

RICHARD MICKMAN

v.

ELAINE MICKMAN

Appellant

: IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
: PENNSYLVANIA: Montgomery County Civil
: Division
: No. 2003-06252

: No. 2207 EDA 2020

ORDER

This appeal has been taken from the October 20, 2020 order that granted Richard Mickman's motion to dismiss Elaine Mickman's support complaint. The October 20th order also enjoined Elaine Mickman from filing any further support complaints with the trial court pending the decision of the appeal at 1725 EDA 2020¹.

In light of the Supreme Court's denial of Elaine Mickman's petition for allowance of appeal of this court's quashal of the appeal at 1725 EDA 2020, it is hereby **ORDERED**:

1. The appeal at 2207 EDA 2020 is **QUASHED**.
2. Richard Mickman's Motion To Quash and request for sanctions is **DENIED as MOOT**.
3. Richard Mickman's Application For Leave To File Post Submission Communication is **DENIED as MOOT**.
4. Elaine Mickman's Application To Amend Reply Brief and Take Judicial Notice is **DENIED as MOOT**.

¹ The appeal at 1725 EDA 2020 was taken from the August 3, 2020 order that sustained Richard Mickman's exceptions upon determination that Richard Mickman's child support obligation terminated as of December 31, 2018 pursuant to the trial court's order of December 28, 2018 and no appeal had been filed from the December 31st order. The August 3rd order also determined that Elaine Mickman's serial support complaints are barred by the doctrine of res judicata. On November 9, 2020 this Court entered an order that quashed the appeal at 1725 EDA 2020 determining that the doctrine of res judicata applied and the child support issues on appeal were moot. On May 18, 2021 the Pennsylvania Supreme Court denied Elaine's petition for allowance of appeal of this Court's November 9th quashal order.

5. Elaine Mickman's "Application To Correct Record/Strike Transcript" is hereby **DENIED as MOOT**.
6. Elaine Mickman is prohibited from filing any further child support filings with the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas.
7. Elaine Mickman is prohibited from filing any further child support filings with this Court.
8. Elaine Mickman's failure to adhere to these prohibitions shall result in the impositions of sanctions. **See Pa. R.A.P. 2744** (an appellate court may remand the case to the trial court to determine the amount of damages if it determines that an appeal is frivolous or that the conduct of the participant against whom costs are to be imposed is dilatory, obdurate or vexatious).

PER CURIAM

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIDDLE DISTRICT

RICHARD MICKMAN,

Respondent

v.

ELAINE MICKMAN,

Petitioner

: No. 387 MAL 2021
:
:
: Application for Reconsideration
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 26th day of January, 2022, the Application for Reconsideration is
DENIED.

Justice Brobson did not participate in the consideration or decision of this matter.

Former Justice Saylor did not participate in the consideration or decision of this
Application for Reconsideration.

A True Copy Elizabeth E. Zisk
As Of 01/26/2022

Elizabeth E. Zisk
Attest:
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania