

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 64

September 16, 2022

No. 20 pp 32-41

IN THIS ISSUE

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
VS. LEMUEL ROBERT CRAWFORD

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.

INCORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation and Fictitious Name were filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania on or about July 19, 2022, for the incorporation of non-profit HEALTHY COMMUNITY LIFESPACES under the Pennsylvania Corporation Law of 1988. The initial registered office of the corporation is 620 Keebler Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406.

Salvatore F. Bello, III, Esq.
Bello, Reilley, McGrory & DiPippo
144 E. DeKalb Pike, Suite 300
King of Prussia, PA 19406

9/16

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
VS. LEMUEL ROBERT CRAWFORD

1. Trooper Dounouk testified at the suppression hearing that he observed Defendant raise his hands into the air while driving. Trooper Dounouk checked Defendant's vehicle registration, which was expired. Based upon the expired vehicle registration, Trooper Dounouk initiated a traffic stop

2. After identifying the purpose of the initial stop, Trooper Dounouk began questioning Defendant about his criminal history and drug use.

3. Trooper Dounouk placed Defendant under arrest for suspicion of DUI and transported him to Gettysburg Hospital for a blood draw.

4. After considering the suppression hearing testimony and viewing the MVR recording, it is clear that, at a minimum, Trooper Dounouk began an independent investigation for DUI at a point in the traffic stop when he asked Defendant whether he was on probation, which began at the 2:43 time stamp on the MVR. As such, we must determine whether, at that point, Trooper Dounouk had the reasonable suspicion necessary to extend the traffic stop beyond addressing the initial violation for an expired vehicle registration.

5. First, Trooper Dounouk testified that Defendant appeared agitated and extremely nervous, to a degree that stood out as atypical amongst thousands of prior traffic stops. At the same time, he stated that Defendant appeared lethargic, laid-back, and relaxed. Our review of the MVR showed no apparent nervous behavior from Defendant. He sounded calm and relaxed when answering Trooper Dounouk's initial questions at the beginning of the traffic stop.

6. Another factor that Trooper Dounouk testified to which led to him initiating a DUI investigation was Defendant's constricted pupils. He initially testified that Defendant's pupils were "extremely" constricted, but then later stated that the pupils were in the middle range of constriction. "Middle range" of constriction was not defined by Trooper Dounouk. Without more, we take it to mean the same as "average." If a person has average pupil construction, is that not normal, and *not* indicative of possible impairment?

7. Viewing the totality of the circumstances, we find that Trooper Dounouk lacked the reasonable suspicion required to extend the traffic stop into an investigation for driving under the influence. As such, the traffic stop should have lasted no longer than necessary to address Defendant's expired vehicle registration.

District Attorney's Office, Attorney for Commonwealth

David R. Erhard, Esquire, Attorney for Defendant

Campbell, J., August 15, 2022

OPINION ON DEFENDANT'S OMNIBUS
PRE-TRIAL MOTION

Presently before this Court is Defendant's Omnibus Pre-Trial Motion filed on May 13, 2022. For the reasons set forth herein, Defendant's motion is granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On October 7, 2021, at approximately 3:00 PM, while on patrol in a marked police cruiser, Pennsylvania State Trooper Jared Dounouk (“Trooper Dounouk”), began following Defendant, Lemuel Crawford, as he drove on York Road, Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania.
2. Trooper Dounouk testified at the suppression hearing that he observed Defendant raise his hands into the air while driving.
3. Trooper Dounouk checked Defendant’s vehicle registration, which was expired.
4. Based upon the expired vehicle registration, Trooper Dounouk initiated a traffic stop.
5. The traffic stop was recorded on Trooper Dounouk’s cruiser’s Mobile Video Audio Recording Equipment (“MVR”), which was entered into evidence and marked as Commonwealth Exhibit No. 1.
6. Trooper Dounouk testified at the suppression hearing that upon making contact with Defendant, he observed several clues which raised suspicion that Defendant might be impaired.
7. After identifying the purpose of the initial stop, Trooper Dounouk began questioning Defendant about his criminal history and drug use.
8. Defendant denied being under the influence of any controlled substances.
9. At Trooper Dounouk’s direction, Defendant performed Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (“SFST”) and Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (“ARIDE”).
10. Trooper Dounouk testified to observing additional clues of possible impairment during the administration of SFSTs and ARIDE.
11. Trooper Dounouk placed Defendant under arrest for suspicion of DUI and transported him to Gettysburg Hospital for a blood draw.

12. Defendant was subsequently charged with the following offenses:
 - Count 1 – Driving Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, in violation of 75 Pa. C.S. Section 3802(d) (1)(i), as a second offense and misdemeanor of the first degree.
 - Count 2 – Driving Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, in violation of 75 Pa. C.S. Section 3802(d) (1)(iii) as a second offense and misdemeanor of the first degree.
 - Count 3 – Registration/Certification of Title, as a summary offense under 75 Pa. C.S. Section 1301.
13. On May 13, 2022, Defendant filed his Omnibus Pre-Trial Motion.
14. On July 25, 2022, a hearing was held on Defendant's Omnibus Pre-Trial Motion.

ISSUES

1. Whether Trooper Dounouk had the reasonable suspicion necessary to extend the initial traffic stop into an independent investigation for DUI.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Trooper Dounouk did not have reasonable suspicion to extend the initial traffic stop into an investigation for DUI.

DISCUSSION

Defendant argues that he was unlawfully detained in violation of the United States and Pennsylvania Constitutions by claiming that Trooper Dounouk did not have the reasonable suspicion required to extend the initial traffic stop for expired vehicle registration into an investigation for DUI. Defendant seeks suppression of any evidence obtained as a result of the unlawful detention. After careful review, we agree.

In a suppression hearing, the Commonwealth has the burden of establishing 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 to 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.”¹ 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) (citing *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, 469 U.S. 325, 334 (1985)). Pennsylvania’s Constitution specifically guarantees citizens the right to be “secure in their persons ... from unreasonable searches and seizures.”² If 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).

Regarding the unlawful extension of a lawful traffic stop, the United States Supreme court has provided:

[T]he tolerable duration of police inquiries in the traffic-stop context is determined by the seizure’s “mission”—to address the traffic violation that warranted the stop, and attend to related safety concerns. Because addressing the infraction is the purpose of the stop, it may “last no longer than is necessary to effectuate th[at] purpose.” Authority for the seizure thus ends when tasks tied to the traffic infraction are—or reasonably should have been—completed.

[A] traffic stop “can become unlawful if it is prolonged beyond the time reasonably required to complete th[e] mission” of issuing a warning ticket.... An officer, in other words, may conduct certain unrelated checks during an otherwise lawful traffic stop. But ... he may not do so in a way that prolongs the stop, *absent the reasonable suspicion ordinarily demanded to justify detaining an individual*.

Commonwealth v. Malloy, 257 A.3d 142, 149 (Pa. Super. 2021) (citing *Rodriguez v. United States*, 575 U.S. 348, 354 (2015) (emphasis added) (citations omitted)). Thus, in order to extend a traffic stop into a secondary investigation, a police officer must have a reasonable suspicion that criminal activity is afoot.

¹ U.S. Const. amend. IV.

² Pa. Const. art. I, §8.

At a suppression hearing, a police officer must demonstrate specific and articulable facts, in addition to inferences based on those facts, upon which he relied to form his reasonable suspicion. See *Commonwealth v. Holmes*, 14 A.3d 89, 96-7. Reasonable suspicion depends on the content of information possessed by the police and the degree of its reliability. *Commonwealth v. Winbush*, 561 Pa. 368, 375 (Pa. 2000). “In order to determine whether the police officer had reasonable suspicion, the totality of the circumstances must be considered.” *Commonwealth v. Hughes*, 908 A.2d 924, 927 (Pa. Super. 2006).

There is no disagreement between the parties as to the legality of the initial traffic stop. Trooper Dounouk ran a check on Defendant’s vehicle registration and found that it had expired approximately a week prior. He initiated the traffic stop based on that Motor Vehicle Code violation. The question before us now is whether Trooper Dounouk had reasonable suspicion to extend the initial traffic stop into an investigation for DUI.

Trooper Dounouk testified at the suppression hearing regarding the traffic stop. Initially, we note Trooper Dounouk’s training and experience in law enforcement. He has been a Pennsylvania State Police Trooper for four (4) years, and has academy training in administering Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (“SFSTs”) and Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (“ARIDE”). He has approximately two hundred and fifty (250) DUI arrests over a two-year period. The traffic stop of Defendant was recorded by Trooper Dounouk’s patrol unit MVR and entered into evidence as Commonwealth Exhibit No. 1.

Trooper Dounouk testified that prior to initiating the traffic stop, he observed Defendant raise his hands into the air while he was driving, appearing “agitated.” He also testified that upon making contact with Defendant at the driver’s window, he observed Defendant’s eyes to be bloodshot, glassy, and with “extremely” restricted pupils. Trooper Dounouk further testified that Defendant appeared nervous, with trembling hands. He believed that the level of nervousness displayed by Defendant was “atypical,” and stood out from thousands of other traffic stops. However, Trooper Dounouk also testified on cross-examination that Defendant was lethargic, laid-back and relaxed. Further, when asked on cross to describe “extreme” pupil

constriction, Trooper Dounouk testified that Defendant's pupils were actually "in the middle range of constriction." According to Trooper Dounouk, based only upon Defendant's eyes, and nervous behavior, he suspected that Defendant might be under the influence of marijuana and began an investigation for DUI.

First, Trooper Dounouk ordered Defendant to pull down his eyelids. He testified that he observed reddening of the lower conjunctiva. Trooper Dounouk then requested that Defendant exit the vehicle for further questioning and to perform field sobriety testing. Trooper Dounouk testified that he observed additional clues during the testing which led him to further suspect that Defendant was impaired. The trooper also testified that Defendant was scratching his arms so badly that his arms started to bleed. Trooper Dounouk asked Defendant about the marks on his arms, and Defendant stated that he donates blood. Based upon the totality of the circumstances, Trooper Dounouk placed Defendant under arrest and transported him to Gettysburg Hospital for a blood draw.

Our review of the MVR revealed the following. As Trooper Dounouk made contact with Defendant at the driver's window, he identified the reason for the stop – the expired vehicle registration. Almost immediately after, Trooper Dounouk asked Defendant where he was coming from that day. Defendant stated that he was on his way home from work. Defendant worked in construction. Trooper Dounouk then asked, "are you on probation or anything right now?" Defendant stated that he was not. Trooper Dounouk then asked Defendant about his criminal history, to which Defendant replied that he had a DUI a few years ago. Trooper Dounouk also asked Defendant if there were any large sums of money or drugs inside, and whether a dog would alert to anything in the vehicle. Defendant replied that there was not.

The DUI investigation continued from there, with Trooper Dounouk continuing to question Defendant about drug use. Once Defendant was outside of the vehicle, Trooper Dounouk explained that if he found out Defendant was lying to him (regarding drug use), that he "could get very creative with what charges to technically apply." Even prior to Defendant performing field sobriety tests, Trooper Dounouk also suggested that he would find clues of impairment no matter how Defendant performed on the tests. Trooper

Dounouk also told Defendant several times that he knew Defendant was lying about his alleged drug use.

After considering the suppression hearing testimony and viewing the MVR recording, it is clear that, at a minimum, Trooper Dounouk began an independent investigation for DUI at the point in the traffic stop when he asked Defendant whether he was on probation, which begins around the 2:43 time stamp on the MVR. As such, we must determine whether, at that point, Trooper Dounouk had the reasonable suspicion necessary to extend the traffic stop beyond addressing the initial violation for an expired vehicle registration.

Up to the moment when Trooper Dounouk began his independent investigation for DUI, he testified that he observed Defendant's abnormal eye appearance, middle-of-range constricted pupils, and allegedly agitated and nervous, but also laid-back and lethargic behavior. Some of this testimony is obviously conflicting, and we struggle to reconcile those inconsistencies. First, Trooper Dounouk testified that Defendant appeared agitated and extremely nervous, to a degree that stood out as atypical amongst thousands of prior traffic stops. At the same time, he stated that Defendant appeared lethargic, laid-back, and relaxed. Our review of the MVR showed no apparent nervous behavior from Defendant. He sounded calm and relaxed when answering Trooper Dounouk's initial questions at the beginning of the traffic stop.

Additionally, although Defendant's demeanor *after* the DUI investigation began is not bearing on our determination as to whether Trooper Dounouk had reasonable suspicion to begin the investigation in the first place, it is, however, helpful in assessing the credibility of Trooper Dounouk's testimony regarding Defendant's alleged "extreme" nervousness overall. On the MVR, Defendant can be seen standing calmly when outside of the vehicle. He appeared relaxed, even leaning against the rear of his vehicle at times. His arms were crossed for most of the interaction. There was no obvious fidgeting. He was cooperative throughout Trooper Dounouk's investigation.

Trooper Dounouk testified that Defendant scratched his arms so badly that he started to bleed. However, on the MVR, when Trooper Dounouk asks Defendant about the scratching and his bleeding arms, Defendant explained that he donated blood recently. Defendant also stated that he has autism, and "picks" himself a lot, and that the

bleeding is from old wounds that have opened up from picking.³ Regardless, nervousness during a traffic stop is not out of the ordinary, and our Superior Court has stated as much:

It is the rare person who is not agitated to some extent when stopped by police, even if the driver is a law-abiding citizen who simply failed to notice or repair a broken taillight or was unaware that he or she was driving above the speed limit. Whether described as nervousness, apprehension, concern or otherwise, forced interaction with a police officer is not an everyday occurrence for the average citizen. *Cf. Commonwealth v. Au*, 42 A.3d 1002, 1010–11 (Pa. 2012) (indicating that encounters with police are viewed through the eye of the reasonable person). Without more, the nervousness of a driver of a vehicle during a late night stop for suspected violation of the tinted window prohibition does not suffice to allow police to conduct a Terry frisk and a protective weapons search of a vehicle. A contrary ruling would serve to essentially eliminate a motor vehicle operator's protection against unreasonable searches and seizures guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8 of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

Commonwealth v. Cartagena, 63 A.3d 294, 305-06 (Pa. Super. 2013) (cleaned up). Even so, Trooper Dounouk's conflicting testimony and the MVR leave us to question whether Defendant was nervous at all, especially to a degree that would be considered atypical and suspicious.

Another factor that Trooper Dounouk testified to which led to him initiating a DUI investigation was Defendant's constricted pupils. He initially testified that Defendant's pupils were "extremely" constricted, but then later stated that the pupils were in the middle range of constriction. "Middle range" of constriction was not defined by Trooper Dounouk. Without more, we take it to mean the same as

³ In an off-camera conversation that was captured by the MVR, the other State Police Trooper at the scene contemplated Defendant's autism as a potential cause for the scratching, but Trooper Dounouk discounted the idea, stating that autism "doesn't make you do that." **Commonwealth Ex. 1** at 31:17.

“average.” If a person has average pupil constriction, is that not normal, and *not* indicative of possible impairment?

Considering Trooper Dounouk’s conflicting testimony on Defendant’s nervousness and pupil constriction, we are left with only Defendant’s alleged red/bloodshot eyes as a factor toward reasonable suspicion of DUI. Bloodshot eyes alone are insufficient to investigate for DUI. However, even if we assume, *arguendo*, that Defendant was nervous, had constricted pupils and red eyes, we would find that those factors combined still do not create a totality of circumstances that rises to the level of reasonable suspicion.

Notably, Trooper Dounouk did not testify to observing any erratic driving, any odor of marijuana, or any slurred or lethargic speech – factors that would strongly suggest Defendant might be impaired. Finding insufficient reasonable suspicion here is not inconsistent with our recent decision in *Commonwealth v. Luiz Alfredo Ruiz Figueroa*, CP-01-CR-261-2022, where the officer testified to detecting a strong odor of burnt marijuana emanating from within the defendant’s vehicle, in addition to other clues of intoxication.

Here, there was no outward evidence of impairment or recent marijuana usage. The fact that a driver has red eyes, average pupil constriction, and appears to be nervous, are not sufficient factors alone to support reasonable suspicion that the driver might be driving under the influence of a controlled substance. Finding that an officer can extend a traffic stop to investigate for DUI based on such factors alone would essentially eliminate a motor vehicle operator’s protection against unreasonable searches and seizures guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. As discussed above, it is even questionable as to whether Defendant did appear nervous or had constricted pupils.

Viewing the totality of the circumstances, we find that Trooper Dounouk lacked the reasonable suspicion required to extend the traffic stop into an investigation for driving under the influence. As such, the traffic stop should have lasted no longer than necessary to address Defendant’s expired vehicle registration. All evidence obtained after Trooper Dounouk unlawfully prolonged the traffic

stop,⁴ including any statements made by Defendant and the blood test results, must be suppressed.

Therefore, Defendant's Motion to Suppress is granted. Accordingly, the attached Order will be entered.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 15th day of August, 2022, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, Defendant's Motion to Suppress is granted. All evidence obtained from the DUI investigation, including any of Defendant's statements and the blood test results, are suppressed.

⁴ The traffic stop was extended to an investigation for DUI when Trooper Dounouk asked Defendant whether he was on probation, which begins around the 2:43 time stamp on the MVR.

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 SANDRA L. BAKER a/k/a SANDRA LEE BAKER, DEC'D

Late of Tyrone Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Charles T. Baker, Jr., 89 Cottage Lane, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Ann C. Shultis, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 1147 Eichelberger Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF BRYON D. DICK, DEC'D

Late of Hamiltonban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Kathy A. Dick, 26 Echo Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320

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

ESTATE OF MARY L. LETCHWORTH a/k/a MARY LOUISE LETCHWORTH, DEC'D

Late of Butler Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Michael C. Cash, c/o Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF DOROTHY I. MICKEY, DEC'D

Late of Highland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrixes: Frances M. Golden, 1670 Knoxlyn Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Judith A. Mickey, 1693 Knoxlyn Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF RONALD EUGENE POOLE, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Littlestown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Rhonda Marie Flynn, c/o Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 1201 West Elm Avenue, Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 1201 West Elm Avenue, Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF G. RANDY REAMER a/k/a GERRY REAMER a/k/a GERRY R. REAMER, DEC'D

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

Co-Executors: Robert A. Fitez, Jr., 755 Pecher Road, Fairfield, PA 17320; Leslie R. Grimes, 24 Northern Pike Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320

Attorney: Bernard A. Yannetti, Esq., Hartman & Yannetti, Inc. Law Office, 126 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

SECOND PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF DONNA IRENE BUCHER, DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Isaac Jacob Bucher, 345 Church Road, Orrtanna, PA 17353; Amanda L. Smyers, 345 Black Horse Tavern Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF CHARLES W. HAHN, JR., DEC'D

Late of Berwick Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Administrators C.T.A.: Charles W. Hahn, III, P.O. Box 349, Bishopville, MD 21813; William Spurlock, 603 Spring Court, Abbottstown, PA 17301

Attorney: Jennifer M. Stetter, Esq., Barley Snyder LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF NANCY J. HECKMAN a/k/a NANCY JEAN HECKMAN, DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Roger A. Heckman, c/o Jared S. Childers, Esq., R. Thomas Murphy & Associates, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

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

ESTATE OF RONALD W. SPEELMAN, DEC'D

Late of Hamiltonban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Judith A. Tully, c/o Barbara Entwistle, Esq., Entwistle & Roberts, PC, 37 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Barbara Entwistle, Esq., Entwistle & Roberts, PC, 37 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

THIRD PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF RONALD COLLINS McIntYRE a/k/a RONALD C. McIntYRE, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Scott C. McIntyre and Denise McIntyre Hammond, c/o Kurt A. Gardner, Esq., Gardner and Stevens, P.C., 109 West Main Street, Ephrata, PA 17522

Attorney: Kurt A. Gardner, Esq., Gardner and Stevens, P.C., 109 West Main Street, Ephrata, PA 17522

ESTATE OF LUCILLE K. MILLER, DEC'D

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

Executor: Bradford V. Miller, c/o Sharon E. Myers, Esq., CGA Law Firm, PC, 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 VIOLET MAE MYERS, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrators: Robin F. Myers, 116 Linden Avenue, Hanover, PA 17331; Daniel P. Myers, 49 Chesapeake Estates, Thomasville, PA 17364

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

ESTATE OF NEVIN P. RILEY a/k/a NEVIN PAXTON RILEY, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Tina M. Denike, 60 Waldheim Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

THIRD PUBLICATION CONTINUED

ESTATE OF DONALD EUGENE SHULTZ,
DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Kenneth L. Shultz, 1043
Green Ridge Road, Orrtanna, PA
17353

Attorney: Matthew R. Battersby, Esq.,
Battersby Law Office, P.O. Box 215,
Fairfield, PA 17320

ESTATE OF MARY SUE VANHOUTTE,
DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Kenneth M. VanHoutte, 320
Hunterstown-Hampton Road,
Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Harold A. Eastman, Jr.,
Barley Snyder, LLP, 123 Baltimore
Street, Suite 101, 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



ADAMS COUNTY
COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

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



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