

Case Name	Date of Report	Notes	Master
Lindenmuth v. Lindenmuth 2014-CV-1819-DV	03-19-2015	Parties appeared before the master on Wife's request for a divorce decree pursuant to §3301(d) Husband contested entry of the divorce decree alleging that the marriage was not irretrievably broken and because a divorce was contrary to his religious beliefs. Wife's testimony evidenced that after Husband's first adulterous affair, she agreed to provide him with the opportunity to change and regain her trust. Instead he had another adulterous affair and broke her trust for good and beyond repair no matter if the parties participate in counseling or not. Accordingly, recommending counseling in accordance with 23 Pa.C.S.A §3301(d)(2) in this matter would be futile since there is no reasonable prospect of reconciliation and Wife proved that the marriage is irretrievably broken. Moreover, the master recommended the entry of a divorce decree over Husband's religious objection in accordance with <i>Wikoski v. Wikoski</i> , 513 A.2d 986, 355 Pa.Super. 409 (1986).	Cindy S. Conley
Coles v. Coles 2011-CV-3152-DV	04-01-2015	Wife filed a divorce complaint in 2011 raising §§3301(c) and (d) divorce and equitable distribution. Husband was properly served with the complaint. In 2012, Wife's counsel withdrew her appearance and Wife became a Self-Represented litigant. In 2014, Husband filed his §3301(d) affidavit and Wife failed to file a counter-affidavit so grounds for divorce were established. In 2015, Husband appointed the master to address the equitable distribution claim. A hearing was scheduled to occur on March 31, 2015 and notice of the hearing was served on Wife by U.S. Mail, First Class at her last known address and was returned by the post office to the master. The hearing was held as scheduled and only Husband appeared. The master determined that Wife was properly served with the hearing notice. As a self-represented litigant, it was incumbent upon Wife to keep the court and opposing counsel apprised of her address for service. In accordance with Pa.R.C.P. 440, Service to Wife was complete upon mailing of the notice to her at her last known address. See also <i>Sklar v. Harleysville Ins. Co.</i> , 587 A.2d 1386 (Pa. 1991). The master saw no reason to disturb the de facto equitable distribution that occurred at the date of separation.	Cindy S. Conley