

From July 28 meeting:

1. Council President Thomas Schuster asked the below question via email:

- a. I am following up after our caucus on parks in the city. At the meeting it was discussed about individuals being in the parks after dark. Do we have a solid plan to lock/close the parks after hours? I am still receiving calls, photos, etc., from several of the parks after dark. Police calls to Weston Field. Are we going to place gates on all of the entrances to Weston Field? Who is locking the parks each day? Are there any reasons the splash pads would be operating at night? Testing system, adding chemicals, filtration?**

- i. Thank you for following up with your concerns. The parks dept has purchased and installed boulders to stop cars from driving through Weston Field. The quote for having gates put up would be \$50,000+ and would be an obstacle for Code Blue patrons.**

The back arm gates that block the track entrances at Weston are locked at the end of the business day, however, by Parks' staff.

The police department was provided codes and key access to lock the gate at Novembrino Park and Sweeney Beach. Signs are present in the parks stating that they close at dusk. The police department is responsible to secure the gates and enforce this rule. The police department asks that residents call 911 to report after-hours activity in any playground.

The splash pad needs to let off pressure AND filter chemicals through at nighttime. We can manually turn them off, but this causes pressure build-up within the system and burns out the chemical sensors and valves over time. That is why you will observe the splashpads periodically turn on overnight.

2. Council Vice President Patrick Flynn asked the below questions:

- a. Mr. Flynn asked the city administration may please follow up with the City Engineer and SPD regarding the pending site/traffic studies from early June related to stop sign requests at Depot Street & Amelia Avenue and Ash Street & N Irving Avenue.**

- i. The city will follow up with the city engineer.**

3. Councilman Sean McAndrew asked the below questions:

- a. Councilman McAndrew asked if the city and city engineer may please advise a date when Theodore Street at the Theodore Street Railway Bridge project will be reopened to traffic and also a timeframe from the railway on when the project may be completed?**

- i. The road was reopened prior to the start of the school year. Crews are completing final details.**

- b. Regarding the city administration July 28th Response to Council under Item 5.b., the city advised that the city has pursued injunctive release in matters related to serious**

public safety concerns. Mr. McAndrew asked if the city may please show Council that action and provide Council with any incidents over the last ten (10) years for these type situations?

- i. The City is attaching numerous filings from recent years for Council's review along with the Court's Orders in each matter. The Orders help provide context for the threshold finding that the Courts are looking for. While most of the attached cases involve the City's pursuit of injunctive relief, included is one matter where the City was the named Defendant as an example of the types of injunction matters we also defend. Additionally, also included is an example of a case where the City sought an Administrative Warrant in a matter concerning public health risks. Again, we hope this is helpful in providing the typical context for these types of filings. Please note that this is not an exhaustive list of all injunction filings for the past ten years, and is instead a sampling of steps taken by the City regarding problem properties and the types of litigation the City engages in.

Attached please find:

1. City of Scranton v. James Munley (2025 CV 3333)
 - a. The City sought and obtained an injunction related to the property located at 1501-1503 North Lincoln Avenue. The injunction was sought following the collapse of a large portion of the building's brick veneer which blocked a public sidewalk. Concerns included threat of collapse of the remainder of the brick façade and the fact that the obstructed sidewalk was located directly across from Neil Armstrong Elementary School.
2. City of Scranton v. John Dodge (2025 CV 3751)
 - a. The City sought and obtained an injunction related to cane Corso dogs located at 421 Campbell Street. The large number of dogs constituted not only a zoning violation, but also posed serious health and safety concerns within the surrounding neighborhood. These concerns included the fact that numerous dogs had gotten loose on multiple occasions, dogs would hang over a deck railing into a neighboring property, and the dogs were not vaccinated.
3. City of Scranton v. Aviyah Menachem (2024 CV 206)
 - a. The City sought and obtained an injunction to enter and clear the property located at 620 Quincy Avenue. The rear portion of the property was littered with numerous large hazardous concrete structures and significant amounts of debris including rebar, concrete, and various other building materials. The yard posed a serious safety risk to both immediate neighbors and the public in general.

4. City of Scranton v. Aviyah Menachem (2024 CV 7224)
 - a. Following the City clearing the rear portion of the property located at 620 Quincy Avenue, the Defendant again began adding “structures” to the property as well as conducting the unpermitted work during nighttime hours. The City again sought and obtained an injunction to enter and clear the property based on the safety concerns posed by the condition of the property.
5. City of Scranton v. Thomas Coyne (1670 C.D.2024)
 - a. The City sought and obtained an injunction to prevent the dissemination of private employee information contained in personnel files. The files which the Defendant had access to contained sensitive and confidential information which would be protected by numerous privileges, privacy laws, and HIPAA.
6. City of Scranton v. Michael Garvey (2023 CV 5060)
 - a. The City sought and obtained an injunction to permit the City to enter and clear vehicles from the property located at 415 Pittston Avenue. Following the issuance of a demolition notice, the owner of the property placed several vehicles in the yard to obstruct the City’s ability to access the structure. The demolition was necessary due to concern over the potential collapse of the structure and danger to the public. Therefore, the City took action to be able to carry out the demolition.
7. City of Scranton v. Dennis Smith (2022 CV 149)
 - a. The City sought and obtained an injunction to prevent the continued storage of junk and compel the removal of hundreds of tires from the property located at 1602 Rear South Webster Avenue. The property was being used in violation of the City’s zoning ordinances, created a dangerous nuisance, and posed a fire hazard.
8. Dennis Smith v. City of Scranton (2025 CV 7522)
 - a. The City defended against Petitioner’s injunction seeking to prevent the demolition of his property located at 524 Gibbons Street. The injunction was filed following the final demolition notice that was provided to the owner. The City successfully argued against the injunction and the property was demolished.
9. Mark Kaskowack (903 Meadow Avenue)(2026)
 - a. This matter involves the arrest of the owner of 903 Meadow Avenue as the result of an animal hoarding and animal cruelty case. The property had been condemned by the City however the owner continued residing on the premises. Following his

arrest, the City became aware of a large number of living and deceased cats having been present in the home. The City sought and obtained an administrative search warrant from Magistrate Corbett to enter the premises in order to assess whether the property could be successfully rehabilitated. An inspector from Datom Products, Inc. entered the property in protective gear and provided a report on his findings to the City. The property is presently on the City's current round of demolitions based on both its prior condemned status and the health concerns discovered on the premises.