

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 65

April 19, 2024

No. 51

IN THIS ISSUE:

H&M HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC, HAUSER FAMILY FARMS, LLC, MELINDA H. DAVIS and HANNAH M. HAUSER v. ALAN K. PATRONO, JONATHAN ALAN PATRONO, JANE HAUSER PATRONO, POLLY E. PATRONO a/k/a POLLY E. PATRONO-CARLSON, JOHN J. MURPHY, III, PATRONO & MURPHY, LLC, APPLE LEAF ABSTRACTING & SETTLEMENT COMPANY and JOHN DOE(S) / JANE DOE(S).

Invest With Experience

The right financial partner will help you plan for the future and manage investments with your best interest in mind. Our disciplined, common sense approach to investment management is customized to meet your objectives.

acnb.com | 1.888.334.2262



**Trust & Investment
Services**

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; Dr. B. Bohleke (since 2019), Business Manager.

Business Office – 117 BALTIMORE STREET, ROOM 305, GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2313. Telephone: (717) 337-9812

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

Chances are, your clients have certain organizations and causes they care deeply about.

Show them you get it.

Help your clients 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 our community. Good for you.

H&M HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC, HAUSER FAMILY FARMS, LLC, MELINDA H. DAVIS and HANNAH M. HAUSER v. ALAN K. PATRONO, JONATHAN ALAN PATRONO, JANE HAUSER PATRONO, POLLY E. PATRONO a/k/a POLLY E. PATRONO-CARLSON, JOHN J. MURPHY, III, PATRONO & MURPHY, LLC, APPLE LEAF ABSTRACTING & SETTLEMENT COMPANY and JOHN DOE(S) / JANE DOE(S).

1. The pleadings have been quite complex involving numerous claims raised in three separate counties. The litigation has also been quite acrimonious as it involves the dissolution of various family businesses and the deterioration of family relationships. Unfortunately, the parties' acrimony has carried over into the courtroom resulting in just about every aspect of this litigation being highly contentious. The genesis of the current issue is Appellants' noncompliance with discovery obligations.

2. Generally, in considering a motion to award counsel fees as a sanction, an evidentiary hearing is required. *Wood v. Geisenheimer-Shaulis*, 827 A.2d 1204, 1208 (Pa. Super. 2003). Although disposition of a claim for attorney fees generally requires an evidentiary hearing, no hearing is necessary where the facts are undisputed.

3. The current sanctions were imposed based upon Appellants' dilatory actions in failing to comply with discovery contrary to direct Orders entered by the Court.

4. Appellants next claim the Trial Court failed to make any finding to support the imposition of sanctions. Although it is true that this Court's Order did not include such finding, the record clearly reflects the Court's conclusions were stated to the parties following argument. The statements made in the presence of the parties in open court clearly confirm the Court's finding that Appellants participated in dilatory, aberrant, and vexatious conduct in regard to their actions in responding to discovery requests. This challenge is not a basis for relief.

5. Appellants' third and fourth issues are summarily meritless. Instantly, there is no factual dispute that this Court entered an Order

compelling Appellants to comply with discovery requests and, further, Appellants violated that Order. The same is sufficient to support the imposition of sanctions.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 2018-SU-1293, No. 985 MDA 2023

Paige Macdonald-Matthes, Esquire,
and Jennifer L. Bruce, Esquire, Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Ronald L. Finck, Esquire,
and Aaron D. Martin, Esquire, Attorneys for Defendants
George, P. J., September 27, 2023

OPINION PURSUANT TO Pa. R.A.P. 1925(a)

The current appeal challenges this Court's Order dated June 12, 2023 which denied Appellees' Motion for Citation of Contempt; directed Appellants to comply with discovery deadlines; precluded Appellants from presenting evidence at trial; and imposed financial sanctions against Appellants.¹ In their Concise Statement of Errors Complained of on Appeal, Appellants raise the following issues:

1. The Trial Court erred in not holding an evidentiary hearing before holding Appellants in contempt *de facto* and imposing sanctions;
2. The Trial Court erred in failing to make a finding of a violation of any order to support a finding of contempt or the imposition of sanctions;
3. The Trial Court erred in finding a basis to support a finding of contempt or the imposition of sanctions; and
4. The Trial Court erred in imposing sanctions for the payment of attorney fees directly to Appellees' counsel.

¹ The current appeal is a challenge to an Order directing discovery sanctions. As the Order challenged is not a final order, the appeal is an improper interlocutory appeal subject to being quashed. *Baranowski v. American Multi-Cinema, Inc.*, 688 A.2d 207, 208 n.1 (Pa. Super. 1997) ("Discovery sanction orders are interlocutory and not appealable until final judgment in the underlying action.").

As the Order which is the subject of this appeal denied Appellees' request for a finding of contempt, the issues currently raised by Appellants will be addressed solely in the context of the propriety of the sanctions imposed against Appellants.

The current litigation was initiated in 2018. The pleadings have been quite complex involving numerous claims raised in three separate counties. The litigation has also been quite acrimonious as it involves the dissolution of various family businesses and the deterioration of family relationships. Unfortunately, the parties' acrimony has carried over into the courtroom resulting in just about every aspect of this litigation being highly contentious. The genesis of the current issue is Appellants' noncompliance with discovery obligations. As the history is relevant to resolution of the current issues, it will be briefly summarized herein.

On September 28, 2022, this Court issued a Case Management Order ("CMO") providing, inter alia, that the deadline for fact discovery was January 27, 2023. During an unsuccessful settlement conference held on March 15, 2023, issues concerning discovery were discussed. The Court encouraged the parties to informally resolve those disputes, however, reiterated expectation that the parties comply with the CMO.² On March 20, 2023, the Court conducted a scheduling conference where the issue of Appellants' compliance with discovery requests was once again raised. The Court directed the parties to file appropriate motions should either party be in violation of the Court's CMO. The Court also reiterated its direction that all parties comply with the CMO. On April 10, 2023, Appellees filed a Motion to Compel Discovery and for the imposition of sanctions. After argument, on April 25, 2023, the Court specifically directed, inter alia, Appellants Alan Patrono, Jonathan Patrono, and Jane Hauser Patrono, to provide Appellees with copies of their individual tax returns for the years 2011 through and including 2021, including therewith any schedules or supporting documentation, within 20 days of the date of the Order. The Court reserved ruling on Appellees' request for sanctions. On May 25, 2023, Appellees filed a Motion for Citation of Contempt seeking the

² The conference was not a record proceeding.

issuance of a citation to Appellants Alan Patrono, Jonathan Patrono, and Jane Hauser Patrono. By Order dated May 25, 2023, hearing and argument were scheduled for June 7, 2023. On June 6, 2023, Appellees supplemented their request by filing a Motion for Discovery Sanctions seeking the imposition of sanctions against both Appellants and their counsel pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 4019 and 42 Pa. C.S.A. § 2503 (concerning right of litigation participants to receive counsel fees).

At the beginning of the June 7, 2023 proceeding, Appellees' counsel indicated, relevant to the current issue, that they were provided a number of documents concerning the Appellants' compliance with the Court's earlier directive to provide federal tax returns to Appellees. That information revealed: (1) information related to tax returns was not provided to Appellees' counsel until June 1, 2023; (2) in some instances, the information which was provided related to an alleged attempt by Appellants to obtain tax return information from the Internal Revenue Service rather than the actual production of the returns; (3) the date on which Appellants made the request to the IRS for the non-produced returns was May 25, 2023; (4) Appellants' request for information from the IRS concerning their tax returns sought only a transcript of the tax return but did not seek supporting documentation; (5) the information related to Appellants' request to the IRS that was provided to Appellants' counsel lacked any indication of veracity as to whether it had been actually filed with the IRS as of the date of hearing; and (6) Appellants Alan Patrono and Jane Hauser Patrono claimed they did not file tax returns for the tax years 2018 and 2019. Appellants' counsel confirmed that Appellees' counsel's representations were correct. Following the June 6, 2023 argument, the Court directed that attorney fees in the amount of \$3,500 be paid to Appellees by Appellants Alan Patrono, Jonathan Patrono, and Jane Hauser Patrono.³

Generally, in considering a motion to award counsel fees as a sanction, an evidentiary hearing is required. *Wood v. Geisenhemer-*

³ Appellants do not challenge the amount or reasonableness of the attorney fees sanction imposed.

Shaulis, 827 A.2d 1204, 1208 (Pa. Super. 2003). Although disposition of a claim for attorney fees generally requires an evidentiary hearing, no hearing is necessary where the facts are undisputed. *In re Estate of Burger*, 852 A.2d 385, 391 (Pa. Super. 2004), *aff'd* 898 A.2d 547 (Pa. 2006); *see also SLT Holdings, LLC v. Mitch-Well Energy, Inc.*, 217 A.3d 1248, 1253-54 (Pa. Super. 2019) (evidentiary hearing unnecessary where the record is sufficient to decide the issue).

The current sanctions were imposed based upon Appellants' dilatory actions in failing to comply with discovery contrary to direct Orders entered by the Court. The record clearly establishes the Court set discovery deadlines on September 28, 2022. The subsequent history reflects consistent ratification of discovery deadlines cumulating in an Order dated April 25, 2023 which directed specific actions by Appellants.⁴ Similarly, there is no dispute as to Appellants' failure to comply with the deadlines including their failure to comply with the April 25, 2023 Order. Accordingly, pursuant to *Burger*, an evidentiary hearing was not necessary.

Appellants next claim the Trial Court failed to make any finding to support the imposition of sanctions. Although it is true that this Court's Order did not include such finding, the record clearly reflects the Court's conclusions were stated to the parties following argument. The statements made in the presence of the parties in open court clearly confirm the Court's finding that Appellants participated in dilatory, aberrate, and vexatious conduct in regard to their actions in responding to discovery requests.⁵ This challenge is

⁴ Notably, at the time of the April 25, 2023 Order, the Court resisted a request for the imposition of sanctions but rather provided Appellants an opportunity to bring their conduct into compliance.

⁵ At the conclusion of the proceeding, this Court stated "[t]his litigation began in 2018 and we're fighting about simple things like tax returns 3, 5 years later." The Court added "[i]n regard to the tax returns...[t]hey clearly have not met the requirement. My Orders are clearly dated as to the dates set forth in the Court Order as the date that was to be provided." The Court further expressed concern that "this litigation is getting way out of control and these are simple requests. They can be simply answered and I'm not going to tolerate gamesmanship for the sake of gamesmanship."

not a basis for relief. *Kulp v. Hrivnak*, 765 A.2d 796, 799-800 (Pa. Super. 2000).

Appellants' third and fourth issues are summarily meritless. Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 4019 permits the imposition of sanctions where "a party fails to serve answers, sufficient answers or objections to written interrogatories[.]" Pa. R. Civ. P. 4019(a)(1)(i). Those sanctions may include attorney fees where the sanction is imposed following a party's noncompliance with a prior order compelling compliance. Pa. R. Civ. P. 4019(g)(1). Additionally, 42 Pa. C.S.A. § 2503(6) permits "the award of counsel fees as a sanction for dilatory, obdurate, or vexatious conduct during the pendency" of a litigation. Instantly, there is no factual dispute that this Court entered an Order compelling Appellants to comply with discovery requests and, further, Appellants violated that Order. The same is sufficient to support the imposition of sanctions.

In their fourth challenge, Appellants take issue with the Court's Order directing them to pay attorney fees directly to opposing counsel. This Court is unaware of any authority supporting Appellants' position. Unquestionably, as discussed above, the assessment of attorney fees is a sanction authorized by both statute and the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure. Whether those fees are paid directly to counsel or as reimbursement to the harmed party for fees previously incurred has no relevance to whether the sanction is appropriate. The issue, if any, as to whom the attorney fees are paid is a matter left to the offended party and their counsel and opposing counsel's obligations under the Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested the appeal in this matter be dismissed.

SHERIFF SALES

IN PURSUANCE of writs of execution issuing out of the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County, Pennsylvania, and to me directed, will be exposed to Public Sale on-line auction conducted by Bid4Assets, 8757 Georgia, Ave., Suite 520, Silver Spring, MD 20910, on May, 17th, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

No. 23-SU-289
Pennymac Loan Servicing, LLC
vs.
Kristin Kaena Elizabeth Abarca, Sariah Scaffidi,
Administrator of the Estate of
Kristin Kaena Elizabeth Abrca
Property Address: 62 Empire Lane,
Aspers, PA 17304
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
29F05-0253---000
Owners of Property Situate in Menallen
Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$364,418.92
Attorney for Plaintiff:
McCabe, Weisberg & Conway, LLC
1420 Walnut Street, Suite 1501
Philadelphia, PA 19102

No. 23-SU-1247
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
vs.
Shannon Buehrle, Robert A. Buehrle
Property Address: 21 Chapel Road,
Hanover, PA 17331
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
08K14-0270-000
Owners of Property Situate in
Conewago Township, Adams County,
Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$285,918.29
Attorneys For Plaintiff:
Powers Kirn, LLC

No. 23-SU-662
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation,
et al.
vs.
June A. Cash
Property Address: 7 Blue Gill Trail,
Fairfield, PA 17320
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
43003-0018--000
Owner of Property Situate in Carroll Valley
Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$85,299.46
Attorney For Plaintiff:
Christopher A. DeNardd

No. 23-SU-981
Crosscountry Mortgage, LLC
vs.
Joshua D. Funt
Property Address: 16 Main Street,
Arendtsville, PA 17303
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
02006-0020---000
Owner of Property Situate in the
Borough of Arendtsville, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$131,193.20
Attorney for Plaintiff:
Manley Deas Kochalski, LLC
P.O. Box 165028
Columbus, OH 43216-5028
614-220-5611

No. 23-SU-1121
Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency
vs.
Samuel A. Hand, The United States of
America
Property Address: 308 East York Street,
Biglerville, PA 17307
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
05004-4005---000
Owners of Property Situate in Biglerville
Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$233,525.18
Attorney for Plaintiff:
Leon P. Haller

No. 23-SU-358
NEWREZ, LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage
Servicing
vs.
Thomas Albert Lazarek, Robin Lazarek
Property Address: 330 Hirschmann Road,
Biglerville, PA 17307
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
29C05-0051--000
Owners of Property Situate in Biglerville
Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$204,983.21
Attorney for Plaintiff:
Christopher A. Denardo

NOTICE directed to all parties in interest and claimants that a schedule of distribution will be filed by the Sheriff in his office no later than (30) thirty days after the date of sale and that distribution will be made in accordance with that schedule unless exceptions are filed thereto within (10) ten days thereafter.
Purchaser must settle for property on or before filing date. ALL claims to property must be filed with Sheriff before sale date.
AS SOON AS THE PROPERTY IS DECLARED SOLD TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER 20% OF THE PURCHASE PRICE OR ALL OF THE COST, WHICHEVER MAY BE THE HIGHER, SHALL BE PAID FORTHWITH TO THE SHERIFF.

James W. Muller
Sheriff of Adams County

4/19, 4/26, 5/3

SHERIFF SALES

IN PURSUANCE of writs of execution issuing out of the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County, Pennsylvania, and to me directed, will be exposed to Public Sale on-line auction conducted by Bid4Assets, 8757 Georgia, Ave., Suite 520, Silver Spring, MD 20910, on May, 17th, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

No. 23-SU-1025
Truist Bank, formerly known as
Branch Banking and Trust Company
vs.
Cindy L. Mundorff a/k/a Cindy L. Curtis,
Executrix of the Estate of Delores J.
Mundorff a/k/a Delores Jean Mundorff
Property Address: 768 Brickcrafter Road,
New Oxford, PA 17350
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
32J11-0066---000
Owners of Property Situate in Mt.
Pleasant Township, Adams County,
Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$71,803.14
Attorneys for Plaintiff:
McCabe, Weisberg & Conway, LLC
1420 Walnut Street, Suite 1501
Philadelphia, PA 19102

No. 22-SU-786
Specialized Loan Servicing, LLC
vs.
Danielle C. Ryan
Property Address: 320 Braggtown Road,
York Springs, PA 17372
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
23-J03-0034-000
Owner of Property Situate in Latimore
Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Property
Judgment Amount: \$206,703.67
Attorneys for Plaintiff:
Robertson, Anschutz, Schneid, Crane &
Partners, PLLC
A Florida Professional Limited Liability
Company
133 Gaither Drive, Suite F
Mt. Laurel, NJ 08054

No. 19-SU-1347
Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC
vs.
Kayla Elizabeth Shipley, Jacob Adam Martin
Property Address: 165m Church Road,
Orrtanna, PA 17353
UPI/Tax Parcel Number:
12809-0084
Owners of Property Situate in Franklin
Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Improvements Thereon:
Residential Dwelling
Judgment Amount: \$138,690.19
Attorneys for Plaintiff:
Stern & Eisenberg, PC
1581 Main Street, Suite 200
The Shops at Valley Square
Warrington, PA 18976
215-572-8111

NOTICE directed to all parties in interest and claimants that a schedule of distribution will be filed by the Sheriff in his office no later than (30) thirty days after the date of sale and that distribution will be made in accordance with that schedule unless exceptions are filed thereto within (10) ten days thereafter.

Purchaser must settle for property on or before filing date. ALL claims to property must be filed with Sheriff before sale date.

AS SOON AS THE PROPERTY IS DECLARED SOLD TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER 20% OF THE PURCHASE PRICE OR ALL OF THE COST, WHICHEVER MAY BE THE HIGHER, SHALL BE PAID FORTHWITH TO THE SHERIFF.

James W. Muller
Sheriff of Adams County

4/19, 4/26, 5/3

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 MARY E. AYRE, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg,
Adams County, Pennsylvania
Administrator: W. Wesley Ayre, 1138
Long Lane, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF WILLIAM S. AYRE, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg,
Adams County, Pennsylvania
Administrator: W. Wesley Ayre, 1138
Long Lane, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF RICHARD W. BURKETT
a/k/a RICHARD WILLIAM BURKETT,
DEC'D**

Late of Union Township, Adams County,
Pennsylvania
Executrix: Wendy H. Burkett, 414
Mehring Road, Littlestown, PA 17340
Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore
Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF WILLIAM WALL BURNS II
a/k/a WILLIAM WALL BURNS, DEC'D**

Late of Fridley, Anoka County, Minnesota
Personal Representative: Erin M. Wood,
c/o Scott A. Ruth, 123 Broadway,
Hanover, PA 17331
Attorney: Scott A. Ruth, Esq., 123
Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF DONALD L. PATTERSON
a/k/a DONALD LEE PATTERSON, DEC'D**

Late of Butler Township, Adams County,
Pennsylvania
Co-Executors: Sommer R. McGuire, 5
Hunt Place, Mechanicsburg, PA 17050;
Elijah D. L. Patterson, 5185 N. Salem
Church Road, Dover, PA 17315
Attorney: John J. Murphy III, Esq.,
Patrono & Murphy, LLC, 28 West
Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF CHARLES A. RITTER, DEC'D
Late of Cumberland Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Administratrix: Michelle R. Chapman, c/o
Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore
St., Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmann
Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore St.,
Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF ALBRECHT R. SCHINDLER,
ESQ.**

Late of East Berlin Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Executor: Michael R. Ressel, c/o 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 DONNA R. TYLER, DEC'D

Late of McSherrystown Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Debra L. Dick, 3321 Old
Harrisburg Road, Gettysburg, PA
17325
Attorney: David K. James, III, Esq., 234
Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA
17325

ESTATE OF DOLORES JANE WILLIAMS

a/k/a D. JANE WILLIAMS, DEC'D
Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Executor: Todd J. Williams, 417 Heritage
Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: David K. James, III, Esq., 234
Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA
17325

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF JASON J. BANGE a/k/a
JASON JACOB BANGE, DEC'D**

Late of Berwick Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Executor: Nathan L. Bange, c/o
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 EUGENE J. GOETZ, SR. a/k/a
EUGENE JOSEPH GOETZ, DEC'D**
Late of Carroll Valley Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Charmaine G. Malik, 9 Main
Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320
Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore
Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF WILBUR M. SENTZ, DEC'D

Late of Littlestown Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Co-Executrices: Debra L. Irvin and Daphne
R. Conn, c/o Salzmann Hughes, P.C.,
112 Baltimore St., Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmann
Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore St.,
Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF BETTY J. STEWART, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Executor: Paul Forrest Stewart, 150 Cedar
Run Drive, York, PA 17404
Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, Attorneys at
Law, 220 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg,
PA 17325

**ESTATE OF DELORES T. WARNER a/k/a
DOLORES T. WARNER, DEC'D**

Late of McSherrystown Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania
Co-Executors: Barbara Ann Warner-
Shields and Mark S. Warner, c/o 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

THIRD PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF WILLIAM C. DECKER, DEC'D**

Late of Huntington Township, Adams
County, York Springs, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Tammy Kitzmiller, 23
McCandless Drive, East Berlin, PA
17316
Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe,
Rice, & Quinn, LLC, 47 West High
Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Continued on page 12

(THIRD PUBLICATION CONTINUED)

ESTATE OF MARTHA M. WONDERS
FAWBER, DEC'D

Late of Biglerville Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Angel Martin Rosado, 69 High
Street, Biglerville, PA 17307

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

ESTATE OF SCOTT L. HOMAN a/k/a
SCOTT LARRY HOMAN, DEC'D

Late of New Oxford Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Dawn E. McMaster, c/o 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 PATRICIA M. KEENEY,
DEC'D

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

Administrator: Ronald Keeney, 75 Ranch
Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320

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

ESTATE OF GAIL OLIVER ROLLS a/k/a
GAIL O. ROLLS, DEC'D

Late of Littlestown Borough, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Elaine J. Rolls Berry, c/o
Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square,
Hanover, PA 17331

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