

# Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 57


October 16, 2015

No. 23, pp. 97-107

## IN THIS ISSUE

PATRICK J. SHEAFFER AND ELIZABETH J. SHEAFFER  
V. CONEWAGO TOWNSHIP

*This opinion is continued from the last issue (October 9, 2015)*



**Benefit  
from local,  
experienced  
advisors with  
only your  
goals in mind.**

**Christy Settle**  
Trust Officer

**Karen Arthur**  
Senior Trust Officer

**Mark Bernier, CFA**  
Investment Officer

**Debra Little, ChFC®**  
Trust Officer

**Contact a local Trust Officer today and  
start building a solid future.**

**Karen Arthur**  
Senior Trust Officer  
717.339.5062  
karthur@acnb.com

**Christy Settle**  
Trust Officer  
717.339.5058  
csettle@acnb.com

**Debra Little, ChFC®**  
Trust Officer  
717.339.5218  
dlittle@acnb.com



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.

IN THE COURT OF  
COMMON PLEAS OF  
ADAMS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
NO. 15-S-50

NOTICE OF ACTION IN MORTGAGE  
FORECLOSURE

Urban Financial of America, LLC,  
Plaintiff

vs.

Estate of Charles T. Conner, Roberta E. Conner, Last Record Owner, Cheryl L. Sampy, Known Heir, and as Personal Representative of the Estate of Charles T. Conner, Unknown Heirs, Successors, Assigns and All Persons, Firms or Associations Claiming Right, Title or Interest From or Under Charles T. Conner and Unknown Heirs, Successors, Assigns and All Persons, Firms or Associations Claiming Right, Title or Interest From or Under Roberta E. Conner, Last Record Owner, Defendants

TO: Roberta E. Conner, Last Record Owner and Unknown Heirs, Successors, Assigns and All Persons, Firms or Associations Claiming Right, Title or Interest from or Under Roberta E. Conner, Last Record Owner, Defendant(s), whose last known addresses are 3801 Baltimore Pike, Littlestown, PA 17340 and 2531 Island Grove Boulevard, Frederick, MD 21701.

COMPLAINT IN MORTGAGE  
FORECLOSURE

You are hereby notified that Plaintiff, Urban Financial of America, LLC, has filed a Mortgage Foreclosure Complaint endorsed with a Notice to Defend, against you in the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County, Pennsylvania, docketed to NO. 15-S-50, wherein Plaintiff seeks to foreclose on the mortgage secured on your property located, 3801 Baltimore Pike, Littlestown, PA 17340, whereupon your property would be sold by the Sheriff of Adams County.

NOTICE

YOU HAVE BEEN SUED IN COURT. If you wish to defend against the claims set forth in the notice above, you must take action within twenty (20) days after this Complaint and Notice are served, by entering a written appearance personally or by attorney and filing in writing with the Court your defenses or objections to the claims set forth against you. You are warned that if you fail to do so the case

may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you by the Court without further notice for any money claimed in the Complaint or for any other claim or relief requested by the Plaintiff. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you.

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

Lawyers referral service

Adams County Court Admin.

Adams County Courthouse

Gettysburg, PA 17325

717.337.9846

Mark J. Udren, Stuart Winneg, Lorraine  
Gazzara Doyle, Sherri J. Braunstein,  
Elizabeth L. Wassall, John Eric  
Kishbaugh, Nicole B. Labletta & David  
Neeren, Attys. For Plaintiff, Udren Law  
Offices, P.C., 111 Woodcrest Rd., Ste.  
200, Cherry Hill, NJ 08003,  
856.669.5400.

10/16

PATRICK J. SHEAFFER AND ELIZABETH J. SHEAFFER V.  
CONEWAGO TOWNSHIP

*Continued from last issue (10/9/15)*

DECISION OF THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

With this record in mind on April 27, 2015, the Township entered the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:<sup>69</sup>

Findings Of Fact

1. On December 1, 2011, the Sheaffers submitted a Conewago Township street occupancy permit application which was received by the Code Enforcement Officer, David Arndt. Arndt Exhibit 1.
2. That application requested a street occupancy permit to tie in South Second Street to the Sheaffers' proposed residential subdivision in McSherrystown. Arndt Exhibit 1.
3. Upon receipt of the application, Code Enforcement Officer Arndt submitted it to the Township Engineer, Eric Mains, who reviewed the application and on December 8 indicated that there were unresolved and inseparable issues associated with the project and returned the application to Mr. Sheaffer. Arndt Exhibit 2.
4. On May 14, 2012, a second application for occupancy permit was filed by the Sheaffers. Arndt Exhibit 3.
5. Upon receipt of the second application, Mr. Arndt forwarded the application to Engineer Mains who authored a memorandum dated May 11, 2012, noting there had been no changes or updates to the Sheaffers' proposed plan prior to the denial of the first application. Arndt Exhibit 4.
6. As a result thereof, the Sheaffers' fee was returned.
7. On December 27, 2012, the Sheaffers submitted a third application. This application, however, was for a "storm"<sup>70</sup> connection permit only. Arndt Exhibit 5.
8. On December 31, 2012, Code Enforcement Officer Arndt notified the Sheaffers that the third application appeared to be in order indicating that the payment of \$100 permit fee and proper

---

<sup>69</sup> The findings are paraphrased for purposes of simplicity and not reported verbatim.

<sup>70</sup> The record reflects an obvious error as the application was for a "sewer" connection.

bonding would be required as a condition to move forward. Arndt Exhibit 5.

9. Despite the approval, the Sheaffers have never satisfied the condition in Arndt's December 31, 2012 correspondence.
10. On or about January 25, 2013, the Sheaffers submitted a fourth Conewago Township street occupancy permit. This fourth application requested the same street connection and sewer connection as the first and second application. Arndt Exhibit 6 at Pages 3 and 4.
11. Following the review on the fourth application, Engineer Mains authored a memorandum dated January 31, 2013, noting that the application had a proposed scope of work identical to the first and second application both of which had been previously denied. Arndt Exhibit 6, Page 11.
12. In correspondence dated February 19, 2013 Arndt confirmed to Sheaffers that the fourth application had been denied. Arndt Exhibit 7.
13. At no time did the Sheaffers post bonds in accordance with the cost of work estimates supplied by his own engineer. Arndt Exhibit 6 at Page 5 and 6.
14. Pursuant to the Conewago Township street occupancy permit process, payment by the applicant for inspection services are charged on a time and materials basis as required in connection with the application. Arndt Exhibit 8.
15. Pursuant to the requirements of the Township's street occupancy process review and approval by the Township engineer, a bond payment may be required at the discretion of the Township. Arndt Exhibit 8.
16. Conewago Township incurred engineering fees totaling \$6,425.56 in connection with the reviews by the Township engineers associated with the project. Arndt Exhibit 9.
17. Notwithstanding the above, to date the Sheaffers have not paid any of the outstanding invoices associated with the Engineer's review of the project.
18. On December 19, 2011, during a regularly scheduled Township Board of Supervisors meeting at which Mr. Sheaffer was pres-

ent, the Board discussed the issue concerning the Sheaffers' project and indicated that in order to have approval, Mr. Sheaffer would have to pay all current engineering invoices, provide a stormwater maintenance plan, and indemnify the Township for potential stormwater run-off and mitigation of erosion that was created by stormwater discharge. Arndt Exhibit 11.

19. The Sheaffers have met none of the conditions set forth by the Township Board of Supervisors at the meeting of December 19, 2011.
20. The Sheaffers have obtained all required approvals for the stormwater management from McSherrystown Borough.
21. Primary stormwater management facilities for the project lie on a single residential lot within his subdivision, which said subdivision adjoins The Preserves, which is a residential development in Conewago Township.
22. The Preserves residential development receives stormwater discharge from the Sheaffers' property and is subject to flooding and specifically the property of Mrs. Patricia Finch property is subject to flooding as a result of heavy rains in the Township. Arndt Exhibit 11.
23. The Township finds that in the absence of proper maintenance of stormwater facilities, stormwater management facilities for the project could fail causing harm, damage, and loss to downstream property owners of The Preserves development; specifically noting the presence of Mrs. Finch.
24. Mrs. Finch has an address of 209 Stafford Drive, Conewago Township and owns the property adjoining the Sheaffers' project and her property is subject to stormwater run-off and flooding from water entering her property from the Sheaffers' property.
25. At the December 2011 meeting, Mr. Robert Kerr of The Preserves HOA, advised the Board of Supervisors that there is a landscaping easement for the HOA, but not a drainage easement. At that point in time, the Solicitor for the Township asked the question of stormwater easement, public or private, and the Board advised that there is no easement because the land is pri-

vate. There has been no clear consensus reached as to whether or not there is, in fact, a stormwater drainage easement available to the Sheaffers.

26. At one of the hearings before the Board of Supervisors, the Sheaffers produced Exhibit No. 23 as a purported stormwater management agreement dated June 25, 2014, which purportedly is addressing the issue of the Township's concern regarding appropriate stormwater management facilities and protection. The stormwater management agreement provides no protection to Conewago Township and specifically the residents of The Preserves development.
27. Paragraph 8 of the stormwater management agreement (Exhibit 23) specifically provides:

“McSherrystown shall have no duty to inspect, maintain, or repair the stormwater management facilities.”
28. Total responsibility for the maintenance, inspection and repair of the system lies with the Lot No. 1 owner who is unidentified. There is no indication that the current or future owner of Lot No. 1 will have the wherewithal or the financial support necessary to maintain the facilities to ensure that the proposed stormwater management program of the Sheaffers would in fact be successful or that the stormwater management program has integrity in the event that it fails.
29. The stormwater management plan for the project is at risk for failing, causing harm, damage, and loss to downstream property owners of The Preserves development.
30. There is no evidence that the extension of Sterling Drive to South Second Street was anticipated and proposed as part of The Preserves Subdivision Land Development Plan.

#### Conclusions Of Law

1. The Township Board of Supervisors hearing this case has placed the burden of proof upon the Code Enforcement Officer, David Arndt, to support the denial of the permit.
2. The Board specifically finds credibility in favor of Mr. Arndt in his testimony and in the presentation of the facts upon which he

based his conclusion.

3. Conewago Township has the authority to review and impose reasonable requirements in connection with a street occupancy permit which is submitted to the Zoning Officer by virtue of the Second Class Township Code; specifically 53 P.S. §6703(a).
4. Conewago Township ordinances impose reasonable requirements regarding stormwater management, easements, development obligations, erosion control, and stormwater maintenance agreements. See Conewago Township Code Section 76 at 135.
5. Conewago Township Ordinance Chapter 130-2, et seq. provides specifically in Section 130-3 that:

“It shall be unlawful for anyone to do any work affecting streets within the Township without having first procured a permit from a permit officer for such work.”
6. Ordinance 130-3 further provides that:

“If the permit officer determines that further inspection is necessary, he may cause such inspections in further determinations may be appropriate.”
7. The Board of Supervisors concludes that Code Enforcement Officer Arndt specifically in response to the permit application of the Sheaffers has the express authority to cause such other inspections and further determination as may be appropriate.
8. The requirements imposed by Conewago Township are reasonable and necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of Conewago Township residents.
9. The Board also concludes that as of December 19, 2011, the applicant was expressly aware of the requirements necessary to have approval of his project and filed no appeal from that determination nor has taken any appeal from that determination in December 19, 2011.
10. The applicant has failed to meet any of the requirements imposed upon him by the Second Class Township Code or Ordinances in the Township of Conewago.
11. The failure of the Sheaffers to meet these reasonable requirements support the conclusion by Mr. Arndt of the denial of the

street occupancy permit.

12. The exhibit from Mr. Arndt correctly establishes all legal requirements upon which he acted in denying the permit to the Sheaffers.

### DISCUSSION

When considering an appeal from a local agency on a full and complete record the court is instructed to affirm the adjudication unless it finds, inter alia, that any finding of fact made by the agency and necessary to support its adjudication is not supported by substantial evidence. 2 Pa. C.S.A. §754(b). Substantial evidence supporting an agency's decision is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Direnzo Coal Co. v. Department of General Services*, 825 A.2d 773, 775 (Pa. Comwlth. Ct. 2003). This court must accept credibility determinations made by the municipal body which heard the testimony and we are not to substitute our judgment on the merits for that of the local agency. *In Re Appeal of Thompson*, 896 A.2d 659, 668 (Pa. Comwlth. Ct. 2006).

The Township and Mr. Arndt have taken the position that pursuant to §2703 of the Second Class Township Code, 53 P.S. §67703, the Township has authority to impose reasonable requirements in connection with street occupancy permits, such as the one last submitted by the Sheaffers, where stormwater management is concerned, even if the water originates elsewhere and passes through the township. They also contend that the requirements imposed upon the Sheaffers were reasonable and because they have not been satisfied no permit should issue. The Sheaffers argue that the issue should be strictly limited to whether they are entitled to a Street Occupancy Permit under the proper Township ordinance and not whether their subdivision or stormwater management plan for property located in the borough is satisfactory to the Township.

In addressing this matter the Court shall examine the situation applicable to the most recent Street Occupancy Permit application submitted by the Sheaffers on January 25, 2013. The Court will review the permit denial in light of the conditions placed upon the Sheaffers by the Township for approval. In doing so, the Court is mindful that the Sheaffers are requesting to connect an existing street in the township with a proposed street running through their property in the borough. The entire scope of the project in the township



is construction of approximately 254 square feet of road surface.

First, as noted, the Township and Mr. Arndt have premised their general authority to condition the Sheaffers' Street Occupancy Permit application by referencing Section 2703 (§67703) of the Second Class Township Code. They suggest that this section grants the Township authority to review and impose reasonable requirements where stormwater management matters are involved even if the water flows from outside the township. A careful reading of this section suggests that this effort is misplaced as it applies to the instant situation.

Section 67703 is part of Article XXVII entitled "Stormwater Management Plans And Facilities." This Article includes four sections. Section 67701 provides that the township board of supervisors may

plan, design, construct, assemble, install and alter facilities, including but not limited to, inlets, outlets, systems of piping, diversion terraces, grass waterways, energy dissipaters, stormwater retention devices and natural or artificial infiltration areas to manage surface water run-off.

In that regard Section 67702 allows the supervisors to acquire existing stormwater management systems. Section 67703 provides that when "exercising the powers under this Article" the supervisors shall "manage stormwater originating in or passing through the township in a manner which is consistent with" the Stormwater Management Act and requirements of DEP. Section 67704 allows the supervisors to adopt stormwater management ordinances consistent with the Stormwater Management Act.

It is clear that the Township is not constructing or acquiring a stormwater management facility. It is also clear that the Township has responsibility to "manage" water passing from outside the township. However, there is nothing in the unambiguous language of this Article that allows the Township to impose conditions upon owners of property situate outside the township even if stormwater flows from that property into the township.

The only issue which the Township has authority to address under this Article is stormwater management associated with the street connection within the township. In that regard, the stormwater from the paved portion will flow into existing facilities. The amount of

flow associated with the 254 square feet of pavement is minimal and, according to Mr. Mains, management of the same consistent with the Township's ordinances and the Stormwater Management Act. The Township's attempts to control other run-off by placing conditions upon the Sheaffers' street occupancy permit application is not consistent with the authority set forth in Section 67703 and is patently unreasonable.

Second, the Township has required the Sheaffers to pay all engineering fees. Arndt Ex. 9 suggests that the Township is seeking at least \$6,523.06 in such fees.<sup>71</sup> The Court finds no authority for the imposition of such fees upon the Sheaffers as a condition for approval of their Street Occupancy Permit.

Chapter 130 of the Conewago Township Zoning Ordinance addresses the general subject of "Streets and Sidewalks". Section 130-2 requires the applicant seeking to construct any street in the township to obtain a permit from the Township and to pay the appropriate "filing fee" as well as "a fee to cover the first inspection of the work proposed to be done." As noted in earlier discussion herein, the permit application instruction form advises the applicant that he will be billed for other "inspection" fees on a time and material basis. Section 130-3.1 also requires the applicant to post appropriate security with the Township for the work to be done. Furthermore, the ordinance reserves to the Township the right to subject the permit to "all reasonable conditions set forth in the permit, which conditions shall be adopted from time to time by resolution of the Board to conform with standards of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation." The record does not reflect any such resolution having been adopted.

The record is clear that the engineering fees being charged to the Sheaffers are related to the Township's "review" of the stormwater management plan associated with the development in the borough and not for "inspection" of the street connection work.<sup>72</sup> In November 2009 the Township requested that the Borough delay approval of the Sheaffers' subdivision plan until it had an opportunity to review the stormwater impact on township residents. The Sheaffers did not request that the Township review the plans and there was no reason to do so. Instead, the

---

<sup>71</sup> The Township's Finding of Fact No. 16 and its brief report the amount as \$6,425.56 but Arndt Ex. 9 reflects the higher amount.

<sup>72</sup> N.T. 7/2/14 p. 89.

Township pursued the review for its own purposes. The engineer submitted 10 invoices for engineer review fees from January 10, 2010 to November 14, 2011 in the amount of \$6,168.56 before the Sheaffers submitted their first Street Occupancy Permit application on December 1, 2011.<sup>73</sup> The Township has identified no authority which permits it to pass its expenses for these reviews on to the Sheaffers and to impose payment of those fees as a condition of approving the Street Occupancy Permit is unreasonable and improper.

Third, the Township is requiring that the Sheaffers secure a stormwater maintenance plan for the retention basin on Lot No. 1 that is satisfactory to the Township. Essentially, the Township is expecting the Sheaffers to diversify the risk of repair to a larger group of property owners or to the Borough so that if the facilities associated therewith fail or are not properly maintained there is proper recourse for the Township or downstream residents. The Township also wants indemnification for loss it may incur. However, the Township has offered no authority for this requirement. In this regard, it appears that the Township is trying to dictate the stormwater management plan related to property outside its geographic jurisdiction and not stormwater management related to the street addition. The appropriateness of the plan was solely for the Borough to decide.

The issue presented to the Township was whether the Sheaffers could connect to Sterling Drive. There is absolutely no evidence that this connection will have any adverse impact on stormwater management in the township. In fact, Mr. Mains testified that there would be no unmanaged water run-off from the paved street connection. The stormwater facilities are already in place to handle that run-off. The stormwater originating from this paved portion does not even flow through the retention basin. According to Mr. Mains the street plan is consistent with the Township's ordinances and the Stormwater Management Act.

Fourth, the Township is requiring that the Sheaffers secure an easement within the township for stormwater run-off from the development. The Township cites provisions from the Conewago Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance of 2009 as authority for this requirement; specifically Chapter 135 Section 40 which address "Stormwater Management." Subsection L thereof states:

#### L. Easements

---

73 Arndt Ex. 9. N.T. 5/12/14 p. 52.

(1) Easements shall be provided where stormwater or surface drainage facilities are proposed, whether located within or beyond the boundaries of the property. Although normal lot grading does not require easements, swales which receive run-off from more than one other lot or from more than ½ acre must be provided with an easement.

The problem with this requirement is that Chapter 135 has nothing to do with land development plans outside the township. It is clear from a reading of the Purpose section (§135-2) of Chapter 135 that the ordinance addresses land development within the township. Although the street connection lies within the township the easement the Township seeks is for other water run-off from the subdivision situate in the borough. The Township cites no authority requiring the Sheaffers to secure an easement (likely unattainable) across property privately owned by township residents for some unknown distance to address run-off from property outside the township.

This condition can only be viewed as a backhanded way of attempting to stop the Sheaffers' land development project in the borough. Furthermore, currently there is no such easement. At the present time stormwater exits the property and flows naturally through portions of the township. There is no evidence that additional stormwater run-off would be produced by the proposed development but, on the contrary, there is evidence that the run-off that does occur will be better controlled than under existing circumstances. Likewise, had the Sheaffers' plan called for a cul-de-sac at the edge of the township line instead of connection to Sterling Drive the run-off would occur without any input from the Township.

Finally, the Township is requiring that the Sheaffers notify immediate downstream property owners of the proposed stormwater discharge. This requirement is inappropriate for several reasons. Initially, authority for this requirement again comes from the Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance at Chapter 135 Section 40(a)(5) which provides

Stormwater run-off from a project site shall flow directly into a natural watercourse, into an existing storm sewer system, or onto adjacent properties in a manner similar to the run-off characteristics of the predevelopment flow. The applicant must provide proof to the Township that he

or his agent has informed the immediate downstream property owner of changes to the stormwater discharges as a result of the proposed development.

Again, the township is attempting to condition approval of a Street Occupancy Permit based upon subdivision requirements established for property development within the township. The Township has no authority to direct the developer of property in the borough to notify downstream owners of any issues related to run-off from a development situated in the borough. To the extent that the Township may use this section to address run-off from the 254 square feet of street connection, it is nevertheless clear that no such notice is required under this section because that run-off flows into “an existing storm sewer system.” Even so, the only “immediate” downstream property owner identified is Mrs. Finch who has been aware of this project since its earliest stages. Finally, there is no evidence that the run-off from the paved portion of the street connection involves “changes to the stormwater discharges” of that small area as a result of the paving.

There being no engineering objection to the requested street connection and the conditions imposed by the Township being unauthorized, the Township’s denial of the Sheaffers’ Street Occupancy Permit application is reversed.

Accordingly, the attached Order is entered.

#### ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 16<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2015, for reasons set forth in the attached Memorandum Opinion, the appeal of Patrick J. Sheaffer and Elizabeth J. Sheaffer from the decision of the Conewago Board of Supervisors dated April 27, 2015, is granted. Conewago Township is hereby directed to grant the Sheaffers’ Street Occupancy Permit application submitted January 25, 2013, without any of the conditions that were imposed by the Township’s Code Enforcement Officer, affirmed by the Township Board of Supervisors, and addressed by this Court.

**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 MARTHA ROSELLA BERKHEIMER a/k/a MARTHA G. BERKHEIMER, a/k/a MARTHA ROSELLA GABER BERKHEIMER, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Linda B. Messinger, 1112 Roosevelt Court, Hanover, PA 17331; Jeffrey M. Garber, 36 Brewster Street, Hanover, PA 17331

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

**ESTATE OF JACQUELYN L. BLEVINS, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Gary Neil Blevins, 11 Laurel Court, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF PATRICIA ANN HEYSER a/k/a PATRICIA HEYSER, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Barbara MacPherson

Attorney: Kevin G. Robinson, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 60 E. Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF MARK L. HOSTETTER, DEC'D**

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Cheyenne M. Hartman, 200 Mill Street, Mt. Holly Springs, PA 17065

Attorney: Mark A. Mateya, Esq., 55 W. Church Avenue, Carlisle, PA 17013

**ESTATE OF NORMAN R. KROFT, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Ronnie L. Kroft, 84 700 Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

**ESTATE OF SANDRA M. OLIVER, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Bendersville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Wanda K. Rowles

Attorney: Jerry A. Weigle, Esq., Weigle & Associates, P.C., 126 East King Street Shippensburg, PA 17257

**SECOND PUBLICATION**

**ESTATE OF CHARLES L. CORNBOWER, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Jennifer Long, 60 Hill Rd., Hanover, PA 17331; Joann Klunk, 1025 Centennial Ave., Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Keith R. Nonemaker, Esq., Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst & Hart, LLP, 40 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331, (717) 632-5315

**ESTATE OF FLORA J. FRAGASSI, DEC'D**

Late of Reading Township, Pennsylvania

Executor: Dean L. Fragassi

Attorney: Sharon E. Myers, CGA Law Firm, PO BOX 606, East Berlin, PA 17316

**ESTATE OF MATTHEW J. SHAFFER, DEC'D**

Late of Hamiltonban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Susan M. Switzer, c/o 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 GLADYS M. STRICKHOUSER a/k/a GLADYS M. CROUSE, DEC'D**

Late of Littlestown Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Dale F. Strickhouser and Dennis G. Strickhouser

Attorney: Amy S. Eyster, Esq., 11 Carlisle Street, Suite 301 Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF JOHN M. TOMKO, DEC'D**

Late of Liberty Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Charlene M. Tomko, 1981 Tract Road, Fairfield, PA 17320

**ESTATE OF KAREN L. WILLIAMS, a/k/a KAREN L. KRAFT, DEC'D**

Late of Littlestown Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrators: Shirley Lee Williams, and Edward Eugene Williams, 425 Westminster Avenue #55, Hanover, Pennsylvania 17331

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

**THIRD PUBLICATION**

**ESTATE OF JAMES W. ALTICE, DEC'D**

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Amanda M. Becker, 307 Lincoln Way East, Apt. B, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Gary E. Hartman, Esq., Hartman & Yannetti, 126 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF JUANITA M. SPAHR, DEC'D**

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: D'Ann Fahringer, c/o Sharon E. Myers, Esq., CGA Law Firm, PC, 106 Harrisburg Street, P.O. BOX 606, East Berlin, PA 17316

Attorney: Sharon E. Myers, Esq., CGA Law Firm, PC, 106 Harrisburg Street, P.O. BOX 606, East Berlin, PA 17316

**ESTATE OF FRANCIS W. WITCHER, DEC'D**

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Susan Witcher, 835 Hilltown Road, Biglerville, PA 17307

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