


IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mark Barfield, et al., :
Petitioners :
v. :
No. 442 M.D. 2006 :
Pedro Cortes, :
Secretary of the Commonwealth, :
Respondent :

ORDER

AND NOW, this 4th day of April, 2008, after hearing argument on Petitioners' motion to dissolve voluntary stay of proceeding and answer thereto, said motion is hereby denied.¹


Barry F. Feudale, Senior Judge

Certified from the Record

APR 07 2008

and Order Exit

¹ I concur with able counsel for Petitioners and Respondent that the extant DRE issues are important and need to be addressed as expeditiously as possible. However, Petitioners (in an apparent *quid pro quo* regarding production of certain documents from Respondent) voluntarily agreed to a stay of the proceedings before this Court pending the Supreme Court's determination of Respondent's interlocutory petition for review. Recently, Petitioners sought to modify the stay and "voluntarily" chose the factual framework within which they sought their request for injunctive relief. The request for injunctive relief was denied. Presently, other than the "passage of time," nothing has occurred that, in this Court's opinion, warrants the dissolution of the stay.