

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 63

January 28, 2022

No. 39, pp. 106-113

IN THIS ISSUE

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA VS.
TARAH ELIZABETH CORDIER

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, Edward G. Puhl, 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.

CIVIL ACTION
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
ADAMS COUNTY, PA
CIVIL ACTION-LAW
NO. 2021-S-462

NOTICE OF ACTION IN
MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE

AMERICAN FINANCIAL RESOURCES,
INC., A NEW JERSEY CORPORATION,
Plaintiff

v.

MELISSA WALKER, IN HER CAPACITY
AS HEIR OF MICHAEL W. SMITH; et al,
Defendants

To: UNKNOWN HEIRS, SUCCESSORS,
ASSIGNS, AND ALL PERSONS, FIRMS
OR ASSOCIATIONS CLAIMING RIGHT,
TITLE OR INTEREST FROM OR UNDER
MICHAEL W. SMITH Defendant(s), 51
SHIRLEY TRAIL, FAIRFIELD, PA 17320

COMPLAINT IN MORTGAGE
FORECLOSURE

You are hereby notified that Plaintiff,
AMERICAN FINANCIAL RESOURCES,
INC., A NEW JERSEY CORPORATION,
has filed a Mortgage Foreclosure
Complaint endorsed with a Notice to
Defend, against you in the Court of
Common Pleas of ADAMS County, PA
docketed to No. 2021-S-462, seeking to
foreclose the mortgage secured on your
property located, 51 SHIRLEY TRAIL,
FAIRFIELD, PA 17320.

NOTICE

YOU HAVE BEEN SUED IN COURT. If
you wish to defend against the claims
set forth in this notice you must take
action within twenty (20) days after the
Complaint and Notice are served, by
entering a written appearance personal-
ly 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 judg-
ment 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. You may lose money or prop-
erty 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 THE
INFORMATION ABOUT AGENCIES
THAT MAY OFFER LEGAL SERVICES
TO ELIGIBLE PERSONS AT A REDUCED
FEE OR NO FEE.

Court Administrator
Adams County Courthouse
111-117 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
717-337-9846

Robertson, Anschutz, Schneid,
Crane & Partners, PLLC
A Florida professional limited
liability company
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Jenine Davey, Esq.,
ID No. 87077
133 Gaither Drive, Suite F
Mt. Laurel, NJ 08054
855-225-6906

1/28

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA VS.
TARAH ELIZABETH CORDIER

1. EWOC [Endangering the Welfare of Children] is a specific intent offense, which requires that the Commonwealth prove a defendant *knowingly* violated a duty of care. Reckless conduct alone is insufficient to support a conviction under EWOC.

2. No witnesses observed Defendant driving unsafely or erratically prior to the moment that the officer arrived on the scene where Defendant's vehicle was disabled. Without evidence to indicate otherwise, we cannot assume that Defendant's accident was caused by unsafe driving that rose to the level of recklessness. As the Superior Court reasoned in *Hutchins*, though Defendant may have exercised poor judgment while driving which led to an accident, it does not equate to recklessness.

3. Furthermore, because the Commonwealth's evidence is insufficient to establish a prima facie case of EWOC under standard grading, such evidence is also insufficient to establish a prima facie case of EWOC under enhanced grading.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, CP-01-CR-1010-2021, COMMONWEALTH
OF PENNSYLVANIA VS. TARAH ELIZABETH CORDIER

Brian R. Sinnett, Esquire, Attorney for Commonwealth

Steve Rice, Esquire, Attorney for Defendant

Campbell, J., January 5, 2022

OPINION ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Presently before this court is Defendant's Motion for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed on October 18, 2021. For the reasons set forth herein, Defendant's motion is granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT

2. On June 13, 2021, Defendant, Tarah E. Cordier, was charged with the following offenses:

1. Count 1 - Endangering the Welfare of Children, as a felony of the second degree;¹
2. Count 2 - Endangering the Welfare of Children, as a felony of the second degree;²
3. Count 3 - Endangering the Welfare of Children, as a misdemeanor of the first degree;³

¹ 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1).

² 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1).

³ 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1).

4. Count 4 – Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;⁴
 5. Count 5 – DUI – Highest Rate of Alcohol, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;⁵
 6. Count 6 – Driving under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;⁶
 7. Count 7 – Driving under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;⁷
 8. Count 8 – Driving under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;⁸
 9. Count 9 – Driving under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;⁹
 10. Count 10 – Driving under the Influence of Alcohol/ Controlled Substance, as a first offense and ungraded misdemeanor;¹⁰
3. On October 7, 2021, the Commonwealth amended Defendant’s Criminal Information to change the grading of Count 3 from a misdemeanor of the first degree to a felony of the third degree.
 4. Defendant’s Preliminary Hearing was held on August 18, 2021.
 5. On October 18, 2021, Defendant filed the instant Motion for Writ of Habeas Corpus.
 6. On December 6, 2021, a hearing and argument was held on Defendant’s motion.

ISSUE

1. Whether the evidence is sufficient to establish a prima facie case for Endangering the Welfare of Children.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Commonwealth has not established a prima facie case for Endangering the Welfare of Children because the evidence is

⁴ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(a)(1).

⁵ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(c).

⁶ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(1)(i).

⁷ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(1)(ii).

⁸ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(1)(iii).

⁹ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2).

¹⁰ 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3).

insufficient to show that Defendant knowingly placed her children in circumstances that could threaten their physical or psychological welfare.

DISCUSSION

Defendant argues in her Motion for Writ of Habeas Corpus that this Court should dismiss the Endangering the Welfare of Children (EWOC) charges against her because the evidence presented at her Preliminary Hearing was insufficient to establish a prima facie case of guilt under Section 4304(a)(1) of the Crimes Code.¹¹ We keep in mind that:

[a]t a preliminary hearing the Commonwealth bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case that a crime has been committed and that the accused is probably the one who committed it. **Commonwealth v. Wojdak**, 466 A.2d 991, 995 (1983). To sustain that burden the Commonwealth must produce evidence that, if accepted as true, would warrant the ... trial judge to allow the case to go to the jury. **Id.** at 995–996. The prima facie standard requires that the Commonwealth produce evidence of the existence of each and every element of the crime charged; consequently, absence of evidence of a material element is fatal. **Id.** at 996–997.

Commonwealth v. Styler, 600 A.2d 1300, 1301 (Pa. Super. 1991). Defendant is charged with three counts of EWOC under Section 4304(a)(1) of the Crimes Code, which states:

[a] parent, guardian or other person supervising the welfare of a child under 18 years of age, or a person that employs or supervises such a person, commits an offense if [she] knowingly endangers the welfare of the child by violating a duty of care, protection or support.

18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1). EWOC is a specific intent offense, which requires that the Commonwealth prove a defendant *knowingly* violated a duty of care. **Commonwealth v. Vela-Garrett**, 251 A.3d 811, 815 (Pa. Super. 2021). Reckless conduct alone is insufficient to

¹¹ 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1).

support a conviction under EWOC.¹² The Superior Court has employed a three-pronged test to determine whether a defendant had the requisite *mens rea* to commit an EWOC offense. **Id.** The Commonwealth must establish that:

- (1) the accused is aware of [her] duty to protect the child;
- (2) the accused is aware that the child is in circumstances that could threaten the child's physical or psychological welfare; and (3) the accused has either failed to act or has taken action so lame or meager that such actions cannot reasonably be expected to protect the child's welfare.

Id. Here, Defendant argues that the Commonwealth has failed to produce evidence that could satisfy the second prong of the EWOC test – that she knowingly placed her children in circumstances that could threaten their physical or psychological welfare. **Defendant's Brief in Support of Motion for Writ of Habeas Corpus** at 6. Defendant also argues that even if the evidence is sufficient to show that she knowingly violated a duty of care, the evidence cannot support the Commonwealth's enhanced grading of the offense – which requires that Defendant created a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury. **Id.** After careful review of relevant precedent, we are constrained to agree with Defendant's first argument. Defendant's second argument is moot.

The evidence offered by the Commonwealth in support of the charges against Defendant is in the form of testimony from Pennsylvania State Police Trooper Nathan McHugh taken during Defendant's Preliminary Hearing and the subsequent hearing on Defendant's instant motion. Trooper McHugh testified to the following.

On June 12, 2021, he was dispatched to the scene of a motor vehicle accident around 11:00 p.m. Upon arriving, he observed Defendant's vehicle off of the roadway. The vehicle's front right wheel and bumper area were damaged, and the driver's airbag was deployed. Defendant was seated in the driver's seat and her three children were in the backseat in age-appropriate restraints. None of the vehicle's occupants were injured.

¹² **Commonwealth v. Martir**, 712 A.2d 327, 329 (Pa. Super. 1998) (“[A] person could never be convicted of EWOC based upon reckless conduct alone.”).

Trooper McHugh also testified that Defendant admitted to driving off of the roadway but that she either offered no explanation as to why, or that he did not recall. He testified that Defendant also admitted to having several drinks before the accident. Trooper McHugh observed open containers of alcohol on the floor of the backseat. He also observed that Defendant was slurring her speech, had dilated pupils, glassy and bloodshot eyes, and was emanating a strong odor of alcohol. Field sobriety tests revealed clues of impairment. Defendant was placed under arrest and transported to Gettysburg Hospital for a blood draw. The blood draw returned results showing a blood alcohol content of 0.219, as well as the presence of several controlled substances. Defendant claimed to have prescriptions, but Trooper McHugh could not recall whether or not she said the prescriptions were for any of the controlled substances present in Defendant's blood system.

Defendant first argues that the Commonwealth's evidence is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for Endangering the Welfare of Children because it cannot show that she knowingly placed her children in circumstances that could threaten their physical or psychological welfare.

Our Superior Court has provided us with clear guidance on the level of *mens rea* required to sustain a conviction under EWOC. In **Commonwealth v. Vela-Garrett**, a defendant was charged with EWOC for driving while intoxicated and impaired with his child in the vehicle. **Vela-Garrett**, 251 A.3d at 813. The Superior Court explained that the *mens rea* required for an EWOC conviction is greater than that required to support a Recklessly Endangering Another Person (REAP) conviction: “[i]t is clear that EWOC’s *mens rea* of ‘knowingly’ involves a higher level of culpability than REAP’s *mens rea* of ‘recklessly.’” **Id.** at 818. Further, more than mere intoxication or impairment alone is required to demonstrate recklessness under REAP. **Id.** at 819. A “tangible indicia of unsafe driving” in addition to intoxication or impairment can be sufficient to demonstrate recklessness. **Id.** (quoting **Mastromatteo**, 719 A.2d at 1083). The court found that driving while under the influence to a degree that impairs the ability to operate a vehicle safely is insufficient to demonstrate that the defendant recklessly, let alone *knowingly*, placed his child in danger. **Id.** at 818.

In **Commonwealth v. Mastromatteo**, 719 A.2d 1081 (Pa. Super. 1998), a defendant was charged with REAP after driving with her child in the vehicle while the defendant was under the influence of alcohol and marijuana, had an open container of alcohol in the front seat, and was impaired enough to fail subsequent field sobriety testing. **Mastromatteo** at 1081. The defendant was also observed to be swerving while driving, as she crossed the middle line in the roadway multiple times. **Id.** at 1082. The Superior Court reversed her REAP conviction, concluding that the evidence was insufficient to demonstrate that the defendant acted recklessly. The court reasoned that while driving intoxicated does increase the chance of causing injury, the risk “is still relatively remote and would not create ‘a substantial risk’ of death or serious bodily injury[.]” **Id.** at 1084.

In **Commonwealth v. Hutchins**, 42 A.3d 302 (Pa. Super. 2011), the defendant was charged with several counts of REAP after causing a serious accident while driving under the influence of marijuana with his three children in the vehicle. The defendant’s children and the driver of another vehicle were injured in the accident. **Id.** at 312. After his conviction, the Superior Court reversed the decision, reasoning that “absent additional evidence of his reckless driving or conduct, the evidence was insufficient to establish that [the defendant] recklessly endangered the lives of others.” **Id.** Notably, the court determined that evidence of an accident occurring in addition to evidence of the Defendant’s impairment was not sufficient to demonstrate recklessness.¹³

The cases discussed *infra* can be contrasted against **Commonwealth v. Sullivan**, 864 A.2d 1246 (Pa. Super. 2004), and **Commonwealth v. Jeter**, 937 A.2d 466 (Pa. Super. 2007), where the Superior Court affirmed convictions for REAP involving DUI. In **Sullivan**, a REAP conviction was affirmed where the defendant was intoxicated and was witnessed driving one-quarter of a mile in the wrong direction of an off-ramp. **Sullivan** at 1250. In **Jeter**, the defendant’s conviction for REAP was also affirmed where he was observed weaving in and out of a roadway for several miles, was driving while intoxicated, and struck a center barrier in the road. The defendants in both

¹³ **Id.** (“The only other relevant evidence presented in this matter is that an accident occurred. However, that [the defendant] exercised poor judgment in negotiating a left turn does not equate to recklessness.”).

Sullivan and **Jeter** were observed to be driving recklessly prior to causing accidents.

The evidence presented in the case at bar is analogous to the facts in **Mastromatteo** and **Hutchins**, and is distinguishable from those in **Sullivan** and **Jeter**, where additional tangible indicia of unsafe driving existed to establish the *mens rea* required for REAP convictions. Here, like in **Mastromatteo**, Defendant was allegedly driving while impaired and had open containers of alcohol in the vehicle. The same facts in **Mastromatteo**, in addition to evidence of some indicia of erratic driving (swerving over the centerline), were not enough to support a finding of recklessness. As in **Hutchins**, Defendant here allegedly caused a vehicle accident while driving. However, the accident in **Hutchins** was “serious” and caused injuries to the children and an innocent driver. Even so, such an accident did not support a finding of recklessness there. Defendant’s accident was much more minor than that in **Hutchins** and caused no injuries to her children or innocent by-standers.

Furthermore, there is no additional evidence of tangible indicia of unsafe driving comparable to the drivers’ actions in **Sullivan** and **Jeter**. No witnesses observed Defendant driving unsafely or erratically prior to the moment that the officer arrived on the scene where Defendant’s vehicle was disabled. Without evidence to indicate otherwise, we cannot assume that Defendant’s accident was caused by unsafe driving that rose to the level of recklessness. As the Superior Court reasoned in **Hutchins**, though Defendant may have exercised poor judgment while driving which led to an accident, it does not equate to recklessness.

Nevertheless, even if additional evidence was presented to show tangible indicia of unsafe driving comparable to the facts in **Sullivan** and **Jeter**, that evidence could only be sufficient to establish the “reckless” *mens rea* required for a REAP conviction. As explained above, a charge under EWOC requires the heightened *mens rea* standard of “knowing” endangerment. Because the Commonwealth’s evidence is insufficient to prove mere recklessness on the part of Defendant, that evidence cannot be sufficient to support the EWOC charges which allege that Defendant knowingly endangered the welfare of her children.

Furthermore, because the Commonwealth's evidence is insufficient to establish a prima facie case of EWOC under standard grading, such evidence is also insufficient to establish a prima facie case of EWOC under enhanced grading. As such, Defendant's second argument is moot.

For the reasons above, Defendant's Motion for Habeas Corpus is granted. Accordingly, the attached Order will be entered.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 5th day of January, 2022, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, Defendant's Motion for Writ of Habeas Corpus is granted. The following charges against Defendant are dismissed:

1. Count 1 - Endangering the Welfare of Children under 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1)
2. Count 2 - Endangering the Welfare of Children under 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1)
3. Count 3 - Endangering the Welfare of Children under 18 Pa. C.S. § 4304(a)(1)

ESTATE NOTICES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that in the estates of the decedents set forth below, the Register of Wills has granted letters, testamentary or of 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 MICHAEL E. BERWAGER, DEC'D**

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Timothy A. Berwager, 112 Fuhrman Mill Road, Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF MICHAEL A. KLUNK, DEC'D

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Carly A. Klunk, 908 Penn Avenue, Apt 702, Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Attorney: Michael J. Bruzzese, Esq., 436 Seventh Avenue, Suite 220, Pittsburgh, PA 15219

ESTATE OF GEORGE RUSSELL KOONTZ a/k/a G. RUSSELL KOONTZ, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Biglerville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Sandra L. Singley, 850 Hanover Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: John J. Murphy III, Esq., Patrono & Murphy, LLC, 28 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF RONALD A. KRAMER, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Kristen M. Kramer, c/o Amanda Snoko Dubbs, Esq., Snoko Dubbs & Buhite Law, Inc., 204 St. Charles Way, Suite F, York, PA 17402

Attorney: Amanda Snoko Dubbs, Esq., Snoko Dubbs & Buhite Law, Inc., 204 St. Charles Way, Suite F, York, PA 17402

ESTATE OF ROBERT C. MALLETTE, SR., DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Joanne M. Hobbs, 25 Chapman Road, Fairfield, PA 17320

Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe, Rice & Quinn, LLC, 47 West High Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF TERENCE RAYMOND McGRATH a/k/a TERENCE R. McGRATH, DEC'D

Late of Mount Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Patricia W. Thorsen, 541 Curtis Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: John J. Murphy III, Esq., Patrono & Murphy, LLC, 28 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF WILLIAM J. REDDING, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Melissa H. Redding, 1919 Highland Avenue Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Anthony D. Redding, 1029 Old Route 30, Orttanna, PA 17353

Attorney: David K. James, III, Esq., 234 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF DANIEL D. SUMMERS, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Littlestown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Terrance Caudill, 103 Clover Lane, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: David K. James, III, Esq., 234 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF JOYCE ELIZABETH TRESSLER, DEC'D

Late of Liberty Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Lester Shockley, 13539 Blue Ridge Avenue, Blue Ridge Summit, PA 17214

Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF JOYCE A. EICHOLTZ, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Arendtsville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Steven D. Eicholtz and Linda K. Carey, c/o Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmänn Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmänn Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF DIANNE M. HOLLINGER, DEC'D

Late of Berwick Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Administrators: Thristin S. James, and Lee E. Hollinger, c/o Amy S. Loper, Esq., The Family Law Practice of Leslie S. Arzt, LLC, 2002 South Queen Street, York, PA 17403

Attorney: Amy S. Loper, Esq., The Family Law Practice of Leslie S. Arzt, LLC, 2002 South Queen Street, York, PA 17403

ESTATE OF ROBERT J. MIDKIFF a/k/a ROBERT JAMES MIDKIFF, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Rachel E. Repcik a/k/a Rachel E. Repcik-Pitts a/k/a Rachel E. Pitts, c/o Rachel L. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Rachel L. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF LEAH C. MILLER a/k/a LEAH CATHERINE MILLER, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of New Oxford, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Nelson L. Miller, 354 South Hickory Lane, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Clayton A. Lingg, Esq., Mooney Law, 230 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF CHARLES L. PLANK a/k/a CHARLES LEROY PLANK, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Steven A. Plank, c/o Sharon E. Myers, Esq., CGA Law Firm, P.O. Box 606, East Berlin PA 17316

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

ESTATE OF CHRISTINE WOLF POOLE a/k/a CHRISTINE W. GERRICK, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Brian A. Poole, c/o Scott L. Kelley, Esq., Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott L. Kelley, Esq., Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF LEE ANN TARANT, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Carroll Valley, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Robert J. Lindsey, 165 Guilford Drive, Chambersburg, PA 17202

Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Continued on page 4

SECOND PUBLICATION CONTINUED

ESTATE OF JACK TORRES a/k/a JACK VINCENT TORRES, DEC'D

Late of Mount Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Rosanne Torres Calure, 13519 Allnutt Lane, Highland, MD 20777

Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe, Rice & Quinn, LLC, 47 West High Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

THIRD PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF KATHRYN L. COPP, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Joan M. Copp and Rebecca A. Strayer, c/o Richard R. Reilly, Esq., 54 N. Duke Street, York, PA 17401-1210

Attorney: Richard R. Reilly, Esq., 54 N. Duke Street, York, PA 17401-1210

ESTATE OF MARY L. CROUSE, DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Catherine L. Swartz, 7500 Molly Pitcher Highway, Lot 26, Shippensburg, PA 17257; Donald P. Crouse, 1200 Siloam Road, Chambersburg, PA 17201

Attorney: Tracy J. Ross, Esq., Keller, Kelley, Beck And Ross, LLC, 1035 Wayne Avenue, Chambersburg, PA 17201

ESTATE OF MARION D. CZAR a/k/a MARION SHONK CZAR, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: David M. Czar, 128 Seminary Avenue, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF BERNETTA G. HELWIG a/k/a BERNETTA HELWIG, DEC'D

Late of Mount Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Larry E. Helwig, 9 Spring Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320

Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF WILLIAM DAVID HOFFMAN, DEC'D

Late of Hamilton Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Scott Douglas Hoffman, c/o John C. Zepp, III, Esq., P.O. Box 204, 8438 Carlisle Pike, York Springs, PA 17372

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

ESTATE OF JANICE K. SPEAKMAN, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Susan L. Dow, c/o D. Keith Brown, Esq., Stuckert & Yates, P.O. Box 70, Newtown, PA 18940

Attorney: D. Keith Brown, Esq., Stuckert & Yates, P.O. Box 70, Newtown, PA 18940

ESTATE OF ELLEN J. STULTZ a/k/a ELLEN JENNIE STULTZ, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Carroll Valley, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Dorothy E. Moul, 375 Heritage Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325



What are your clients' favorite things?

Chances are, your clients care deeply about certain organizations and causes. Help them bring their dreams to fruition with free philanthropic planning tools and ongoing support from the Adams County Community Foundation.

- Expertise in all areas of gift planning
- Free, confidential consultations
- Respect for your client relationships
- Facilitation of charitable giving in Adams County and beyond

To find out more, contact Ralph M. Serpe:
717-337-0060 / rserpe@adamscountycf.org



25 South 4th Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
www.adamscountycf.org



Good for your clients. Good for the community. Good for you.