



---

Release from Incarceration. However, Defendant's appropriate and legal means of challenging the Court Order of December 2, 2004 was to file a timely Motion for Reconsideration or a timely appeal. In the within case, the Defendant's Petition for Special Relief: Release from Incarceration is merely a way to circumvent the appeals process from which he failed to take a timely appeal.

Furthermore, this Court notes that the Honorable Thomas A. Wallitsch was the trial judge who entered the Order from which the Defendant is now seeking relief. The present matter was thus assigned to the undersigned on or around February 11, 2005. In Judge Wallitsch's absence, this Court does not find itself in any position to be able to review Judge Wallitsch's factual determinations, reasons and justifications for his entering of the Order of December 2, 2004. Additionally, judges of coordinate jurisdiction sitting in the same court and in the same case should not overrule the decisions of each other. Okkerse v. Howe, 521 Pa. 509, 556 A.2d 827 (1989). Indeed, absent the most compelling circumstances, a judge should follow the decision of a colleague on the same court when based on the same set of facts. Yudacufski v. Dep't of Transportation, 499 Pa. 605, 454 A.2d 923 (1983). This rule is a rule of sound jurisprudence based on the policy of fostering finality of pre-trial applications so that judicial economy and efficiency can be maintained. Commonwealth v. Starr, 541 Pa. 564, 664 A.2d 1326 (1995). Judge Wallitsch held a hearing on December 2, 2004 and made fact determinations therefrom. This Court lacks authority to review Judge Wallitsch's findings and Order of December 2, 2004, and the proper means for the Defendant to have challenged this Order would have been through appellate review.