, [Township] Defendants may reassert their objections to this claim in a motion for summary judgment." Trial Ct. May 14, 2025 Order at 19. On May 15, 2025, the trial court amended its order and sustained the Solicitor's Preliminary Objection to Count VI with prejudice, but overruled the Township Defendants' Preliminary Objection to Count VI. On June 4, 2025, rather than file an amended complaint, BLC on June 4, 2025, voluntarily, and without the consent of the trial court or any party, filed a Praecipe to Discontinue without prejudice as to Count VI.

On June 11, 2025, BLC appealed to this Court.[10] By June 20, 2025 order, the trial court directed BLC to file a Concise Statement of Errors Complained

---

[10] In reviewing a trial court's order sustaining or overruling preliminary objections, [this Court's] "review is limited to determining whether that court committed an error of law or abused its discretion." *E*[.] *Lampeter Twp. v. Cnty. of Lancaster*, 696 A.2d 884, 886 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1997). To sustain preliminary objections, "it must appear with certainty that the law will not permit recovery and, where any doubt exists as to whether the preliminary objections should be sustained, that doubt should be resolved by a refusal to

of on Appeal pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Appellate Procedure (Appellate Rule) 1925(b), which it did on July 7, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the trial court issued its opinion pursuant to Appellate Rule 1925(a). *See* R.R. at 889a-896a. Therein, the trial court opined that its order was interlocutory, and not a final, appealable order. *See* R.R. at 894a-895a.

On July 18, 2025, Appellees' filed a Joint Motion to Quash (Quashal Motion), arguing that the trial court's May 14, 2025 order, as amended May 15, 2025, is an interlocutory, non-appealable order and, thus, this Court lacks jurisdiction on appeal. On August 1, 2025, BLC opposed the Quashal Motion. By October 3, 2025 Order, this Court directed the Prothonotary to list the Quashal Motion with the merits of this appeal.

Discussion

Because jurisdiction is a threshold requirement, *see Pa. Mfrs.' Ass'n Ins. Co. v. Johnson Matthey, Inc.*, 188 A.3d 396 (Pa. 2018), this Court first addresses the Quashal Motion. Appellees argue that the trial court's May 14, 2025 Order, as amended on May 15, 2025, was not a final, appealable order where, as here, the trial court sustained preliminary objections without prejudice, and with leave to file an amended complaint and, thus, did not dispose of all claims and parties as required by Appellate Rule 341(b)(1), Pa.R.A.P. 341(b), and BLC did not seek a finality determination from the trial court pursuant to Appellate Rule 341(b)(3) and (c)(1), Pa.R.A.P. 341(b)(3), (c)(1).

---

sustain them." *Peerless Publ'ns, Inc. v. Cnty. of Montgomery*, 656 A.2d 547, 550 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995).

West on behalf of S.W. v. Pittsburgh Pub. Sch., 327 A.3d 340, 343 n.7 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2024), *appeal denied*, 362 A.3d 730 (Pa. 2026).

BLC retorts that Appellees overlooked that each of its issues on appeal arise out of the trial court's dismissal with prejudice of BLC's declaratory judgment claims relating to alleged violations of the Sunshine Act (Counts I, II, and III), and/or the trial court's denial of BLC's requests for injunctive relief (Counts I, II, IV, and V), all of which are immediately appealable as of right under Appellate Rule 311(a)(4) and (8). In addition, although the trial court granted BLC leave to amend Counts IV and V of its Complaint, it so limited the scope of any such amendment that the trial court's May 14, 2025 order (amended May 15, 2025) should be treated as a final order under Appellate Rule 341(b)(1).

Initially, Appellate Rule 341 provides, in relevant part:

> **(a) General Rule.** Except as prescribed in subdivisions (d) and (e), an appeal may be taken as of right from any final order of a government unit or trial court.
>
> **(b) Definition of Final Order.** A final order:
>
> (1) **disposes of all claims and of all parties**;
>
> . . . .
>
> (3) is entered as a final order pursuant to subdivision (c)[.]
>
> . . . .
>
> **(c) Determination of Finality.** When more than one claim for relief is presented in an action, whether as a claim, counterclaim, cross-claim, or third-party claim, or when multiple parties are involved, **the trial court or other government unit may enter a final order as to one or more but fewer than all of the claims and parties only upon an express determination that an immediate appeal would facilitate resolution of the entire case**. Such an order becomes appealable when entered. In the absence of such a determination and entry of a final order, any order or other form of decision that adjudicates fewer than all the claims and parties shall not constitute a final order. In addition, the following conditions shall apply:

> (1) **An application for a determination of finality under subdivision (c) shall be filed within 30 days of entry of the order**. During the time an application for a determination of finality is pending, the action is stayed.
>
> (2) Unless the trial court or other government unit acts on the application within 30 days after it is filed, the trial court or other government unit shall no longer consider the application and it shall be deemed denied.
>
> (3) A notice of appeal may be filed within 30 days after entry of an order as amended unless a shorter time period is provided in [Appellate Rule 903(c),] Pa.R.A.P. 903(c). Any denial of such an application is reviewable only through a petition for permission to appeal under [Appellate Rule 1311,] Pa.R.A.P. 1311.

Pa.R.A.P. 341 (text emphasis added).

This Court has long held: "An order that sustains preliminary objections, but with leave to file an amended complaint, is generally considered to be interlocutory and not a final, appealable decree." *Hionis v. Concord Twp.*, 973 A.2d 1030, 1034 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2009).

> It should be noted that an order sustaining preliminary objections often grants the plaintiff leave to amend within a time certain or suffer dismissal. Such an order is interlocutory and never will become appealable, because it is a mere direction that an order be entered at some time in the future, unaccompanied by actual entry of the specified order in the docket. *In order to appeal such an order, the plaintiff must allow the period for amendment specified in the* [*trial*] *court's order to expire, and then praecipe the* [*trial*] *court clerk to enter an order dismissing the complaint.*

Id. at 1036 (quoting 20 G. Ronald Darlington, et al., Pa. Appellate Practice § 301:19 (2008-2009) (emphasis added)). Thus, the *Hionis* Court held: "[A] plaintiff who chooses not to file an amended complaint may appeal by filing a praecipe with the trial court to dismiss the original complaint with prejudice. In this way, the plaintiff can convert an interlocutory order into a final and appealable order." *Id*. at 1035-

36. Here, BLC did not file a praecipe requesting the trial court to dismiss its Complaint.[11] Accordingly, the trial court's order is interlocutory, and not a final, appealable order. *See Hionis*; *see also G&B Amusements LLC v. City of Phila.* (Pa. Cmwlth. No. 1178 C.D. 2024, filed Nov. 5, 2025);[12] *May v. Doe*, 269 A.3d 1286 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2022).

Relative to BLC's argument that because the trial court denied declaratory and injunctive relief, the trial court's order is appealable as of right under Appellate Rule 311,[13] since the trial court's order sustained the Preliminary Objections to Counts IV and V with leave to amend, BLC could still pursue declaratory and injunctive relief on those counts. Because "the [trial c]ourt's order [denied] only part of the relief requested and merely narrowed the dispute between the parties[,]" *U.S. Orgs. for Bankr. Alts., Inc. v. Dep't of Banking*, 26 A.3d 474, 481 (Pa. 2011), such that BLC might still be able to obtain a declaration and an injunction under Counts IV and V, "the order dismissing [the challenge under Counts I, II, and III as moot] 'had no practical effect upon the ultimate decision in th[is] case.'" *Id.* at 479 (quoting *Pa. Bankers Ass'n v. Dep't of Banking*, 948 A.2d 790, 798 (Pa. 2008)). Accordingly, since the trial court sustained the Preliminary Objections to Counts IV and V with leave to amend, the trial court's order is not appealable as of right.

---

[11] Similarly, BLC did not file an application for a determination of finality under Appellate Rule 341(c).

[12] Pursuant to Section 414(a) of this Court's Internal Operating Procedures, an unreported opinion may be cited for its persuasive value. 210 Pa. Code § 69.414(a). *G&B Amusements LLC* is cited herein for its persuasive value.

[13] Appellate Rule 311(a) provides in relevant part: "An appeal may be taken as of right and without reference to [Appellate Rule] 341(c) from the following types of orders: . . . (4) *Injunctions* . . . [and] (8) *Other Cases* . . . ." Pa.R.A.P. 311(a).

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, this Court does not have jurisdiction to review this appeal. Accordingly, Appellees' Quashal Motion is granted and BLC's appeal is quashed.

_____
ANNE E. COVEY, Judge

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Bethlehem Landfill Company, Appellant	:	
v.	:	
Lower Saucon Township, Lower Saucon Township Council, Priscilla Deleon, Laura Ray, and Victoria Opthof-Cordaro in their official capacities as elected councilpersons for Lower Saucon Township, and Steven Goudsouzian in his official capacity as Lower Saucon Township Solicitor	:	No. 737 C.D. 2025

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 6th day of November, 2026, Lower Saucon Township's, Lower Saucon Township Council's, Lower Saucon Township councilpersons Priscilla deLeon's, Laura Ray's, and Victoria Opthof-Cordaro's Joint Motion to Quash Bethlehem Landfill Company's (BLC) appeal is GRANTED. BLC's appeal from the Northampton County Common Pleas Court's May 14, 2025 order (as amended May 15, 2025) is QUASHED.

_____

ANNE E. COVEY, Judge