

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 59

January 19, 2018

No. 37, pp. 187-196

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA V. RAMIRO FIGUEROA

Invest with Experience.

The right financial partner will help you plan for the future and manage investments with you and your family's best interests first and foremost. No need to look further...you've found the right partner at ACNB Bank.

Securities and Insurance Products are: NOT FDIC INSURED • MAY LOSE VALUE • NOT BANK GUARANTEED • NOT A DEPOSIT • NOT INSURED BY ANY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTITY



ADAMS COUNTY LEGAL JOURNAL (USPS 542-600)

Designated for the Publication of Court and other Legal Notices. Published weekly by Adams County Bar Association, John W. Phillips, Esq., Editor and Business Manager.

Business Office – 117 BALTIMORE STREET, ROOM 305, GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2313. Telephone: (717) 334-1553

Copyright© 1959 by Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., for Adams County Bar Association, Gettysburg, PA 17325.

All rights reserved.

FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, effective December 7, 2017, The Brethren Home Community, 2990 Carlisle Pike, New Oxford, Adams County, Pennsylvania registered the name "Wellbrook Adult Day Services" by filing a Fictitious Name Registration under the Fictitious Names Act, 54 Pa.C.S. § 311(g) with the Pennsylvania Department of State in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, for the conduct of business at its place of business situated at 2990 Carlisle Pike, New Oxford, Adams County, Pennsylvania.

Latsha Davis & Mckenna, P.C.
1700 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 140
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050

1/19

INCORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed on with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the purposes of obtaining a Certificate of Incorporation of a proposed business corporation to be organized under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Corporation Law of 1988, approved December 21, 1988, P.L. 1444, No. 177, as amended.

The name of the corporation is ASHER REALTY, INC., with its principal office or place of business at 1904A Old Harrisburg Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325. The name and address of person or entity owning or interested in said business is: Christopher D. Sites.

John J. Murphy III, Esq.
Patrono & Murphy, LLC

1/19

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
OF ADAMS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
ORPHANS' COURT DIVISION

NO. OC-43-2017

DYLAN J. SEITZ

vs.

PNC BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
and NEVIN C. SEITZ

NOTICE

To: **Nevin C. Seitz**

You have been sued in Court. If you wish to defend against the claims set forth in the following pages, you must take action within twenty (20) days of publication of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, which publication commenced on January 19, 2018, by entering a written appearance personally or by attorney and filing in writing with the Court your defenses or objections to the claims set forth against you. You are warned that if you fail to do so the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you by the Court without further notice for any money claimed in the Complaint or for any other claim or relief requested by the Plaintiff, Dylan J. Seitz or Defendant, PNC Bank, National Association. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you.

YOU SHOULD TAKE THIS PAPER TO YOUR LAWYER AT ONCE. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A LAWYER, GO TO OR TELEPHONE THE OFFICE SET FORTH BELOW. THIS OFFICE CAN PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT HIRING A LAWYER.

IF YOU CANNOT AFFORD TO HIRE A LAWYER, THIS OFFICE MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT AGENCIES THAT MAY OFFER LEGAL SERVICES TO ELIGIBLE PERSONS AT A REDUCED FEE OR NO FEE.

Adams County
Court Administrator
Adams County Courthouse
Gettysburg, PA 17325
(717) 337-9846

Lawyer Referral Service
Pennsylvania Bar Association
P.O. Box 186
Harrisburg, PA 17108
(800) 692-7375

Kiandra Bair, Esq.
Mcnees Wallace & Nurick, LLC

1/19

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA V. RAMIRO FIGUEROA

1. Since **Leet**, majority decisions of this Court have repeatedly confined sheriffs' non-statutory arrest powers to those for in-presence breaches of the peace or felonies. **Commonwealth v. Marconi**, 64 A.3d 1036, 1043 (Pa. 2013).

2. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has stated "binding majority decisions of this Court confirm the general understanding that express statutory authorization is required for independent investigations by sheriffs and/or their deputies implicating constitutionally-protected interests of the citizenry."

3. Sheriffs are not police officers-nor are they invested with general police powers beyond the authority to arrest for in-presence breaches of the peace and felonies-in the absence of express legislative designation.

4. There are three relevant cognizable categories of interactions between persons and police: a mere encounter, an investigative detention, and a custodial detention or arrest.

5. Deputy Beall had the authority, as would any private citizen, to drive down the street and speak to Defendant who was standing on the public sidewalk. The interaction between Deputy Beall and Defendant transpired as follows. Deputy Beall asked Defendant "how's it going?" to which Defendant stated "all right." Deputy Beall did not violate Defendant's constitutional rights when he asked Defendant those basic questions. Defendant was not detained or under arrest and was free to leave.

6. However, when Defendant voluntarily discarded the sandwich bag containing cocaine onto the top step of the landing where a young child and adult female were standing, Defendant committed a breach of the peace. As this occurred in Deputy Beall and Deputy Romero's presence, under **Dobbins** and **Marconi**, they had reasonable suspicion to initiate a criminal investigation and then ultimately, arrest Defendant.

7. The United States Supreme Court has explained the area immediately surrounding and associated with the home - what our cases call the curtilage . . . [is] part of the home itself for Fourth Amendment purposes.

8. In **Commonwealth v. Gibbs**, 981 A.2d 274, 280 (Pa. Super. 2009), the Pennsylvania Superior Court determined the front porch at issue in that case did not constitute curtilage. Even those courts which have found that a front porch constitutes curtilage have generally found no Fourth Amendment violation where the porch in question was used by the general public.

9. Under the plain view doctrine, if an officer views from a lawful vantage point an item of incriminating nature of which is immediately apparent, he may seize it.

10. An exception to the warrant requirement exists when the property seized has been abandoned.

11. Once a person abandons an item, he does not retain standing to complain about the search and seizure.

12. Although abandoned property may normally be obtained and used for evidentiary purposes by the police, such property may not be utilized where the abandonment is coerced by unlawful police action.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, CRIMINAL CP-01-CR-976-2017,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA V. RAMIRO
FIGUEROA.

Robert A. Bain, Esq., Attorney for Commonwealth
Kristin L. Rice, Esq., Attorney for Defendant
Wagner, J., January 3, 2018.

OPINION ON DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR
SUPPRESSION

Presently before the Court is Defendant Ramiro Figueroa’s Omnibus Pretrial Motion filed October 30, 2017. The issues before the Court are (1) whether Deputy Beall and Deputy Romero had the authority to investigate and arrest Defendant, (2) whether Deputy Romero lawfully seized the suspected cocaine, and (3) whether Defendant voluntarily abandoned the suspected cocaine before Deputy Romero seized it. Based upon the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, this Court will deny Defendant’s Omnibus Pretrial Motion.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Deputy Sheriff Timothy Beall (“Deputy Beall”) has been a deputy sheriff with the Adams County Sheriff’s Office for approximately 2 ½ years. Deputy Beall is Act 120 certified and completed the Act 2 waiver course, which granted him his deputy sheriff certification.
2. Deputy Beall was a detective with the Baltimore Police Department for approximately 13 years. Deputy Beall worked in a narcotics and gang unit while he was with the Baltimore Police Department and made over 2,000 arrests for narcotics violations, with more than 500 of those arrests involving felonies. Deputy Beall has extensive experience dealing with individuals who possess guns and/or drugs.
3. Deputy Sheriff Adam Romero (“Deputy Romero”) has been a deputy sheriff with the Adams County Sheriff’s Office for approximately 2 years. Based on his training and experience,

Deputy Romero has had the opportunity to observe controlled substances.

4. On August 23, 2017 at approximately 6:48 p.m., Deputies Beall and Romero were on duty, in full uniform.
5. Deputies Beall and Romero were traveling westbound on High Street in the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania. Deputy Beall was unable to turn from High Street on to Court Alley because a crash on Baltimore Street had congested both lanes of traffic on High Street.
6. While stopped in traffic, a male in a pickup truck traveling eastbound on High Street yelled to Deputy Beall and Deputy Romero that “there was drug activity in the next block” The “tipster” provided the deputies with a description of the male¹ and told them the male was “standing on the south side of the street in the next block” and “had just picked up drugs off the street.”
7. Deputy Beall saw a male (Defendant) on the next block who appeared to match the “tipster’s” description. The male was standing in front of 114 West High Street.
8. Deputy Beall then proceeded down High Street. As he approached the intersection with Washington Street, Deputy Beall saw the same male he previously observed matching the “tipster’s” description standing on the sidewalk talking with a female and young child on the porch of 114 West High Street.
9. As Defendant turned and faced Deputies Beall and Romero, Defendant began clutching his right pants pocket with his right hand. Deputy Beall noticed Defendant’s right pants pocket “bulged out slightly.”
10. Deputy Beall then stopped his vehicle in front of 114 West High Street and asked Defendant “how’s it going?” and Defendant responded “all right.” Deputy Beall told Defendant he looked familiar and asked Defendant for his name. Defendant answered “Ramiro.”
11. As Defendant responded to Deputy Beall’s question, Defendant,

¹ The “tipster” stated the male was Hispanic or “black looking” and had on a red shirt and black shorts.

who was still standing on the sidewalk, turned his body away from the deputies and tossed a sandwich bag over Defendant's right shoulder. Deputy Beall, based on his training and experience, believed Defendant just discarded drugs.

12. Upon viewing Defendant toss the sandwich bag, both deputies exited the vehicle.
13. Deputy Beall went to speak with Defendant.
14. While still standing on the sidewalk, Deputy Romero walked toward the steps and landing where he observed the discarded sandwich bag on the edge of the top step of the landing. Deputy Romero observed a sandwich bag containing a white, powdery substance, which based on the deputy's training and experience, likely contained drugs.
15. Deputy Romero retrieved the sandwich bag, inspected it, and showed it to Deputy Beall.
16. Deputy Beall saw a large amount of a white powdery substance which he believed to be cocaine inside the sandwich bag.
17. Deputy Beall handcuffed Defendant and placed him under arrest.
18. Defendant was charged with two counts of possession with intent to deliver controlled substance² and two counts of simple possession.³
19. The criminal complaint filed against Defendant listed Defendant's address as 279 West Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Deputy Beall's initial conversation with Defendant while Defendant was standing on the public sidewalk and Deputy Beall was in his sheriff's vehicle involved a "mere encounter" with Defendant.
2. Deputy Romero lawfully observed the suspected cocaine from a public sidewalk.
3. After Defendant threw the sandwich bag, Deputies Beall and

² 35 P.S. § 780-113(a)(30).

³ 35 P.S. § 780-113(a)(16).

Romero had the legal authority to investigate and arrest Defendant when he committed a breach of the peace in their presence.

4. Defendant voluntarily abandoned the sandwich bag and lost standing to object to its subsequent seizure.

LEGAL STANDARD

In a suppression hearing, the Commonwealth has the burden to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, the admissibility of those items the accused seeks to preclude. **Commonwealth v. Ruey**, 892 A.2d 802, 807 (Pa. 2006).

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.”⁴ The Fourth Amendment is applicable to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. **Commonwealth v. Kohl**, 615 A.2d 308, 311 (Pa. 1992). Pennsylvania’s Constitution specifically guarantees citizens the right to be “secure in their persons . . . from unreasonable searches and seizures.”⁵ A search or seizure is reasonable only if “it is conducted pursuant to a search warrant issued by a magistrate upon a showing of probable cause.” **Kohl**, 615 A.2d at 313. When police obtain evidence in violation of an individual’s Fourth Amendment rights, the Commonwealth is precluded from using that evidence at trial. **Commonwealth v. Pratt**, 930 A.2d 561, 563 (Pa. Super. 2007).

“Since [**Commonwealth v.] Leet**,⁶ majority decisions of this Court have repeatedly confined sheriffs’ non-statutory arrest powers to those for in-presence breaches of the peace or felonies.” **Commonwealth v. Marconi**, 64 A.3d 1036, 1043 (Pa. 2013).

The United States Supreme Court has explained “the area ‘immediately surrounding and associated with the home’ – what our cases call the curtilage . . . [is] ‘part of the home itself for Fourth Amendment purposes.’” **Florida v. Jardines**, 569 U.S. 1, 7 (2013) (quoting **Oliver v. United States**, 466 U.S. 170, 180 (1984)).

“[A] person charged with a possessory offense must be accorded

⁴ U.S. Const. amend. IV.

⁵ Pa. Const. art. I, § 8.

⁶ 641 A.2d 299 (Pa. 1994).

automatic standing. However, once a person abandons an item, he does not retain standing to complain about the search and seizure. This principle also applies to cases where the defendant is charged with a possessory offense.” **Commonwealth v. Wilson**, 606 A.2d 1211, 1212 (Pa. Super. 1992) (internal citations omitted).

DISCUSSION

I. Deputy Sheriff’s Authority to Investigate and Arrest

Defendant succinctly states the issue in this case as follows, “[w]hether deputy sheriffs possess the authority to arrest or investigate a non-felony [breach of the peace] or a felony that is alleged to have occurred outside of their presence.” Defendant’s Memorandum of Law.

A sheriff has the power to “either personally or by deputy . . . serve process and execute orders directed to him pursuant to law.” **42 Pa. C.S.A. § 2921**. Noticeably absent from the statute is language which gives the sheriff the power to investigate a crime. As there is no statutory authority which provides the sheriff with the authority to investigate a crime, this Court must determine whether the common law provides the sheriff with such authority.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has stated “binding majority decisions of this Court confirm the general understanding that express statutory authorization is required for independent investigations by sheriffs and/or their deputies implicating constitutionally-protected interests of the citizenry.” **Marconi**, 64 A.3d at 1039. Sheriffs “are not police officers-nor are they invested with general police powers beyond the authority to arrest for in-presence breaches of the peace and felonies-in the absence of express legislative designation.” *Id.* at 1043-44. **See also Commonwealth v. Dobbins**, 934 A.2d 1170, 1181 (Pa. 2007) (“[A]bsent specific statutory authorization, sheriff’s lack authority to conduct independent investigation under the Controlled Substances Act . . . where no breach of the peace or felony has occurred in their presence.”).

“There are three relevant cognizable categories of interactions between persons and police: a mere encounter, an investigative detention, and a custodial detention or arrest.” **Commonwealth v. Chase**, 960 A.2d 108, 117 (Pa. 2008). “A mere encounter need not be supported by any level of suspicion, and does not require a person

to stop or respond.” **Id.** “An ‘investigative detention,’ . . . must be supported by reasonable suspicion; it subjects a person to a stop and a period of detention, but does not involve such coercive conditions as to constitute the functional equivalent of an arrest.” **Id.** “An arrest or custodial detention must be supported by probable cause.” **Id.**

Deputy Beall had the authority, as would any private citizen, to drive down the street and speak to Defendant who was standing on the public sidewalk. The interaction between Deputy Beall and Defendant transpired as follows. Deputy Beall asked Defendant “how’s it going?” to which Defendant stated “all right.” Deputy Beall then asked Defendant for his name and Defendant responded “Ramiro.” At that point, the interaction can best be described as a “mere encounter.” Deputy Beall did not violate Defendant’s constitutional rights when he asked Defendant those basic questions. Defendant was not detained or under arrest and was free to leave.

However, when Defendant voluntarily discarded the sandwich bag containing cocaine onto the top step of the landing where a young child and adult female were standing, Defendant committed a breach of the peace. As this occurred in Deputy Beall and Deputy Romero’s presence, under **Dobbins and Marconi**, cited supra, they had reasonable suspicion to initiate a criminal investigation and then ultimately arrest Defendant.

II. Constitutionality of Seizure of Suspected Cocaine

Defendant also argued in his Omnibus Pretrial Motion and at the suppression hearing that Deputy Romero violated Defendant’s constitutional rights when he went up the steps of 114 West High Street and removed the sandwich bag containing suspected cocaine from the top step of the landing.

The United States Supreme Court has explained “the area ‘immediately surrounding and associated with the home’ – what our cases call the curtilage . . . [is] ‘part of the home itself for Fourth Amendment purposes.’” **Jardines**, 569 U.S. at 7 (quoting **Oliver**, 466 U.S. at 180). In **Commonwealth v. Gibbs**, 981 A.2d 274, 280 (Pa. Super. 2009), the Pennsylvania Superior Court determined the front porch at issue in that case did not constitute curtilage. In determining the front porch was not curtilage, the Superior Court reviewed case law from other jurisdictions and explained “even those courts which have found that a front porch constitutes curtilage

have generally found no Fourth Amendment violation where the porch in question was used by the general public.” *Id.* The porch in **Gibbs** “‘butted up’ against the sidewalk . . . was an empty, unenclosed, concrete slab that was used by deliverymen and visitors to the apartment.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted).⁷ **See also Commonwealth v. Eichler**, 133 A.3d 775, 784 (Pa. Super. 2016) (stating “entry onto the curtilage generally is not a Fourth Amendment violation when the curtilage is used by the public”).

Instantly, Deputy Beall described the property at 114 West High Street as a duplex with an open porch. Deputy Beall testified the steps of 114 West High Street were not enclosed and the property did not have a lawn. In order to enter the property, a person would need to proceed toward the side of the property where they would see the steps “which come out into the sidewalk area.” An individual would then ascend the steps and walk onto the concrete landing. As in **Gibbs**, the testimony illustrates that a delivery person or visitor would need to go up those steps and walk onto the landing in order to deliver a package or visit the residents.

Here, while still standing on the sidewalk, Deputy Romero walked toward the steps and landing where he observed the discarded sandwich bag on the edge of the top step of the landing.⁸ Deputy Romero saw the suspected cocaine from his “lawful vantage point” on the sidewalk and, based on his training and experience, he believed the sandwich bag contained drugs. “Under the plain view doctrine, if an officer views ‘from a lawful vantage point’ an item of the incriminating nature of which is immediately apparent, he may seize it.” *Gibbs*, 981 A.2d at 279-80 (citation omitted).

⁷ In determining the front porch did not constitute curtilage, the Superior Court also considered the fact that “[t]here was no gate blocking entry to the porch and nothing else which would indicate that the porch was closed to members of the general public.” *Id.*

⁸ This Court recognizes that under **Jardines**, a front porch is curtilage. While cognizant of that fact, this Court feels the instant case is factually distinguishable from **Jardines**. In **Jardines**, a drug-sniffing dog entered onto the front porch of Jardines home and alerted law enforcement of the presence of narcotics within the residence. 569 U.S. at 4. The Court determined that because the police officers were in the curtilage when they conducted the search, they violated Jardines constitutional rights. *Id.* at 5-6, 11-12. Instantly, Deputy Romero was standing on the public sidewalk when he observed the sandwich bag containing suspected cocaine, in plain view. This fact alone takes this case outside the confines of **Jardines**.

Therefore, Deputy Romero did not violate Defendant's constitutional rights when he walked up the steps and retrieved the sandwich bag.

III. Voluntary vs. Forced Abandonment

An “exception to the warrant requirement exists when the property seized has been abandoned.” **Commonwealth v. Johnson**, 636 A.2d 656, 658 (Pa. Super. 1994) (quoting **Commonwealth v. Williams**, 551 A.2d 313, 315 (Pa. Super. 1988)). “[O]nce a person abandons an item, he does not retain standing to complain about the search and seizure.” **Wilson**, 606 A.2d at 1212. “To aid courts in deciding whether property has been abandoned, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has laid out the following test,

Abandonment is primarily a question of intent, and intent may be inferred from other words spoken, acts done, and other objective facts. All relevant circumstances existing at the time of the alleged abandonment should be considered. The issue is not abandonment in the strict-property right sense, but whether the person prejudiced by the search had voluntarily discarded, left behind, or otherwise relinquished his interest in the property in question so that he could no longer retain a reasonable expectation of privacy with regard to it at the time of the search.

Johnson, 636 A.2d at 658 (quoting **Commonwealth v. Shoatz**, 366 A.2d 1216, 1220 (Pa. 1976)).

“Although abandoned property may normally be obtained and used for evidentiary purposes by the police, such property may not be utilized where the abandonment is coerced by unlawful police action.” **Commonwealth v. Byrd**, 987 A.2d 786, 791 (Pa. Super. 2009) (internal quotations omitted and citation omitted). The Pennsylvania Supreme Court “has held that initial illegality taints the seizure of the evidence . . . [because] in such a situation it cannot be said that there was a ‘voluntary abandonment or relinquishment’ of the evidence No improper or unlawful act can be committed by the officer *prior* to the evidence being abandoned [or relinquished].” **Id.** (emphasis in original) (internal quotations omitted).

A review of the facts establishes Defendant voluntarily abandoned the sandwich bag. When Defendant threw the sandwich bag onto the

landing, Deputy Sheriff's Beall and Romero were still inside the sheriff's vehicle. Deputy Beall had only asked Defendant "how's it going" and for his name. As stated previously, this was nothing more than a "mere encounter" between the deputies and Defendant. Deputy Beall and Deputy Romero's actions were not improper or illegal, nor were Defendant's constitutional rights infringed upon; thus, Defendant cannot claim forced abandonment. Defendant voluntarily discarded the sandwich bag in an attempt to distance himself from the item. When he did so, he relinquished any reasonable expectation of privacy he may have had. **See Shoatz**, 366 A.2d at 1220; **Commonwealth v. Perdue**, 564 A.2d 489, 493 (Pa. Super. 1989). As such, Defendant lacks standing to challenge the seizure of the sandwich bag.

Furthermore, the address listed for Defendant in the criminal complaint is 279 West Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, not 114 West High Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Since 114 West High Street is not Defendant's address, Defendant did not have a reasonable expectation of privacy on the landing.

Therefore, Defendant's Omnibus Pretrial Motion is denied.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 3rd day of January, 2018, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, Defendant's Omnibus PreTrial Motion is denied.

ESTATE NOTICES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that in the estates of the decedents set forth below, the Register of Wills has granted letters, testamentary of or administration to the persons named. All persons having claims or demands against said estates are requested to make known the same, and all persons indebted to said estates are requested to make payment without delay to the executors or administrators or their attorneys named below.

FIRST PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF CHARLES W. ALEXANDER, SR., DEC'D

Late of Liberty Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Randall L. Alexander, 126 West Main Street, P.O. Box 443 Fairfield, PA 17320

Attorney: Teeter Law Office, 108 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF MARY M. CASH, DEC'D

Late of Hamilton Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Shelley Rooney, c/o P.O. Box 606, East Berlin PA 17316

Attorney: Sharon E. Myers, Esq., CGA Law Firm, PC, P.O. Box 606, East Berlin PA 17316

ESTATE OF NADINE M. DETTINBURN, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Rose M. Marchio, 25 Northview Drive, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: David C. Smith, Esq., 754 Edgegrove Road, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF RICHARD V. EMERSON, DEC'D

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Patricia R. Emerson, 62 Heritage Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Robert L. McQuaide, Esq., Suite 204, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF FLORENCE L. HEMPFING a/k/a FLORENCE LOUISE HEMPFING, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Linda K. Zumbrum, 136 North School House Road, Thomasville, PA 17364; Max B. Beckner, 4187 Smoketown Road, Glenville, PA 17329

Attorney: Muriel Anne Crabbs, Esq., Crabbs & Crabbs, 202 Broadway Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF TRACY S. MCGLAUGHLIN, DEC'D

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrices: Sherry L. Yeingst and Kelley A. McGlaughlin, c/o R. Thomas Murphy, Esq., R. Thomas Murphy & Associates, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

Attorney: R. Thomas Murphy, Esq., R. Thomas Murphy & Associates, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

ESTATE OF MONROE J. PHILLIPS, DEC'D

Late of Germany Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Janet M. Miller, 1150 Mathias Road, Littlestown, PA 17340

Attorney: Thomas E. Miller, Esq., Law Office Of Thomas E. Miller, Esquire LLC, 249 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF MARVIN R. SIMPSON, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Susan J. Fox, 204 Hospital Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Teeter Law Office, 108 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF BARBARA JEAN ULRICH, DEC'D

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Sherri L. Ulrich-Davis, 7503 Carlisle Pike, York Springs, PA 17372

Attorney: John C. Zepp, III, Esq., P.O. Box 204, 8438 Carlisle Pike, York Springs, PA 17372

SECOND PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF KRISTI L. THORPE, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of East Berlin, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Jeff A. Boyer, 441 Highspire Rd., Glenmoore, PA 19343

Attorney: Thomas R. Nell, Esq., 130 W. King Street, P.O. Box 1019, East Berlin, PA 17316

THIRD PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF WILLIAM H. HOWLAND, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Carmen A. Doyle, c/o Alex E. Snyder, Esq., Barley Snyder LLP, 100 E. Market Street, York, PA 17401

Attorney: Alex E. Snyder, Esq., Barley Snyder LLP, 100 E. Market Street, York, PA 17401

ESTATE OF MARTIN V. STORM, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Mark E. Storm, 1046 Kohler Mill Road, New Oxford, PA 17350; Marie E. Penley, 130 Nashville Blvd., Spring Grove, PA 17362; Janet L. Arnett, 50 Fawn Avenue, New Oxford, PA 17350; Kenneth Eugene Storm, 1042 Kohler Mill Road, New Oxford, PA 17350; Richard B. Storm, 861 East Berlin Road, York Springs, PA 17372

Attorney: John M. Crabbs, Esq., Crabbs & Crabbs, 202 Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF DANIEL ZITO a/k/a DANIEL JOSEPH ZITO, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Katherine Zito, 477 Lake Meade Drive, East Berlin, PA 17316

Attorney: David R. Breschi, Esq., 946 Lincoln Way East, Chambersburg, PA 17201

