



remains a question of fact as to whether Cooper breached the duty owed to licensees by failing to warn of the possible danger when he released the cable tension the third time. A possessor of land owes a duty to licensees to exercise reasonable care to make the condition safe and to warn the licensee of a dangerous condition only if the possessor has knowledge of it, realizes that the condition involves an unreasonable risk of harm, and that the licensee is not likely to discover the condition. Id. at 1044; Restatement (Second) of Torts §§341, 342 (1965). Whether Cooper's verbal warnings on two prior occasions was sufficient to discharge his duty owed to the Humphreys is a question of fact to be decided by the jury. Reeves v. Philadelphia Import Co., 150 F.2d 854, 856 (3d Cir. 1944).

Upon consideration of the Motion for Summary Judgment of the Defendant William Cooper, the Response of Linda and Kenneth Humphrey, and Cooper's Reply thereto, it is ORDERED that the Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

---

JAMES MCGIRR KELLY, J.