

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 59

September 29, 2017

No. 21, pp. 108-118

IN THIS ISSUE

ACS171921, LLC V. PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL
BOARD V. READING TOWNSHIP

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 pursuant to the provisions of Section 311 of the Act of December 16, 1982, P.L. 1309, No. 295, codified as amended (54 Pa. C.S.A. §311), there was filed in the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania an Application for Registration of Fictitious Name of BOYER CELLARS, the address of the principal place of business being 405 Boyer Nursery Road, Biglerville, PA 17307. The name and address of the entity that is a party to said registration is: Boyer Nurseries & Orchards, Inc., 405 Boyer Nursery Road, Biglerville, PA 17307.

Puhl, Eastman & Thrasher
Attorneys

9/29

INCORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed on September 5, 2017 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 BALDWIN FAMILY ENTERPRISES, INC., with its principal office or place of business at 430 Glenwood Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325. The names and addresses of all persons or entities owning or interested in said business are: William E. Baldwin and Margaret E. Baldwin.

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

9/29

ADAMS COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
NUMBER: 17-S-789NOTICE OF ACTION IN
MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE

Astoria Bank, Plaintiff
v.
Christine A. Clouser, Known Surviving
Heir of Terri L. Neiderer, Carroll
Bradford Sneeringer, Known Surviving
Heir of Terri L. Neiderer and Unknown
Surviving Heirs of Terri L. Neiderer,
Defendants

TO: Unknown Surviving Heirs of Terri L. Neiderer. Premises subject to foreclosure: 185 Bollinger Road, Littlestown, Pennsylvania 17340.

NOTICE

If you wish to defend, you must enter a written appearance personally or by attorney, and file your defenses or objections in writing with the court. You are warned that if you fail to do so, the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you without further notice for the relief requested by the Plaintiff. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you. You should take this notice 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.

Court Administrator
Adams County Courthouse
111-117 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325
McCabe, Weisberg & Conway, P.C.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
123 S. Broad Street, Suite 1400
Philadelphia, PA 19109
215-790-1010

9/29

ACS171921, LLC V. PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD V. READING TOWNSHIP

1. The Commonwealth Court in *Giant Food Stores, LLC v. Penn Twp.*, held that even though Section 461(b.3) of the Liquor Code states there is no right to appeal a municipality's decision to deny an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license, under Local Agency Law, Giant could appeal the Township's decision. The Court also found that procedurally, Giant did not have to first apply to the PLCB, wait for the PLCB to deny the intermunicipal transfer application based on the lack of municipal approval, and then appeal that decision.

2. Under Section 754(b) of the Local Agency Law, where a full and complete record of the proceedings has been made before the local agency, the trial court may reverse the agency's decision if the agency's findings of fact were not supported by substantial evidence, an error of law was committed, constitutional rights were violated, or the procedure before the agency was contrary to statute.

3. Since the Liquor Code is silent as to the standard a municipality must use when deciding whether to grant or deny a request for an intermunicipal transfer of liquor license, this court agrees with Reading Township's reliance on 53 P.S. § 65607(1).

4. The Commonwealth Court explained our legislature has established the principle that a licensed establishment is not ordinarily detrimental to the welfare, health, and morals of a neighborhood or its residents.

5. Noticeably absent from the record is any objective evidence that granting Plaintiff's request for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license would run contrary to the health, safety and, welfare of the citizens of the township.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, CIVIL 2016-S-1158, ACS171921, LLC V.
PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD V. READING
TOWNSHIP.

L. C. Heim, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff

Robert W. McAteer, Esq., Attorney for Defendant PLCB

Victor A. Neubaum, Esq., Attorney for Defendant Reading Township

Wagner, J., September 6, 2016

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before this Court is Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal from Decision of Reading Township denying Plaintiff's request for approval of the intermunicipal transfer of Pennsylvania Restaurant Liquor License R-18379 into Reading Township, such Petition for Appeal filed on June 30, 2017. For the reasons set forth herein, Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal from Decision of Reading Township is hereby granted.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On March 17, 2016, counsel for ACS171921, LLC (hereinafter referred to as Plaintiff) hand delivered a letter to Reading Township's Solicitor requesting the Township approve an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license.¹ On April 19, 2016, Reading Township held a public hearing on the matter. Plaintiff's counsel attended the hearing and presented testimony.² At the meeting, Defendant (Reading Township Board of Supervisors, hereinafter referred to as Reading Township) unanimously voted to reject Plaintiff's request for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license.³

Thereafter, Plaintiff sent an application for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license to Defendant (Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, hereinafter referred to as PLCB) arguing because "the Township failed to act . . . its application was deemed approved."⁴ On October 31, 2016, PLCB sent Plaintiff's counsel a letter informing him the application for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license "had been cancelled."⁵

On November 16, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Petition for Appeal from PLCB's decision to deny the intermunicipal transfer. This Court issued a rule to show cause order on PLCB on November 18, 2016 which directed PLCB to answer Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal within twenty (20) days of service. On December 13, 2016, PLCB filed a Motion to Dismiss Petitioner's Appeal. Plaintiff filed its Answer to Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Plaintiff's Brief in Support of Petition of Appeal and in Opposition to PLCB's Motion to Quash on December 21, 2016 and January 10, 2017, respectively. By Order of Court dated January 12, 2017, this Court scheduled oral argument for February 3, 2017. On January 18, 2017, this Court stayed paragraph two of its November 18, 2016 Court Order requiring PLCB to file an Answer to Petitioner's Appeal within twenty (20) days. Argument before this Court occurred on February 3, 2017.

¹ See Plaintiff's Petition to Appeal, Exhibit B.

² Plaintiff's Petition to Appeal at para. 8 and 9.

³ See Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Petitioner's Appeal, Exhibit A at 3.

⁴ *Id.* at para. 6.

⁵ See Plaintiff's Petition to Appeal, Exhibit A. The letter stated, in relevant part, "[s]ince a municipal resolution was not received from the receiving municipality, Reading Township, the information you provided was referred to our Legal Bureau for decision. Legal has opined the application should be denied." *Id.*

On February 13, 2017, PLCB filed a Motion to Join Indispensable Party, seeking to join Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania as an indispensable party in the above-captioned litigation. This Court, on February 15, 2017, issued a rule to show cause order on Plaintiff and Reading Township directing them to file an Answer to PLCB's Motion to Join Indispensable Party. On February 23, 2017, Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's Answer to Defendant's Motion to Join Reading Township. Reading Township filed its Answer on March 2, 2017. By Order of Court dated March 13, 2017, this Court granted PLCB's Motion to Join Indispensable Party and joined Reading Township as an indispensable party to the above-captioned action.

On April 7, 2017, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Remand, seeking the "matter be remanded to the Township for the entry by the Township of a resolution either approving the transfer of the license into the Township or disapproving the transfer of the license into the Township, which resolution shall contain findings of fact from the existing record, without re-hearing, that are supported by evidence in the record." On April 21, 2017, this Court scheduled a pre-trial conference for May 8, 2017. Following pre-trial conference, this Court issued, on May 8, 2017, a rule to show cause order upon PLCB and Reading Township to show cause why Plaintiff's Motion for Remand should not be granted. On May 19, 2017, PLCB filed its Answer to Petitioner's Motion for Remand. Thereafter, Reading Township filed its Answer and Memorandum of Law in Support of its Answer on May 26, 2017. In accordance with Local Agency Law, 2 Pa. C.S. § 555, this Court, on June 8, 2017, granted Plaintiff's Motion for Remand and directed Reading Township to file, within thirty (30) days from the date of the Order, Findings of Fact and Reasons for Decision, regarding the hearing held before Reading Township Board of Supervisors on April 19, 2016.

On June 21, 2017, Reading Township filed Findings of Facts and Reasons for Decision of Reading Township. On June 30, 2017, Plaintiff filed a Petition for Appeal from Decision of Reading Township denying Plaintiff's request for an intermunicipal transfer of liquor license. On July 12, 2017, this Court ordered PLCB and Reading Township "thirty (30) days from receipt of this Order of Court to file a brief in reference to Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal from Decision of Reading Township." Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's

Supplementary Brief in Support on July 21, 2017. Reading Township filed its Brief of Reading Township on Petition for Appeal of ACS171921, LLC on July 31, 2017. On August 3, 2017, PLCB filed its Brief Responding to Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal from Decision of Reading Township. Finally, on August 7, 2017, Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Support of Petition for Appeal.

READING TOWNSHIP'S FINDINGS OF FACT

For ease of reference, this Court is including in its Opinion Reading Township's Findings of Facts and Reasons for Decision.

1. On March 17, 2016, ACS171921, LLC, by their attorney, L.C. Heim, Esq., requested by way of a letter to the Reading Township, for approval of an intermunicipal transfer of the license pursuant to 47 P.S. § 4-461(b.3).
2. That letter requested a public hearing for the purpose of receiving comments and recommendations of interested individuals residing within the municipality concerning the transfer.
3. The request indicated that the license was currently in safekeeping and was previously issued to the premises at 2350 Harney Road, Littlestown, [Adams County], and, the license would be transferred to 2115 East Berlin Road, Reading Township, Adams County. This location is a Rutters Store ("Rutters"). The letter referenced "transfer of Pa. Liquor License #R-18379, LID 58967."
4. Reading Township scheduled a public hearing on Applicant's request for its regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors for April 19, 2017 [sic] and advertised Notice of the Hearing in the Evening Sun Newspaper (Hanover, PA) on March 31, 2016 and April 7, 2016.
5. On April 19, 2016, the Reading Township Board of Supervisors ("Board") held its regular meeting; during this meeting, the Board held a hearing on the request of Applicant. Chairman Paul Bart, Vice-Chairman Marcia Weaver and Supervisor Donald Kauffman were in attendance for the Board of Supervisors.
6. Appearing on behalf of the Applicant was L.C. Heim, Esq. Attorney Heim represented to the Board that there first must be

a resolution approving the request. Attorney Heim also indicated that although this is an R license transfer, Rutters “is only interested in beer sales, including craft beer” that will be housed in only one section of the store with select hours of operation. The business would be primarily carryout of the beer, but seating would be provided such that patrons could drink a beer on the premises. Following the Liquor Code, hours of operation are: 7:00 A.M. until 2:00 A.M. every day except Sundays, which would be 9:00 A.M. to 2:00 A.M.

7. No other person appeared at the hearing representing Applicant.
8. Subsequently, comment from the public was received by the Board. The members of the public voiced various objections to Rutters selling alcohol at that location, including comments that: Rutters is a farm store; that the roadway intersection is already a dangerous intersection; and adding alcohol sales there would make the dangerous intersection more dangerous; and, there are many bars in the area and a beer distributor where alcohol can already be purchased. One member of the public spoke in favor of the application.
9. Following public comment, the Board closed the hearing. By motion of Supervisor Bart, the Board of Supervisors voted to reject the application with a vote of three votes in favor to reject and no votes against.

READING TOWNSHIP’S REASONS FOR REJECTION

The Board of Supervisors rejected the application for the reasons stated by the public at the meeting.

1. The Rutters store functions as a “farm” store for the community, being a store catering to a generally agricultural community, which is not compatible with its sale of beer.
2. The intersection of Pa. Rt. 94 and Pa. Rt. 234 is a busy and dangerous intersection which would be made more so by the additional customers patronizing the Rutters for the purpose of purchasing alcoholic beverages.
3. Reading Township already has two locales that serve beer to the public, along with a beer distributorship 5 miles away from the

Rutters in the Borough of East Berlin, all of which sufficiently meet the demand for the consumption of beer products.

LEGAL STANDARD

Section 461(b.3) of the Liquor Code states, in relevant part, that

An intermunicipal transfer of a license or issuance of a license for economic development under subsection (b.1) (2)(i) must first be approved by the governing body of the receiving municipality when the total number of existing restaurant liquor licenses and eating place retail dispenser licenses in the receiving municipality equal or exceed one license per three thousand inhabitants. Upon request for approval of an intermunicipal transfer of a license or issuance of an economic development license by an applicant, at least one public hearing shall be held by the municipal governing body for the purpose of receiving comments and recommendations of interested individuals residing within the municipality concerning the applicant's intent to transfer a license into the municipality The governing body shall, within forty-five days of a request for approval, render a decision by ordinance or resolution to approve or disapprove the applicant's request for an intermunicipal transfer of a license The municipality may approve the request. A decision by the governing body of the municipality to deny the request may not be appealed. A copy of the approval must be submitted with the license application. . . . Failure by the governing body of the municipality to render a decision within forty-five days of the applicant's request for approval shall be deemed an approval of the application in terms as presented unless the governing body has notified the applicant in writing of their election for an extension of time not to exceed sixty days. Failure by the governing body of the municipality to render a decision within the extended time period shall be deemed an approval of the application in terms as presented.

47 P.S. § 4-461(b.3).

Local agency law provides that “[i]n the event a full and complete record of the proceedings before the local agency was made, the court shall hear the appeal without a jury on the record certified by the agency.” **2 Pa.C.S. § 754**. “After hearing the court shall affirm the adjudication unless it shall find that the adjudication is in violation of the constitutional rights of the appellant, or is not in accordance with law . . . or that any finding of fact made by the agency and necessary to support its adjudication is not supported by substantial evidence.” **Id.**

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff appeals Reading Township’s decision to deny its request for approval of an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license. As stated above, Plaintiff argues Reading Township’s reasons for denying Plaintiff’s request are not supported by the requisite substantial evidence. Reading Township based its decision to deny the request on public safety reasons. In support of its decision, Reading Township cites the comments made at the April 19, 2016 public hearing, and **53 P.S. § 65607(1)** which states “[t]he board of supervisors shall: (1) [b]e charged with the general governance of the township and the execution of legislative, executive and administrative powers in order to ensure sound fiscal management and to secure the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the township.”⁶

As an initial matter, during the pendency of this appeal, the Commonwealth Court in **Giant Food Stores, LLC v. Penn Twp.**,⁷ held that even though Section 461(b.3) of the Liquor Code states there is no right to appeal a municipality’s decision to deny an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license, under Local Agency Law,

⁶ **53 P.S. § 65607(1)**; Brief of Reading Township on Petition for Appeal of ACS171921, LLC at 2, para. 5.

⁷ No. 1310 C.D. 2016, 2017 WL 3026922 (Pa. Commw. Ct. July 18, 2017). Penn Township, after a public hearing, denied Giant’s request for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license. **Id.** at *1-2. Two of the issues on appeal before the Commonwealth Court were “(1) whether the trial court erred by quashing an appeal brought under the Local Agency Law; and, (2) whether the trial court erred by concluding that Giant’s appeal was premature. . . .” **Id.** at *1 (footnote omitted).

Giant could appeal the Township’s decision.⁸ The Court also found that, procedurally, Giant did not have to first apply to the PLCB, wait for the PLCB to deny the intermunicipal transfer application based on the lack of municipal approval, and then appeal that decision.⁹ “Giant need not and, in fact, must not wait for the PLCB to ministerially refuse its license application to appeal from the Township’s decision.”¹⁰ Therefore, under **Giant**, this case is correctly before this Court for review.

“[U]nder Section 754(b) of the [Local Agency Law] . . . where a full and complete record¹¹ of the proceedings has been made before the local agency, the trial court may reverse the agency’s decision if the agency’s findings of fact were not supported by substantial evidence, an error of law was committed, constitutional rights were violated, or the procedure before the agency was contrary to statute.” **Boston Concessions Grp., Inc. v. Logan Twp. Bd. of Supervisors**, 815 A.2d 8, 11 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2002) (citing **SSEN, Inc. v. Borough Council of the Borough of Eddystone**, 810 A.2d 200, 207 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2002) (internal citation omitted)). Substantial evidence has been described as “‘more than a mere scintilla’ of evidence and [is] that which a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” **SSEN, Inc.**, 810 A.2d at 207 (citing **Kish v. Annville-Cleona Sch. Dist.**, 645 A.2d 361, 364 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1994)).

⁸ **Id.** at *2, 7. The Court explained,

Although Giant could apply to the PLCB for the License transfer, **without the statutorily-mandated prerequisite municipal approval, Giant’s application** would be **fatally flawed**, and the PLCB would be statutorily-mandated to reject it. Further, even if the PLCB held a hearing on the application under Section 464 of the Liquor Code, it has no authority to review the Township’s decision. Thus, absent the right to appeal under the Local Agency Law, the Township’s decision would be insulated from **any** review.

Id. (emphasis in original) (footnote omitted).

⁹ **Id.** at *8. “[S]ince the Township’s decision is an adjudication, and Giant must either initially obtain approval from the [Township] or appeal [from] the denial under Section 752 of the Local Agency Law, Giant here properly appealed from the Township’s decision to the trial court.” **Id.** at *9 (internal quotations omitted) (citation omitted).

¹⁰ **Id.** at *9.

¹¹ All parties are in agreement that this Court has a full and complete record before it and de novo review is not necessary.

Section 461(b.3) of the Liquor Code governs the intermunicipal transfer of liquor licenses. Prior to its amendment in 2006, the statute provided, in part, that “[t]he municipality must approve the request unless it finds that doing so would adversely affect the welfare, health, peace and morals of the municipality or its residents.”¹² However, that language was removed from the statute and replaced with the much more general “[t]he municipality may approve the request” language.¹³ Since Section 461(b.3) of the Liquor Code is silent as to the standard a municipality must use when deciding whether to grant or deny a request for an intermunicipal transfer of liquor license, this Court agrees with Reading Township’s reliance on **53 P.S. § 65607(1)**. Without any standard, the board of supervisors could arbitrarily deny or grant a request for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license.¹⁴

In **SSEN**, the Commonwealth Court explained “[o]ur legislature has established the principle that a licensed establishment is not ordinarily detrimental to the welfare, health and morals of a neighborhood or its residents.” 810 A.2d at 208. In affirming the trial court’s decision to reverse the Borough Council’s finding that the intermunicipal transfer “would adversely affect the Borough or its residents[.]” the Commonwealth Court focused on the lack of objective evidence in the record before the Borough Council. *Id.* at 208-09.¹⁵ In **AWT Beaver Independence Deli, Inc. v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania**, 876 A.2d 500, 505 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2005), the Commonwealth Court again focused on the lack of objective evidence and found “the record [before the Board] lack[ed] any specific evidence indicating that the license transfer would be detrimental to

¹² **47 P.S. § 4-461(b.3)** (former).

¹³ **47 P.S. § 4-461(b.3)**.

¹⁴ See **Giant**, 2017 WL 3026922, at *7.

¹⁵ The Commonwealth Court stated “[l]ittle objective evidence was presented by the Borough; in fact, testimony intended to demonstrate increased traffic hazards, parking problems, drinking and driving under the influence which would result from the transfer was, at most, general and speculative.” **SSEN**, 810 A.2d at 208.

the Township or its residents.”¹⁶ See also **Boston Concessions Group, Inc.**, 815 A.2d at 13-14 (“Here, the record is absent of any specific evidence indicating that the license transfer would in fact be *detrimental* to Lakemont or its patrons.”) (emphasis in original).¹⁷

Instantly, the evidence before the Board of Supervisors at the April 19, 2016 public hearing consisted only of the testimony of Plaintiff’s attorney and comments from members of the public. The minutes from the meeting summarize the public comments as follows,

Members of the public at the meeting voiced objection to Rutters selling alcohol. The comments related to the fact that Rutters is a ‘farm store’ and that intersection is already a dangerous intersection without adding alcohol to the mix. Another objection was to the fact there are many bars in the area and a beer distributor where alcohol can be purchased. ¹⁸

Noticeably absent from the record is any objective evidence that granting Plaintiff’s request for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license would run contrary to “the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the township.”¹⁹

¹⁶ Although several residents expressed concerns regarding the possible dangers of alcohol-related problems . . . we note that little objective evidence was presented by the Township. Testimony intending to demonstrate a negative impact on the use and enjoyment of nearby facilities and other possible dangers of alcohol-related problems was merely general and too speculative.” AWT Beaver, 876 A.2d at 505 (footnote omitted).

¹⁷ This Court recognizes that **SSEN, AWT Beaver and Boston Concessions Group, Inc.** all deal with the previous version of Section 461(b.3) which includes the language “the municipality must approve or disapprove the request unless it finds that doing so would adversely affect the welfare, health, peace and morals of the municipality or its residents.” However, this language is very similar to the language in **53 P.S. § 65607(1)** which states “[t]he board of supervisors shall: (1) [b]e charged with the general governance of the township and the execution of legislative, executive and administrative powers in order to ensure . . . the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the township.” Therefore, this Court finds the aforementioned cases both instructive and relevant.

¹⁸ See Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Petitioner’s Appeal, Exhibit A at 3.

¹⁹ **53 P.S. § 65607(1)**.

Therefore, under Local Agency Law, this court finds Reading Township's Reasons for Decision were not supported by substantial evidence. As such, this Court grants Plaintiff's Petition to Appeal.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 6th day of September, 2017, Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal From Decision of Reading Township is hereby Granted. This Court reverses Reading Township's decision to deny Plaintiff's request for an intermunicipal transfer of a liquor license and, in accordance with 47 P.S. § 4-461(b.3) and 40 Pa. Code § 7.61 approves Plaintiff's request for an intermunicipal transfer of Pennsylvania Restaurant Liquor License R-18379 into Reading Township.

PLCB's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Appeal is Granted and Plaintiff's Petition for Appeal, filed on November 16, 2016 is hereby Dismissed.

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 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 RICHARD R. GOLDEN, DEC'D

Late of Highland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Frances M. Golden, 1670 Knoxlyn Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Phillips & Phillips, 101 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF C. EDWARD LAWRENCE a/k/a C.E. LAWRENCE a/k/a CYRIL E. LAWRENCE, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Jane M. (Wright) Hempfing, 1120 Roosevelt Court, Hanover, Pennsylvania 17331

Attorney: Elinor Albright Rebert, Esq., 515 Carlisle Street, Hanover, Pennsylvania 17331

ESTATE OF RUTH ELIZABETH STAUB a/k/a RUTH E. STAUB, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Jeffrey A. Megonnell, 47 Stoney Point Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

SECOND PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF LARRY E. GEBHART, DEC'D

Late of Mount Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Rose M. Gebhart, 893 White Hall Road, Littlestown, PA 17340

Attorney: Henry O. Heiser, III, Esq., 104 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF SALLY ANN LOHMAN a/k/a SALLY ANN GILBERT a/k/a SALLY ANN MILLER, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Evelyn S. D'Elia, P.O. Box 206, Newport, PA 17074

ESTATE OF PATRICIA A. PITNEY, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Susan P. Giuffreda, 10 Waterford Court, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF JAMES W. SCHAFER a/k/a JAMES WILLIAM SCHAFER, DEC'D

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Stephen M. Schafer, 116 Bennett Drive, Thurmont, MD 21788; Michael D. Rankin, 7061 Kidwelly Lane, Matthews, NC 28104

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

ESTATE OF FRANK R. SCOTT, DEC'D

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: F. Dennis Scott, 625 Mt. Tabor Road, Gardners, PA 17324; Corinne Ann (Scott) Moore, 1265 Russell Tavern Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF DAWSON W. SHELLEY, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Donald Milhimes, 1735 Highland Avenue Road Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF JAY E. WEAVER, a/k/a JAY E. WEAVER, SR., DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Christian J. Weaver, c/o Gillian A. Woodward, Esq., 1701 West Market Street, York, PA 17404

Attorney: Gillian A. Woodward, Esq., 1701 West Market Street, York, PA 17404

ESTATE OF JOHN F. WILLIAMS JR., DEC'D

Late of Liberty Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Natalie Williams, c/o Johanna H. Rehkamp, Esq., Cunningham, Chernicoff & Warshawsky, P.C., 2320 North Second Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110.

Attorney: Johanna H. Rehkamp, Esq., Cunningham, Chernicoff & Warshawsky, P.C., 2320 North Second Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110.

ESTATE OF BETTY JANE KARNITZ WYKES, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: James Carl Roubal, Jr., 956 Fairview Ave., Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Keith R. Nonemaker, Esq., Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst & Hart, LLP, 40 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

THIRD PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF GEORGE W. CROOK, DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Barbara A. Runyon, 781 Apple Way, Saint Thomas, PA 17252

ESTATE OF BRENDA L. MUMMERT, DEC'D

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrices: Katrina J. Humphrey, 2588 Shippensburg Rd., Biglerville, PA 17307; Natasha N. Humphrey, 36 S. High St., PO Box 462, Arendtsville, PA 17303

Attorney: James T. Yingst, Esq., Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst & Hart, LLP, 40 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

