

July 9, 2020

Via Electronic Filing
Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Re: Flynn et al. v. Sunoco Pipeline, L.P.
Docket No. C-2018-3006116 (consolidated)
Complainant's Objection to Request for Admissions
and Answers to Interrogatories

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for electronic filing with the Commission is Thomas Casey's Objection to Request for Admissions and Answers to Interrogatories in the above-mentioned Docket No. Please direct all responses and any documents via electronic format to tcaseylegal@gmail.com.

If your office has any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Casey', is written over a light gray rectangular background.

Thomas Casey, *pro se*
1113 Windsor Drive West
Chester, PA 19380
tcaseylegal@gmail.com

cc: Hon. Elizabeth H. Barnes

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

MEGHAN FLYNN et al.	:	Docket Nos.	C-2018-3006116 (consolidated)
	:		P-2018-3006117
MELISSA DIBERNADINO	:	Docket No.	C-2018-3005025 (consolidated)
REBECCA BRITTON	:	Docket No.	C-2019-3006898 (consolidated)
LAURA OBENSKI	:	Docket No.	C-2019-3006905 (consolidated)
ANDOVER HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION, INC.	:	Docket No.	C-2018-3003605 (consolidated)
	:		
	:		
v.	:		
	:		
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.	:		

**THOMAS CASEY, *Pro Se*, LITIGANT'S OBJECTIONS TO
SUNOCO'S FIRST REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS
AND ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES**

I. BACKGROUND

This proceeding against Sunoco has challenged the company's ability to build, operate, maintain, and secure the safety of the public by installing and reusing existing HVL pipelines that have the capability of causing the catastrophic loss of life and property throughout rural, densely populated suburban and urban areas throughout Pennsylvania. Sunoco's historic record in operating pipelines is one of the worst in its industry.

On or about, September 28, 2018, Melissa DiBernardino filed a Formal Complaint with the Pa PUC against Sunoco Pipeline, LP. The Complaint was accepted by the Commission via a letter from the Pa PUC Secretary and distributed to all parties. Intervenor filed his information with the Commission on December 18, 2018 for intervention status. My status as Intervenor was granted shortly thereafter by your honor.

Since this acceptance I, Thomas Casey, have remained relatively silent on my filings and input with regards to this case and have remained true to my initial position of being an Intervenor

by simply asking questions at public hearings but also reserving my right to provide evidence under the rules of this commission's guidelines.

For many years Sunoco has acted in inappropriate ways towards me, and many other people involved in this case. On or about June 2016, Sunoco's counsel, Duane Morris, LLP, had me attend an ordered Deposition where Sunoco's attorneys berated me and treated me as a criminal for almost 5 hours for simply standing against their project. I was asked questions during this deposition that were outside the bounds of their case with regards to my personal information. They accused me of being the author of some online blog that made fun of the attorneys and Sunoco, which I had nothing to do with and asserted that I had made derogatory statements about them and other Counsel at that time. This was not true, and I testified under oath at the Deposition that I had nothing to do with these statements. They even went to so far as to include my under aged children in their plethora of questions and attacks. Sunoco, nor their Counsel, have the right to information outside the bounds of this case.

I have made my position clear as to how I feel about Counsel's client in multiple filings both in the PUC, the Court of Common Pleas, and the State Appellate Court. At no time have I ever been proven to have acted in such a manner as Counsel suggests.

II. SUNOCO'S INAPPROPRIATE DISCOVERY REQUESTS

On June 19, 2020, attorney Robert Fox sent an email to counsel and parties in this proceeding that contained the following text:

I wanted to bring to your attention a disturbing and inappropriate communication we received. As you know we distributed to all parties Sunoco's rebuttal testimony and exhibits. To ensure that people received and were able to access the documents, we checked the login information. One person logged in with a username and a fake email address both of which contained profanity directed at us and Sunoco. We assume that this was not done by counsel in the case or any of the pro se litigants, but rather someone this was forwarded to. We request that you immediately ask your clients or persons you forwarded the

documents to whether they are the individual who directed this profanity and identify that individual to us. We intend to inform Judge Barnes of this incident.

Counsel states in this email that *“We assume that this was not done by counsel in the case or any of the pro se litigants,”* at which point I did not think that this was my concern. As a *Pro Se* litigant in this matter, I have only engaged in the process when necessary and on a very limited basis, so I had not seen the original email until many days later on June 20, 2020 after receiving a phone call from another litigant. As this request did not pertain to me nor was I responsible for the assertion or know who they may be looking for, I chose to ignore the request as being irrelevant to me or my position in the case.

Then Mr. Fox sent me a private email (June 22nd, 4:06pm) with the title “Closing the loop” which read:

Can you please confirm whether or not you were involved in the inappropriate communication relating to the log in for the testimony. I have only a few who have not responded.

Now I was presented with an accusation against my character and another request from Counsel which is outside the bounds of discovery for this case. My estimation was that it was a witch hunt and I was not going to respond or play games.

The issue worsened when Mr. Fox sent a knew individual email (June 23rd, 5:45pm) to me which read:

Mr. Casey:
I have asked twice for you to respond. I ask for a third time. If I do not receive a response tomorrow, I will have no choice but to serve formal discovery which will require a verification under oath

After receiving this new threatening private email from Mr. Fox, I felt compelled to respond to the entire group email so that everyone could see what many of us were having to endure in private. My response (June 24, 8:56pm) read:

Mr. Fox,

With all due respect, are you kidding me with this childish nonsense? How dare you threaten me or anyone with legal action because someone may have said a bad word to or about lawyers or your client. I received this from you yesterday:

"I have asked twice for you to respond. I ask for a third time. If I do not receive a response tomorrow, I will have no choice but to serve formal discovery which will require a verification under oath"

And I have to say I don't deserve to be spoken to or questioned like I'm some kind of criminal or delinquent. Forgive me if I chose not to respond to this lunacy in a timely manner to satisfy your concerns. You have no idea what any of us are dealing with in our daily lives to be able to respond to you. Either share with the group exactly what you're claiming occurred or drop it.

I haven't even accessed the documents in question but if this is the level of security that your client is in control of with regards to the upcoming proceedings then I think maybe the judge needs to reconsider allowing your client, the defendants I will add, from hosting or controlling the matter.

If you feel the need to file against me then please be my guest. But before you do check to see if I accessed the records. I will not be bullied by anyone.

I answered Mr. Fox's question regarding his concerns about accessing the links and files. It would appear that Counsel is not satisfied with all the assurances that were given to him by Mr. Bomstein representing Flynn, Mr. Raiders representing Andover Homeowner's Association and myself with regards to this nonsensical hunt for whomever may have sent to Counsel what they assert is part of the case before the most honorable Judge Barnes. Counsel did not request interrogatories from all the other attorneys and parties involved, yet I am being singled out because I chose not to reply nor did I believe that it was necessary to reply.

On June 29th, served upon myself, Flynn, and Andover counsels, a request for admissions together with interrogatories. I did not respond and have chosen to file my denial with the PUC and follow the process that Mr. Fox has chosen to pursue. Which in my estimation is a complete

waste of her honor's time, along with the waste of valuable resources for all attorney's and litigants involved in this matter.

Upon receipt of everyone's denial to having anything to do with his assertion, Mr. Fox's lack of decorum and the fact that he will not take no as an answer, he further questions my position with another email response (June 30th, 10:00 am) which reads:

As your email identifies, these discovery requests go directly to bias, credibility, and motivation. Bias, credibility, and motivation, especially of the parties, are always relevant. Therefore we will not withdraw the discovery requests.

To further highlight the issue, another Complainant Melissa DiBernardino sent a request for clarity to Mr. Fox on June 30, 2020 at 2:26 am. Which read in part:

"...Being that there are only letters addressed to Mr. Bomstein, Mr. Raiders and Mr. Casey (and of course, Rosemary Chiavetta), I'm not even sure if this is for everyone to file or only those you chose to address in letters.... Please clarify if I'm expected to respond to this nonsense. As I previously stated, letters not addressed to me make your targets confusing. I have already responded to the original inquiry that I had not accessed the link (AND STILL HAVE NOT) nor forwarded it to anyone else..."

Mr. Fox replied to Ms. DiBernardino with the following on June 30, 2020 at 10:03 am.:

"The requests for admissions and interrogatories are not directed to you and therefore you are not required to respond. Also, these were not filed with the Board or Judge Barnes. The letter transmitting them and the certificate of service was all that was sent to the Board as required by the rules."

After reading that Mr. Fox did not send in to the proceedings the list of questions he had served on me because that was all that was "required by the rules," I responded to everyone with a final email on July 3, 2020 at 9:28 am. which read:

"All,
I find this course of action highly suspect and unnecessary. It places a new and unfounded burden on only certain individuals that Counsel feels are somehow criminally or ethically liable. I answered Counsel's question with regards to my involvement in this

matter. However, Counsel seems to want to play a game with the system to determine who may have posted or typed something that may have hurt their feelings.

Thankfully I didn't take my wife's advice to pursue a legal career. Because if this is the level of ethics and civility within the system I would be filing ethics complaints on a weekly basis. You will get my answer in the form of Objections within a few days.”

Let me be abundantly clear, yes I am biased against their client or I would not have filed against them, yes my motivation is to make the legal process work in the favor of my position and to come out the other end of this with some form of justice. But Mr. Fox believes he can attack my credibility without any proof that I have ever lied in any case brought before the judicial system in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania nor any of its subsidiary bodies. I am sure that if he had done this to another of the attorneys involved that the system would have sanctions against him. *Pro Se* litigants were to adhere to the same decorum as any other attorney in this matter and we were to be afforded the same level of respect. This is completely unacceptable, and I believe needs to be addressed in the form of sanctions against Counsel and their client. It is simply harassment of a *Pro Se* litigant because Mr. Fox has not filed against the other Counsels, Counties, Townships, or entities which have dozens, if not hundreds of potential avenues for discovery for his hunt.

As of the date of my filing, Mr. Fox still has not shown me a copy of the records as I requested in my response on June 24th that is the subject of his assertion.

III. OBJECTIONS

A. Requests for Admissions

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.350, I object to Sunoco’s seven requests as follows:

1. Admit that on or after June 15, 2020 you received the ShareFile link via

Email from SPLP’s counsel that granted access to SPLP’s Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions).

Admitted: _____

Denied: _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

2. Admit that on or after June 15, 2020, you accessed the ShareFile link to view, download, or otherwise access SPLP's Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions).

Admitted: _____ **Denied:** _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

3. Admit that you used the First Name/Last Name "Fuck You" or the email address "fred@fucksunoco.com" to access the ShareFile link to view, download, or otherwise access SPLP's Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions).

Admitted: _____ **Denied:** _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

4. Admit that you used the First Name/Last Name "Mankogold Endangerschildren" or the email address "kaboom@milewideblastradius.com" to access the ShareFile link to view, download, or otherwise access SPLP's Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions).

Admitted: _____ **Denied:** _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

5. Admit that on or after June 15, 2020, you forwarded the ShareFile link previously received via email from SPLP's counsel that granted access to SPLP's Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions), to anyone.

Admitted: _____ **Denied:** _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

6. Admit that your internet service provider is Verizon Fios.

Admitted: _____ **Denied:** _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

7. Admit that your internet protocol (“IP”) address is 100.19.129.46.

Admitted: _____ **Denied:** _____

Objection. Irrelevant. Outside the scope of discovery.

Arguably, there is no possible way for any of the litigants to answer such a question since the “IP” address sought is dynamic in nature.

There are two different kinds of “IP” addresses, static and dynamic. Verizon uses both types of “IP” addresses. A static “IP” will cost more. Most residential “IP” addresses are dynamic. In other words, your “IP” address, for your router, is subject to change without notice or that it was changed at all.

One important note, every device on the Internet has two “IP” addresses: a public and a private one. In your home, your router uses your public “IP” address—assigned by your provider. Your mobile devices also have public and private “IP” addresses. But they are constantly changing, and therefore, pretty much meaningless.

If any of the litigants are to attest in the affirmative that the “IP” address belongs to them, then sometime in the future that could change, and their admittance could be viewed as lying under oath which could then challenge their credibility in these proceedings as was stated by Counsel, ***“these discovery requests go directly to bias, credibility, and motivation. Bias, credibility, and motivation, especially of the parties, are always relevant.”***

Subsequently, if any of the litigants’ attest in the negative that the “IP” address does not belong to them then a search in the future after the service provider changes the “IP” address to the litigant’s “IP” address would force them to be perceived as to have lied under oath.

A simple search of the “IP” address in question shows multiple possibilities as to the location of the “IP” addresses’ current location. (See Exhibit A & B attached) On July 3, 2020 I was able to utilize an “IP” address internet look up tool¹, as well as a global positioning tool² to determine the location of the “IP” address in question. Most of these appear to be public access dynamic “IP” addresses’ that could be accessed by thousands of people daily. It must also be noted that I do hold an Associates Degree in Information Technology and that I do have some understanding about this issue. Your Honor, it is to say that it would be next to impossible to determine who utilized a publicly available dynamic “IP” address to be able to learn who may have done what Mr. Fox alleges occurred.

B. COUNSEL’S INTERROGATORIES

1. If your answer to Request for Admission No. 2 is the affirmative, and you admitted that on or after June 15, 2020, you accessed the ShareFile link to view, download, or otherwise access SPLP’s Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions), list the First Name, Last Name, and email address that you used to access the ShareFile link.

Answer: Irrelevant.

2. If your answer to Request for Admission No. 5 is in the affirmative, and you admitted that on or after June 15, 2020, you forwarded the ShareFile link previously received via email from SPLP’s counsel that granted access to SPLP’s Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions), identify the person(s) to whom you forwarded the ShareFile link, including his or her First Name, Last Name, and email address.

Answer: Irrelevant.

¹ Internet IP address online tool - <https://iplocation.net>

² Global positioning online tool - <https://duckduckgo.com/?q=map+39.9607+-75.6055&t=brave&ia=maps&iaxm=maps>

3. If your answer to Requests for Admission No. 3 or 4 were in the negative and you denied that you used the First Name/Last Name “Fuck You,” the email address “fred@fucksunoco.com,” the First Name/Last Name “Mankogold Endangerschildren,” or the email address “kaboom@milewideblastradius.com” to access the ShareFile link to view download, or otherwise access SPLP’s Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits (public versions), identify whether you know the person(s) who used those names or email addresses, and if you do, identify that person(s).

Answer: Irrelevant.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Casey, *Pro Se*
1113 Windsor Drive
West Chester, PA 19380
tcaseylegal@gmail.com

Dated: July 9, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the persons listed below as per the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a party). The document also has been filed electronically on the Commission's electronic filing system.

See attached service list.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Casey', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Casey, *Pro Se*

Dated: July 9, 2020

SERVICE LIST

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq.
Whitney E. Snyder, Esq.
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP
100 North Tenth Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com
wesnyder@hmslegal.com

Robert D. Fox, Esq.
Neil S. Witkes, Esq.
Diana A. Silva, Esq.
Manko, Gold, Katcher & Fox LLP
401 City Avenue, Suite 901
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
rfox@mankogold.com
nwitkes@mankogold.com
dsilva@mankogold.com

Michael S. Bomstein, Esquire
Pinnola & Bomstein
Suite 2126 Land Title Building
100 South Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19110
mbomstein@gmail.com
Counsel for Flynn et al. Complainants

Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire
Post & Schell PC
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
akanagy@postschell.com
glent@postschell.com
*Counsel for Intervenor Range Resources –
Appalachia LLC*

Erin McDowell, Esquire
3000 Town Center Blvd.
Canonsburg, PA 15317
emcdowell@rangeresources.com
Counsel for Range Resources Appalachia

Rich Raiders, Esquire
Raiders Law
606 North 5th Street
Reading, PA 19601
rich@raiderslaw.com
*Counsel for Andover Homeowner's
Association, Inc.*

Vincent M. Pompo
Guy A. Donatelli, Esq.
24 East Market St., Box 565
West Chester, PA 19382-0565
vpompo@lambmcerlane.com
gdonatelli@lambmcerlane.com
*Counsel for Intervenor West Whiteland
Township, Downingtown Area School District,
Rose Tree Media School District*

Leah Rotenberg, Esquire
Mays, Connard & Rotenberg LLP
1235 Penn Avenue, Suite 202
Wyomissing, PA 19610
rotenberg@mcr-attorneys.com
*Counsel for Intervenor Twin Valley School
District*

Margaret A. Morris, Esquire
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
mmorris@regerlaw.com
*Counsel for Intervenor East Goshen
Township, County of Chester*

Mark L. Freed
Joanna Waldron
Curtin & Heefner LP
2005 S. Easton Road, Suite 100
Doylestown, PA 18901
mlf@curtinheefner.com
jaw@curtinheefner.com
Counsel for Intervenor Uwchlan Township

James C. Dalton, Esquire
Unruh Turner Burke & Frees
P.O. Box 515
West Chester, PA 19381-0515
jdalton@utbf.com
Counsel for West Chester Area School District

James R. Flandreau
Paul, Flandreau & Berger, LLP
320 W. Front Street
Media, PA 19063
jflandreau@pfblaw.com
Counsel for Intervenor Middletown Township

Patricia Sons Biswanger, Esquire
217 North Monroe Street
Media, PA 19063
patbiswanger@gmail.com
Counsel for County of Delaware

Joseph Otis Minott, Esquire
Alexander G. Bomstein, Esquire
Ernest Logan Welde, Esquire
Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esquire
Clean Air Council
135 South 19th Street, Suite 300
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Joe_minott@cleanair.org
abomstein@cleanair.org
lwelde@cleanair.org
kurbanowicz@cleanair.org
Counsel for Clean Air Council

James J. Byrne, Esquire
Kelly S. Sullivan, Esquire
McNichol, Byrne & Matlawski, P.C.
1223 N. Providence Road
Media, PA 19063
jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com
ksullivan@mbmlawoffice.com
Counsel for Thornbury Township, Delaware County

Michael P. Pierce, Esquire
Pierce & Hughes, P.C.
17 Veterans Square
P.O. Box 604
Media, PA 19063
Mppierce@pierceandhughes.com
Counsel for Edgmont Township

Rebecca Britton
211 Andover Drive
Exton, PA 19341
rbrittonlegal@gmail.com
Pro se Complainant

Melissa DiBernardino
1602 Old Orchard Lane
West Chester, PA 19380
lissdibernardino@gmail.com
Pro se Complainant

Laura Obenski
14 South Village Avenue
Exton PA 19341
ljobenski@gmail.com
Pro se Complainant

Josh Maxwell
Mayor of Downingtown
4 W. Lancaster Avenue
Downingtown, PA 19335
jmaxwell@downingtown.org
Pro se Intervenor

Virginia Marcille-Kerslake
103 Shoen Road
Exton, PA 19341
vkerslake@gmail.com
Pro Se Intervenor

Exhibit A

Dynamic IP Geolocation Coordinates



Search homes

MY IP | HIDE IP | CHANGE IP | VPN | PROXY | GAMES | DDOS | WEB | TOOLS | BLOG | FORUMS

Where is Geolocation of an IP Address?

Follow @iplocation_net

SEARCH OUR WEBSITE

Google Custom Search



Geolocation for IP **100.19.129.46**.

[Hide IP with VPN](#)

IP Location Finder

Here are the results from a few Geolocation providers. Accuracy of geolocation data may vary from a provider to provider. Test drive yourself, and decide on the provider that you like.

Do you have a problem with IP location lookup? [Report a problem.](#)

IP TOOLS

- Trace Email Source
- Verify Email Address
- Proxy Check
- Subnet Calculator

2020 TOP VPN PROVIDERS

Personal VPN hides your IP address, and protect your privacy and security by encrypting traffic between you and the Internet.

privateInternetaccess™	\$2.85/mo <input type="button" value="Company Review"/> <input type="button" value="Visit Site"/>
vyprvpn™	\$2.50/mo <input type="button" value="Company Review"/> <input type="button" value="Visit Site"/>
ExpressVPN	\$8.32/mo <input type="button" value="Company Review"/> <input type="button" value="Visit Site"/>
GUIDE View full VPN Comparison.	

Is the data shown below not accurate enough? Please read [geolocation accuracy](#) info to learn why.

Geolocation data from [IP2Location](#) (Product: DB6, updated on 2020-7-1)

IP Address	Country	Region	City
100.19.129.46	United States of America	Pennsylvania	West Chester
ISP	Organization	Latitude	Longitude
Verizon Communications Inc.	Not Available	39.9607	-75.6055

#1

Geolocation data from [ipinfo.io](#) (Product: API, real-time)

IP Address	Country	Region	City
100.19.129.46	United States	Pennsylvania	West Chester
ISP	Organization	Latitude	Longitude
MCI Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business	MCI Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business (verizonbusiness.com)	39.9610	-75.6080

#2

Geolocation data from [DB-IP](#) (Product: Full, 2020-7-1)

IP Address	Country	Region	City
100.19.129.46	United States	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia
ISP	Organization	Latitude	Longitude
MCI Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business	Verizon Communications	39.9526	-75.1652

#3

Geolocation data from [ipdata.co](#) (Product: API, real-time)

IP Address	Country	Region	City
100.19.129.46	United States	Pennsylvania	West Chester
ISP	Organization	Latitude	Longitude
MCI Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business	Not Available	39.9444	-75.5875

#4

DOMAIN TOOLS

- Who is Hosting a Website
- Alexa Traffic Rank Checker
- Domain Age Checker
- Reverse DNS Lookup
- HTTP Server Header Check

POPULAR ARTICLES

- Find IP address of a network printer?
- Find IP addresses of a private network
- How to wire a RJ-45 cable?
- What is the difference between public and private IP address?
- What is static and dynamic IP addresses?
- What is IP Address?
- What is Proxy Server?
- My IP address is hacked. What do I do?

- IP Address
- Virtual Private Network
- Distributed Denial of Service
- Search Engine Optimization
- Network
- Email
- World Wide Web
- Security
- Internet of Things
- Smartphone

Exhibit B

Dynamic IP Geolocation Addresses

duckduckgo.com/?q=map+39.9607+-75.6055&t=brave&ia=maps&iaxm=maps&strict_bbox=0&bbox=39.95122357369149%2C-75.59596865151907%2C39.92631485045345%2C-75.55... ☆

map 39.9607 -75.6055

5 W Gay St
West Chester, PA 19380, United States

Directions
Bing Maps ▾

Search this area for...

- 🍴 Restaurants
- 🏠 Hotels
- 🍷 Bars
- 🛒 Groceries
- 🏦 Banks
- 🅇 Parking
- ☕ Coffee
- 🌳 Parks

Search the web instead > Feedback

duckduckgo.com/?q=map+39.9610+-75.6080&t=brave&ia=maps&iaxm=maps&strict_bbox=0&bbox=39.96119949989406%2C-75.60626666266973%2C39.95964319738329%2C-75.60... ☆

map 39.9610 -75.6080

115 W Chestnut St
West Chester, PA 19380, United States

Directions
Bing Maps ▾

Search this area for...

- 🍴 Restaurants
- 🏠 Hotels
- 🍷 Bars
- 🛒 Groceries
- 🏦 Banks
- 🅇 Parking
- ☕ Coffee
- 🌳 Parks

Search the web instead > Feedback

duckduckgo.com/?q=map+39.9444+-75.5875&t=brave&ia=maps&iaxm=maps&strict_bbox=0&bbox=39.95884822410484%2C-75.17587888950202%2C39.946396384080344%2C-75.1... ☆

map 39.9444 -75.5875

890 S Matlack St
West Chester, PA 19382, United States

Directions
Bing Maps ▾

Search this area for...

- 🍴 Restaurants
- 🏠 Hotels
- 🍷 Bars
- 🛒 Groceries
- 🏦 Banks
- 🅇 Parking
- ☕ Coffee
- 🌳 Parks

Search the web instead > Feedback

duckduckgo.com/?q=map+39.9526+-75.1652&t=brave&ia=maps&iaxm=maps&strict_bbox=0&bbox=39.961854055524185%2C-75.60913648731082%2C39.95874144487652%2C-75.6... ☆

map 39.9526 -75.1652

Dilworth Park

Directions
Bing Maps ▾

Dilworth Park is a public park and open space along the west side of City Hall in Center City Philadelphia. Dilworth Park opened in September, 2014. It is named in honor of Richardson Dilworth, the 118th mayor of Philadelphia. The current park was designed by KieranTimberlake Urban Engineers and Olmsted & Associates.