

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 60

March 29, 2019

No. 47, pp. 137-145

IN THIS ISSUE

TRIPWIRE OPERATIONS GROUP, LLC AND RYAN J.
MORRIS VS. MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP ZONING
HEARING BOARD VS. MOUNT JOY 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, 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.

FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that pursuant to the provisions of the Fictitious Name Act, 54 Pa. C.S.A. §311, that an Application to conduct business in Pennsylvania under the assumed or fictitious name, style or designation of GLENN'S BODY SHOP was filed with the Department of State, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The business is located at 1319 Baltimore Street, York Springs, Adams County, Pennsylvania. The name and address of the person who is the party to the registration is: C. Glenn Brechbiel, 1319 Baltimore Street, York Springs, PA 17372.

Robert L. McQuaide, Esq.
Barley Snyder
Suite 101
123 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325

**TRIPWIRE OPERATIONS GROUP, LLC AND RYAN J.
MORRIS VS. MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING
BOARD VS. MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP**

1. Morris purchased the Property on September 6, 2013. Prior to purchasing the Property, Todd A. King, Esquire sent a letter dated June 5, 2013 to the then Township Zoning Officer, Cindy Smith, requesting a zoning determination with regard to uses that Tripwire desired to conduct on the Property (“Determination Letter”).

2. Zoning Office Smith responded to Attorney King’s Determination Letter, by letter dated June 17, 2013, stating: “In response to your letter dated June 5, 2013, requesting a Zoning Determination at the above referenced property, the business as outlined within your letter is in compliance with the current zoning ordinance(s).” Appellants never applied for a zoning permit for the proposed use of the Property and no zoning permit was ever issued to Appellants.

3. On February 16, 2018, upon a citizen complaint to the ZO, the ZO issued an Enforcement Notice that the use of the Property for outside training and detonation of explosives violated the 2017 Zoning Ordinance (“the 2018 Enforcement Notice”). The language of the 2018 Enforcement Notice set forth the specific provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that were allegedly being violated, however, it cited to the section numbers of the prior Zoning Ordinance, not the 2017 Zoning Ordinance. Appellants appealed the 2018 Enforcement Notice on March 19, 2018.

4. Appellants argue the ZHB committed an error or law or abused its discretion in failing to rule that the 2018 Enforcement Notice violated section 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC and by concluding that Appellants’ use of the Property is in violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

5. In the instant case, the 2018 Enforcement Notice informed Appellants what district the Property is zoned in, that they violated the Zoning Ordinance by conducting outside training and detonating explosive at the Property without first applying for and receiving a zoning permit for those activities, provided the text of the 2017 Zoning Ordinance provisions that were violated, and provided the time frame within which Appellants were to apply for and receive a zoning permit to come into compliance. The only deficiency in the 2018 Enforcement Notice was that the section numbers cited were for the previous Zoning Ordinance.

6. Appellants were not denied their due process rights and suffered no prejudice. As such, this Court finds that the ZHB did not commit an error of law or abuse its discretion in concluding that the 2018 Enforcement Notice was sufficient under section 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC.

7. Appellants also contend that outside training and detonation of explosives were allowed by the June 5, 2013 Determination Letter, such uses have occurred on the Property since 2013, the Ordinance requiring noise impact studies and vibration studies for outdoor training was not enacted until 2015, therefore the outside training and detonation of explosives were lawful pre-existing nonconforming uses.

8. Assuming the record contains substantial evidence, we are bound by the Board’s finds that result from resolutions of credibility and conflicting testimony rather than a capricious disregard of evidence. Therefore, this Court is bound by the ZHB’s Findings of Fact that the testimony of Morris on the issue concerning the outside training of dogs and the use of explosive devices is not credible.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 2018-SU-885, TRIPWIRE OPERATIONS
GROUP, LLC AND RYAN J. MORRIS VS. MOUNT JOY
TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD VS. MOUNT JOY
TOWNSHIP

Todd A. King, Esq., Attorney for Appellant
Steven A. Stine, Esq., Attorney for Appellee
Susan J. Smith, Esq., Attorney for Intervenor
Wagner, J., March 15, 2019

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before this Court is a Land Use Appeal filed by Appellants, Tripwire Operations Group, LLC (hereinafter “Tripwire”) and Ryan J. Morris (“Morris”) (collectively “Appellants”) on August 20, 2018. Appellants’ appeal is from a July 20, 2018 written decision by Appellee, Mount Joy Township Zoning Hearing Board (“ZHB”), concerning Appellants’ alleged use of his property at 1685 Baltimore Pike, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325 (hereinafter “the Property”). For the reasons set forth herein, Appellants’ Land Use Appeal is denied.

BACKGROUND

The relevant procedural history and facts are as follows. Tripwire is a business owned by Morris and operating out of the Property. The Property is zoned Baltimore Pike Corridor Intensive Uses Overlay District in the Mount Joy Code. The Property is close to three (3) residential properties, one (1) that is across Baltimore Pike from the Property and two (2) that are adjacent to the Property on the same side of Baltimore Pike, 306 feet and 201 feet away, respectively. The Property is improved with a large building, which is occupied by Tripwire, a smaller building to the rear occupied by the Lincoln Intermediate Unit, and a small package sewer treatment plant that serves the Property.

Morris purchased the Property on September 6, 2013. Prior to purchasing the Property, Todd A. King, Esquire sent a letter dated June 5, 2013 to the then Township Zoning Officer, Cindy Smith, requesting a zoning determination with regard to uses that Tripwire desired to conduct on the Property (“Determination Letter”).

According to the Determination Letter, Appellants proposed to use the Property primarily to house the offices of Tripwire and its employees; approximately once a month for classes to train first responders in a classroom setting; storage of equipment to be used in classroom presentation and demonstrations that take place off-site, but would not involve the storage of explosives in any manner; and selling specially-trained bomb sniffing dogs, which would involve Tripwire purchasing dogs from Belgium that are specially trained in detecting explosive materials. The dogs would be shipped to Tripwire and the end user of the dog would come to the Tripwire office to be trained in the handling of the dog. Appellants' Determination Letter did not specifically reference outdoor training or the detonation of explosives at the Property.

Zoning Officer Smith responded to Attorney King's Determination Letter, by letter dated June 17, 2013, stating: "In response to your letter dated June 5, 2013, requesting a Zoning Determination at the above referenced property, the business as outlined within your letter is in compliance with the current zoning ordinance(s)."

Appellants never applied for a zoning permit for the proposed use of the Property and no zoning permit was ever issued to Appellants. On April 12, 2016, the current Zoning Officer ("ZO") issued an Enforcement Notice to Appellants that the use of the Property for conducting outside training and detonation of explosives was in violation of the Zoning Ordinance ("the 2016 Enforcement Notice").

The 2016 Enforcement Notice was sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Tripwire at its business address at the Property, and Morris at his home address, 19 Misty Lane, Biglerville, PA 17307. The Tripwire return receipt was signed on April 14, 2016 by Mike Loney, an employee of Tripwire at the time, and returned to the Zoning Officer. The return receipt for Morris's address was signed on April 21, 2016 by Karen Morris, Morris's wife, and returned to the Zoning Officer. Appellants never appealed the 2016 Enforcement Notice to the ZHB. Mt. Joy Township never filed a civil enforcement proceeding under section 613.2 of the MPC with a magisterial district judge or filed a complaint in equity to enjoin Appellants from further violation.

On February 16, 2018, upon a citizen complaint to the ZO, the ZO issued an Enforcement Notice that the use of the Property for outside

training and detonation of explosives violated the 2017 Zoning Ordinance (“the 2018 Enforcement Notice”). The language of the 2018 Enforcement Notice set forth the specific provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that were allegedly being violated, however, it cited to the section numbers of the prior Zoning Ordinance, not the 2017 Zoning Ordinance.¹

Appellants appealed the 2018 Enforcement Notice on March 19, 2018. The ZO indicated that the Appeal was incomplete by letter dated March 28, 2018. Appellants supplemented the Appeal on April 9, 2018 and the ZO sent a letter on April 13, 2018 indicating that the Appeal was complete. The ZHB held a public hearing on May 23, 2018 to address the Appeal.

During the hearing on the Appeal, Morris testified that the Determination Letter did not reference outside training or detonation of explosives at the Property. Morris also testified that since he purchased the Property, Tripwire had been conducting outside training and detonating explosives at the Property. Morris testified that Zoning Officer Smith had observed a demonstration of the outside dog training activities and observed the dogs subjected to explosive devices. Morris testified that he had emails corroborating this testimony, but no such emails were introduced into evidence. Former Zoning Officer Smith did not testify.

On July 20, 2018, the ZHB issued a written decision with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law denying the Appellants’ Appeal of the 2018 Enforcement Notice. On August 20, 2018, Appellants filed a Notice of Land Use Appeal, which is the matter before this Court. On September 10, 2018, Mount Joy Township (the “Township”) filed a Notice of Intervention in the Appeal.

The ZHB’s Findings of Fact 33 stated: “Morris’ testimony, with regard to meeting with the then Zoning Officer, including demonstrations of dog activities outside and emails, which allegedly corroborate his testimony is not credible.”

¹ The 2018 Enforcement Notice alleged violations of Section 110-6.A. and 110-7.A.(2) for failing to apply for a zoning permit before using, changing, or expanding the use of a structure or land, and 110-86.A.70. for failure to submit a noise impact study and conducting outdoor training at a trade school. These Section cites have changed in the 2017 Zoning Ordinance, but were correct under the prior Zoning Ordinance.

Section 1005-A of the MPC provides procedure for the presentation of additional evidence following a land use appeal. Appellants did not attempt enlargement of the ZHB record to present the referenced emails or the testimony of Zoning Officer Smith to corroborate Morris' testimony.

LEGAL STANDARD

In zoning cases such as the instant matter where the trial court does not receive any additional evidence, the scope of review is limited to determining whether the Board committed an error of law or a manifest abuse of discretion. **In re Petition of Dolington Land Group**, 839 A.2d 1021, 1026 (Pa. 2003). The Court does not substitute its own interpretation of the evidence for that of the Board. **Pietropaolo v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of Lower Merion Twp.**, 979 A.2d 969, 976 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2009). "A conclusion that the governing body abused its discretion may be reached only if its findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence." **Sutliff Enterprises, Inc. v. Silver Spring Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.**, 933 A.2d 1079, 1081 n.1 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2007). Evidence is substantial when a reasonable mind could accept it as adequate to support a conclusion. **Cardamone v. Whitpain Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.**, 771 A.2d 103, 104 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001).

Moreover, the Board's interpretation of the zoning ordinance it is charged with enforcing is generally entitled to a great degree of deference. **Ruley v. W. Nantemear Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.**, 948 A.2d 265, 268 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2008). The basis for this deference is the specific knowledge and expertise the Board possesses to interpret said zoning ordinances. **Willits Woods Assoc. v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment City of Philadelphia**, 587 A.2d 827, 829 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1991).

An owner asserting the protected status of a nonconforming use has the burden of proving that the use pre-dated the pertinent ordinance. **Appeal of Lester M. Prange, Inc.**, 647 A.2d 279 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1994). It is the burden of the property owner to establish that the use existed before the enactment of the zoning ordinance and that the use was lawful. **Hafner v. Zoning Hearing Board of Allen Township**, 974 A.2d 1204 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2009). The property owner must provide objective evidence of the extent, nature, time of creation, and continuation of the alleged nonconforming use. **Jones v.**

Township of North Huntington Zoning Hearing Board, 467 A.2d 1206 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1983).

DISCUSSION

Appellants allege that the ZHB erred in denying Appellants' Appeal and that such decision constituted an error of law or abuse of discretion. Appellants argue the ZHB committed an error of law or abused its discretion in failing to rule that the 2018 Enforcement Notice violated section 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC and by concluding that Appellants' use of the Property is in violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

Appellants initially contend that the 2018 Enforcement Notice violated 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC. In support of this argument, Appellants cite to **Township of Maidencreek v. Stutzman**, 642 A.2d 600 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1994). In **Stutzman**, the township sent an enforcement letter to the landowners, which described alleged zoning violations and potential consequences of the landowners' continued violation under section 616.1 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC). The landowners contended that the enforcement notice violated section 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC because it did not state the specific provision which the township contended the landowner had violated. The enforcement notice also listed the wrong zoning district for the property. In finding that the enforcement notice was so deficient as to render the trial court's grant of the preliminary injunction improper, the Commonwealth Court in **Stutzman** looked to a Pennsylvania Supreme Court interpretation of the term "cite:"

In interpreting that section, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has held that the legislature intended the word "cite", as used in section 508(2), to mean a specific reference to an ordinance section. **Coretsky v. Board of Commissioners of Butler Township**, 520 Pa. 513, 555 A.2d 72 (1989). Similarly, in section 616.1, the legislature indicated that notices *shall* indicate the specific violations, citing the applicable ordinance provisions. Hence, the township's notice to the landowners does not satisfy the requirements of section 616.1.

Id. at 602. (Emphasis in original).

This Court finds that the instant case is factually distinguishable from the facts in Stutzman. Instead, this Court finds as controlling **Three Rivers Aluminum Company, Inc. v. Zoning Hearing Board of Marshall Township**, 618 A.2d 1165 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1992) and **Krupa v. Fayette County Zoning Hearing Bd., No. 1111 C.D. 2007**, an unreported Commonwealth Court Panel decision. While unreported, and therefore not binding precedent, **Krupa** may be cited for its persuasive value pursuant to Commonwealth Court Internal Operating Procedure § 414.

In **Three Rivers**, a zoning hearing officer issued a stop, cease, and desist order on Three Rivers to stop it from operating a public restaurant on its private golf course in violation of a zoning ordinance. Three Rivers argued that the stop, cease, and desist order issued by the zoning officer failed to comply with 616.1(c) of the MPC and therefore was defective because it failed to include notice that Three Rivers had a right to appeal the order to the Board. The Commonwealth Court in **Three Rivers** ruled:

However, Three Rivers did not argue that it was prejudiced in any way by the zoning officer's omission. In fact, Three Rivers appealed the order in a timely manner and received a full and fair hearing. Thus, although the order may have technically violated the enforcement notice provisions of the MPC, Three Rivers' substantive rights were in no way affected. Accordingly, we hold that the Board did not err in refusing to set aside the order as defective.

Id. at 1167.

In **Krupa**, the appellants argued that enforcement notice did not set forth a specific section of the zoning ordinance Appellants were violating. The Commonwealth Court ruled that the information provided to the Krupas was sufficient, and the mere lack of a citation to a section of the Ordinance that they violated was neither fatally defective under Section 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC² nor violative of their due process rights. **Id.** at 3.

In the instant case, the 2018 Enforcement Notice informed Appellants what district the Property is zoned in, that they violated

² Section 616.1 of the MPC is codified at 53 P.S. § 10616.1 "Enforcement Notice".

the Zoning Ordinance by conducting outside training and detonating explosives at the Property without first applying for and receiving a zoning permit for those activities, provided the text of the 2017 Zoning Ordinance provisions that were violated, and provided the time frame within which Appellants were to apply for and receive a zoning permit to come into compliance. The only deficiency in the 2018 Enforcement Notice was that the section numbers cited were for the previous Zoning Ordinance.³

The 2018 Enforcement Notice properly advised Appellants concerning violations of the Zoning Ordinance, Appellants appealed the 2018 Enforcement Notice in a timely manner, and received a full and fair hearing before the ZHB. Appellants were not denied their due process rights and suffered no prejudice. As such, this Court finds that the ZHB did not commit an error of law or abuse its discretion in concluding that the 2018 Enforcement Notice was sufficient under section 616.1(c)(3) of the MPC.

Appellants also contend that outside training and detonation of explosives were allowed by the June 5, 2013 Determination Letter, such uses have occurred on the Property since 2013, the Ordinance requiring noise impact studies and vibration studies for outdoor training was not enacted until 2015, therefore the outside training and detonation of explosives were lawful pre-existing nonconforming uses.

The ZHB's Findings of Fact of July 20, 2018 included, "Morris' testimony with regard to meeting with the then zoning officer, including demonstrations of dog activities outside in emails, which allegedly corroborate his testimony is not credible." (Finding of Fact 33). The Board is the sole judge of the credibility of witnesses and the weight afforded their testimony. **Manayunk Neighborhood Council v. Zoning Board of Adjustment of the City of Phila.**, 815 A.2d 652 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002), appeal denied, 833 A.2d 145 (Pa. 2003). Assuming the record contains substantial evidence, we are bound by the Board's findings that result from resolutions of credibility and conflicting testimony rather than a capricious disregard of

³ It is noted that Appellants were cited for violating the previous Zoning Ordinance by conducting outside training and detonating explosives on the Property in the 2016 Enforcement Notice. Appellants did not appeal the 2016 Enforcement Notice.

evidence. **Macioce v. Zoning Hearing Board of the Borough of Baldwin**, 850 A.2d 882 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2004), appeal denied, 863 A.2d 1150 (Pa. 2004). Therefore, this Court is bound by the ZHB's Finding of Fact that the testimony of Morris on the issue concerning the outside training of the dogs and the use of explosive devices is not credible. Without such evidence, Appellants cannot argue that outside training and detonation of explosives were lawful pre-existing nonconforming uses.

Appellant Morris testified that the 2013 Determination Letter never referenced nor described outside training and/or the detonation of explosives. A review of the June 5, 2013 Determination Letter does not contain any reference to outside training or the use of explosive devices and such uses cannot be inferred from the plain language of the June 5, 2013 Determination Letter. Appellants never applied for and never received a zoning permit for the uses set forth in the Determination Letter nor did Appellants apply for or receive a zoning permit for outdoor training or detonation of explosives. Since outdoor training and detonation of explosives were not permitted by the Determination Letter and were not approved by a zoning permit, they were never lawful uses. Therefore, such uses are not pre-existing nonconforming uses, because such uses were never lawful uses at any time on the Property.

Therefore, this Court finds no error of law or abuse of discretion in the ZHB's conclusion that outdoor training and detonation of explosives at the Property violated the 2017 zoning ordinance.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 15th day of March, 2019, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, the appeal taken by Tripwire Operations Group, LLC and Ryan J. Morris, Appellants, from the decision of the Mount Joy Township Zoning Hearing Board, dated July 20, 2018, is denied.

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 MADELINE E. MARTIN, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Robert A. Martin, 25 Brickyard Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

ESTATE OF WALTER REYNOLDS OTTEY, JR., DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: James Tuschall, c/o Andrew D. Cotlar, Esq., Law Offices Cotlar & Cotlar, 23 West Court Street, Doylestown, PA 18901

Attorney: Andrew D. Cotlar, Esq., Law Offices Cotlar & Cotlar, 23 West Court Street, Doylestown, PA 18901

ESTATE OF FREDERICK D. RANDT, DEC'D

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

Executor: Ronald F. Schultz, 13253 Old Mill Road, Waynesboro, PA 17268

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

ESTATE OF HAZEL B. RIDER, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Christine V. Rider, 584 Lake Meade Drive, East Berlin, PA 17316

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

ESTATE OF WALTER C. SHOWERS, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix CTA: Doris A. Showers, 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 RICHARD E. WHISLER a/k/a RICHARD E. WHISLER, SR., DEC'D

Late of Latimore Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Eugene R. Whisler, 220 Union Church Road, Dillsburg, PA 17019

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

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF FRANCES E. ANDREW, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Clarence L. Andrew, 199 Blacksmith Shop Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF MARGARET L. DELLINGER, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Ernest G. Dellinger, 875 Oxford Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Kristen Snyder, Esq., 1215 Manor Drive, Suite 202, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

ESTATE OF JEANNE E. GLENNY, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executor: Robin J. Cohen, 47505 Sharpskin Island Square, Sterling, VA 20165

ESTATE OF BARBARA A. HOFFMAN, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Representative: Timothy E. Hoffman, 3907 Gettysburg Road, Camp Hill, PA 17011-6705

ESTATE OF GLADYS J. LEESE, DEC'D

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

Executor: Ronald E. Leese, c/o Craig A. Diehl, Esq., CPA, Law Offices of Craig A. Diehl, 119A West Hanover Street, Spring Grove, PA 17362

Attorney: Craig A. Diehl, Esq., CPA, Law Offices of Craig A. Diehl, 119A West Hanover Street, Spring Grove, PA 17362

ESTATE OF EMERSON F. MULLER, DEC'D

Late of Mount Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Ray E. Muller, 21401 Northeast Evelyn Place, Bend, OR 97701; Stephanie L. Muller, 5594 Fairway Drive West, Fayetteville, PA 17222

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

ESTATE OF JACKLYN M. MYERS, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Littlestown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Melissa Myers, 3635 Baltimore Pike, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

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

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Tina M. Steich, 323 Terrace Avenue, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Crabbs & Crabbs, 202 Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF LARRY R. SHORB, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Barbara A. Shorb, c/o Linda S. Siegle, Esq., Siegle Law, 1010 Eichelberger Street, Suite 3, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Linda S. Siegle, Esq., Siegle Law, 1010 Eichelberger Street, Suite 3, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF NEREIDA SIMON, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrators: Monica Ramirez-Hsu, 2500 Mill Road, Unit 3, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055; Rodolfo Ramirez, 239 Spanglers Mill Road, New Cumberland, PA 17070; Alice Ramirez, 164 Gettys Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF CHARLES L. SWOPE, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Biglerville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Judy Ann Shultz, 129 Zeigler Mill Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Ryan E. Taylor, 50 Ditzler Road, Biglerville, PA 17307

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

Continued on page 4

THIRD PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF RITA M. DeWITT, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Littlestown,
Adams County, Pennsylvania

Robert D. DeWitt, Jr., 121 Colorado
Avenue, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

ESTATE OF HELEN M. GRAYBILL, DEC'D

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

Michele Miller, c/o Gerald J.
Shekletski, Esq., Stone LaFaver &
Shekletski, P.O. Box E, New
Cumberland, PA 17070

Attorney: Gerald J. Shekletski, Esq.,
Stone LaFaver & Shekletski, P.O.
Box E, New Cumberland, PA 17070

ESTATE OF BURNELL F. HARNER, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Christine R. Settle, Vice
President and Trust Officer, ACNB
Bank, 675 Old Harrisburg Road,
P.O. Box 4566, Gettysburg, PA
17325

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

**ESTATE OF WELLINGTON A. HUMMEL,
DEC'D**

Late of Straban Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Patricia A. Dutterer, 7 Sunlight Drive,
Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF LEO F. LAMER, DEC'D

Late of Germany Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Mrs. Melanie L. Furlow, 59
Gettysburg Court, Littlestown, PA
17340; Rev. Terry L. Lamer, 65
Barrens Valley Road, Dillsburg, PA
17019

Attorney: Clarence B. Turns, Jr., Esq.,
Corporate Plaza, Suite 101, 2080
Linglestown Road, Harrisburg, PA
17110-9670

**ESTATE OF EUGENE C. McCauslin,
DEC'D**

Late of Menallen Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Attorney: Jeffery M. Cook, Esq., 234
Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA
17325

ESTATE OF EDWARD H. RUNK, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Littlestown,
Adams County, Pennsylvania

Dennis L. Runk, P.O. Box 235,
Littlestown, PA 17340; David E.
Runk, 556 South Queen Street,
Littlestown, PA 17340; Janet E.
Smith, 212 Carlisle Street, Apt. 1,
First Floor, Hanover, PA 17331

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

**ESTATE OF JOSEPH R. SCHEER,
DEC'D**

Late of Liberty Township, Adams
County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Margaret S. Scheer, 2885
Bullfrog Road, Fairfield, PA 17320

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

ESTATE OF GLENN E. UNGER, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Littlestown,
Adams County, Pennsylvania

Beverly M. Ruggles, 119 Bittern Drive,
Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

*Are your clients
ready to give back?*

ADAMS COUNTY

**COMMUNITY
FOUNDATION***For Good. For Adams County. For Ever.*

**When your clients want to talk about what
matters to them, are you ready?**

Put the **Adams County Community Foundation**
on your team.

- Free, no-obligation consultations
- Expertise in philanthropic planning
- Respect for your client relationship
- Support for giving in Adams County, South Central PA and across the U.S.

Contact us at 717-337-0060 or info@adamscountycf.org
with questions or to discuss a specific scenario.



Good for your client. Good for Adams County. Good for you.