

[Krasner v. Ward \(2023\)](#). Judge Wojcik authored a separate concurrence.

Majority holding: The Court held that while the General Assembly has authority to impeach local officials like Philadelphia's District Attorney and impeachment proceedings may continue across legislative sessions, the articles of impeachment against Krasner did not constitutionally allege valid "misbehavior in office." As a result, the Court ruled that the pending impeachment was unlawful. The Court rejected arguments that the case was a nonjusticiable political question, that Krasner lacked standing, or that indispensable parties were missing. The decision effectively blocked the impeachment trial from going forward.

Wojcik's Concurrence: Wojcik **agreed** that impeachment articles based on alleged violations of attorney ethics rules (Articles III–V) were unconstitutional because only the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has authority over attorney discipline. But he **disagreed** with the majority about the other articles (I, II, VI, VII). He believed those fell within the state's Constitution's grant of impeachment power to the House (to accuse) and Senate (to try). Wojcik argued that courts had no business second-guessing those charges in advance, because they raised **nonjusticiable political questions**.

Background: The Pennsylvania House of Representatives voted to impeach Philadelphia District Attorney Larry Krasner, citing alleged failures to enforce the law, obstruction of investigations, misconduct in court cases, violations of victims' rights, and usurpation of legislative authority. The Senate set a trial date, but before it began, Krasner filed a petition in Commonwealth Court arguing the impeachment was unconstitutional. He claimed the articles expired with the prior legislative session, that the General Assembly had no power to impeach a locally elected DA, and that the articles did not allege valid "misbehavior in office."