

Case Name	Date of Report	Notes	Master
Lindenmuth v. Lindenmuth 2014-CV-1819-DV	03-19-2015	<p>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).</p>	Cindy S. Conley