

Petition was dismissed. This time the Defendant filed a timely Notice of Appeal and in response the Court requested a concise statement of the matters complained of on appeal in accordance with Pa.R.A.P. 1925(b).

On August 21, 2012, the Defendant filed a concise statement; however, it is 487 pages and raises over 1,000 issues. Under the “Requirements; waiver” section of Rule 1925 it states that:

(i) The Statement shall set forth only those rulings or errors that the appellant intends to challenge.

...

(iv) The Statement should not be redundant or provide lengthy explanations as to any error. Where non-redundant, non-frivolous issues are set forth in an appropriately concise manner, the number of errors raised will not alone be grounds for finding waiver.

Pa.R.A.P. 1925(b)(4)(i), (iv). This Court believes that the Defendant is raising numerous redundant and frivolous issues. Many of the issues use the same language throughout but change the person it is directed towards or the theory of law the allegation is based upon. Also, the Court has dismissed the Defendant’s PCRA Petition based on it being untimely. Defendant raises over 1,000 issues and none of them go directly to the issue of whether his Petition was timely or whether he falls under an exception. The Defendant merely states that he falls under exceptions without stating why or how. Therefore, this Court believes that the issues raised are frivolous.

Moreover, many of the issues raised by the Defendant have been covered in previous PCRA Petitions. Defendant alleges for specific issues that he has “accidentally discovered new

evidence” on February 13, 2012; however, many of the same issues have already been raised in past Petitions. The Defendant does not state how the new evidence was discovered.

Therefore, for purposes of this Opinion, the Court will further rely on Judge Butts’ Order dated May 25, 2012, which determined that the Defendant’s sixth PCRA Petition was untimely. In addition, Judge Butts’ Order and Opinion filed on March 7, 2012 details why the Court found the Defendant’s fifth PCRA Petition as untimely.

DATE: _____

By the Court,

Nancy L. Butts, President Judge

xc: Ken Osokow, Esq.
Lawrence Knight DQ2131
SCI Coal Township
1 Kelley Drive
Coal Township, PA 17866