

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LYCOMING COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
JUVENILE COURT DIVISION**

**IN RE:** : **NO. JV-195-2017**  
 : **1673 MDA 2017**  
**JSZ,** :  
 :  
**A Minor,** :

***Dated: June 4, 2018***

**OPINION IN SUPPORT OF THE ORDER OF OCTOBER 12, 2017, IN COMPLIANCE  
WITH RULE 1925(a)(2) OF THE RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE**

The Commonwealth (hereinafter referred to as “Appellant”) has appealed this Court’s Order dated October 12, 2017, entered after a hearing held on September 28, 2016. The Order granted the Motion to Suppress filed by the Juvenile on September 19, 2017. On October 26, 2017, Appellant was ordered, pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1925(b), to file a Concise Statement of the Matters Complained of on Appeal, and to serve a copy of said Concise Statement on the undersigned within 21 days of the date of the Order’s entry on the docket. Said Order was docketed on October 27, 2017.

On November 22, 2017, this Court issued an Opinion in Support of the Order of October 12, 2017, in compliance with Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) and indicated that more than 21 days had passed since the docketing of the Order requiring Appellant to file a Concise Statement of Matters Complained of on Appeal, and Appellant’s failure to timely file and serve a Concise Statement resulted of a waiver of all issues on appeal.

On December 5, 2017, the Commonwealth filed an application for remand to supplement the record with a Rule 1925(b) statement because the Commonwealth’s counsel was “admittedly ineffective.” By Order filed May 25, 2018, the Superior Court remanded the case to this Court for the Commonwealth to file a Rule 1925(b) statement

*nunc pro tunc*. On May 30, 2018, the Commonwealth filed a Rule 1925(b) Statement of Errors Complained of on Appeal Nunc Pro Tunc and alleged the following:

1. The trial court erred in finding that the police lacked reasonable suspicion to stop the juvenile's vehicle and in granting suppression of all evidence obtained from the stop.

In light of the single issue raised on appeal, this Court's Opinion and Order of October 12, 2017, is a comprehensive analysis of the evidence presented and conclusions of law. This Court would continue to rely on that Opinion and Order for this appeal. The findings of the Court are supported by the testimony from the hearing held on September 28, 2017.

By the Court,

Joy Reynolds McCoy, Judge