

# Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 63

October 1, 2021

No. 22, pp. 36-45

## IN THIS ISSUE

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
VS. LANCE LEVI SHANNON

# 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 an application for registration of the fictitious name, CIVIL WAR TAILS DIORAMA MUSEUM was filed in the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on August 5, 2010, under the Fictitious Names Act, Act 1982, No. 295 (54 Pa.C.S. Sections 301-332). The address of the principal office of the business to be carried on through the fictitious name is 785 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325. The name and address of the principal party to the registration is Civil War Tails at the Homestead Diorama Museum, LLC, 785 Baltimore Pitt Street, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17325.

James M. Robinson, Esq.  
Salzmann Hughes, P.C.  
354 Alexander Spring Road, Suite 1  
Carlisle, PA 17015

10/1

FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that an application for registration of the fictitious name, CIVIL WAR TAILS was filed in the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on August 5, 2010, under the Fictitious Names Act, Act 1982, No. 295 (54 Pa.C.S. Sections 301-332). The address of the principal office of the business to be carried on through the fictitious name is 785 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325. The name and address of the principal party to the registration is Civil War Tails at the Homestead Diorama Museum, LLC, 785 Baltimore Pitt Street, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17325.

James M. Robinson, Esq.  
Salzmann Hughes, P.C.  
354 Alexander Spring Road, Suite 1  
Carlisle, PA 17015

10/1

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
VS. LANCE LEVI SHANNON

1. The issues before the Court are whether the search warrant issued lacked sufficient particularity and was unconstitutionally overbroad and whether the search warrant was supported by probable cause.

2. A warrant lacks sufficient particularity if it “authorizes a search in terms so ambiguous as to allow the executing officers to pick and choose among an individual’s possession to find which items to seize.”

3. A warrant is unconstitutionally overbroad if it “authorizes in clear or specific terms the seizure of an entire set of items, or documents, many of which will prove unrelated to the crime under investigation.” A warrant may permit the seizure of electronic equipment so long as the search of the equipment is limited to looking for evidence of the specific crimes that the police had probable cause to believe the defendant committed.

4. Defendant contends that the search warrant contained insufficient probable cause because the only facts provided were from Defendant’s biased, soon-to-be ex-wife. Defendant incorrectly treats the information from Shelly Shannon as if the information came from an unnamed confidential informant.

5. In assessing an informant’s reliability, a presumption exists that the information is trustworthy when it has been provided by an identified witness.

6. Based on the totality of the circumstances, Detective Beyer provided sufficient evidence in his search warrant and incorporated affidavit of probable cause to allow the issuing authority to conclude that evidence of child pornography probably would be found on Defendant’s cellular telephones.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,  
PENNSYLVANIA, CP-01-CR-345-2021, COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA VS. LANCE LEVI SHANNON

Brian R. Sinnett, Esquire, Attorney for Commonwealth  
Shawn M. Stottlemeyer, Esquire, Attorney for Defendant  
Wagner, J., September 15, 2021

OPINION ON DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO SUPPRESS

Presently before the Court is Defendant’s Omnibus Pretrial Motion, Motion to Suppress, filed May 24, 2021. A suppression hearing was held on August 19, 2021. The issues before the Court are whether the search warrant issued lacked sufficient particularity and was unconstitutionally overbroad and whether the search warrant was supported by probable cause. For the reasons set forth herein, Defendant’s Motion to Suppress is denied.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Defendant is charged with sexual abuse of children – possession of child pornography as a felony of the second degree, sexual abuse of children – possession of child pornography as a felony of the third degree and criminal use of a communication facility as a felony of the third degree.
2. On January 20, 2021, Detective Eric B. Beyer of the Adams County District Attorney’s Office applied for a search warrant and served Defendant with the search warrant on the same day.
3. The search warrant requested in part “[T]he seizure and full forensic examination of any and all computer systems located at 53 East Hanover Street, Apartment B, Bonneauville Borough, Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania 17325. The biometric data of Lance L. Shannon, date of birth 3/14/1995. This data includes, but is not limited to, facial features and fingerprint data. Any and all documentation and records, whether on paper or stored on magnetic media (including information stored within a computer), disclosing, describing, referring, reflecting or advertenting to pornographic images (child or adult).” “These items will be seized and later searched for evidence relating to the possession and/or distribution of child pornography.”
4. The search warrant specified that the statutes violated were Title 18 section 6312, sexual abuse of children and Title 18 section 7512, criminal use of a communication facility.
5. The probable cause affidavit set forth an extensive outline of Detective Beyer’s training and expertise concerning child exploitation crimes, including eight separate trainings he attended between August 2013 and June 2018 concerning child exploitation crimes and the use of computers and the internet to commit these crimes. The probable cause affidavit also set forth that Detective Beyer was a member of the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC) and explained the ICAC program.
6. The probable cause affidavit stated in part:
  2. On 20 January 2021, I interviewed Shelly Shannon, the female occupant of 53 East Hanover Street, Apartment B, Bonneauville Borough, Gettysburg, Adams County

PA 17325. Shelly Shannon stated that she is in the process of a divorce with Lance Shannon, who[m] she identified by name and date of birth. Shelly Shannon stated that on or about 17 January 2021, she had been going through a Samsung cell phone that had been possessed by Lance Shannon. During this examination of Lance Shannon's cellular phone, she observed images of what she described as young children, possibly 5 or 6 years of age, engaged in acts of nudism and sex acts.

3. I was unable to personally observe the files in question, but in discussion with Shelly Shannon, she stated that she has young children, and was able to identify these images as being of children under the age of 18 years of age based upon personal experience. Shelly Shannon further stated that she had observed similar images of children under the age of 18 years old, engaged in child erotica, on Lance Shannon's new phone. Shelly Shannon further identified the address as 53 East Hanover Street, Apartment B, Gettysburg PA 17325. This address is physically located within Bonneauville Borough, Adams County, PA.
4. Immediately after this interview, I traveled to the area of 53 East Hanover Street, Apartment B, Gettysburg, Bonneauville, PA 17325, at which time I observed a black 2019 Chevrolet Malibu sedan bearing PA registration LNA7839, parked in front of this building. A PennDot records check of this registration revealed that this vehicle bears VIN 1G1ZD5DTGKF221692 and is registered to Lance L. Shannon as lessee at 53 East Hanover Street, Apartment B, Gettysburg, PA 17325.
5. Shelly Shannon informed me during this interview that Lance Shannon had become aware of her finding these two phones and had taken possession of them. It has been my experience that people will typically possess their cellular phones on their person or within close proximity to them.
6. It has been my experience, based upon prior child exploitation investigations, that forensic examiners can

recover files even when they have been deleted. My prior investigations have recovered deleted files which had been deleted for several months. When the device which was sharing the child pornography is seized, it is likely to contain evidence relating to the possession and/or distribution of child pornography even if the child pornography has been deleted.

7. Based upon the above information, there is probable cause to believe that Title 18 § 6312, which, among other things, make it a crime for any person to knowingly produce, distribute, receive or possess child pornography, or attempt to do the above acts, has been violated, and that the property, evidence, and instrumentalities of these offenses, listed in the items to be searched for and seized if found, are located at 53 East Hanover Street, Apartment B, Bonneauville Borough, Gettysburg, Adams County, PA 17325. I request that a search warrant issue to allow for the search and seizure of such property and evidence.
7. Following service of the search warrant on January 20, 2021, various cellular devices were recovered from Defendant. A forensic examination was conducted on the cellular devices, which revealed two separate videos of a male child engaged in sexual contact with an adult, numerous images of children engaged in nudity, numerous images of children in intimate contact, and numerous images of male children clothed in underwear with emphasis shown on their buttocks or genital areas.
8. Defendant was arrested on February 10, 2021 and charged with the above-referenced criminal offenses.
9. An Omnibus Pretrial Motion, Motion to Suppress was filed on May 24, 2021. A suppression hearing was held on August 19, 2021 before this Court.

#### ISSUE

1. Whether the search warrant issued on January 20, 2021 lacked sufficient particularity and was unconstitutionally overbroad.
2. Whether the search warrant issued on January 20, 2021 was supported by probable cause.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The search warrant did not lack sufficient particularity and was not unconstitutionally overbroad.
2. The search warrant was supported by probable cause.
3. A common sense and non-technical reading of the search warrant contained legally sufficient probable cause and authorized Detective Beyer to search and seize evidence related to the possession and/or dissemination of child pornography.

## DISCUSSION

The first issue presented is whether the search warrant lacked sufficient particularity and was constitutionally overbroad.

The Pennsylvania Constitution requires that all warrants be both particular and not overbroad: "[N]o warrant to search any place or to seize any person or things shall issue without describing them as nearly as may be, nor without probable cause ...." **Pa. Const. art. I § 8**. A warrant lacks sufficient particularity if it "authorizes a search in terms so ambiguous as to allow the executing officers to pick and choose among an individual's possessions to find which items to seize." **Commonwealth v. Rivera**, 816 A.2d 282, 290 (Pa. Super. 2003). A warrant is unconstitutionally overbroad if it "authorizes in clear or specific terms the seizure of an entire set of items, or documents, many of which will prove unrelated to the crime under investigation." **Id.** "[A] warrant may permit the seizure of electronic equipment so long as the search of the equipment is limited to looking for evidence of the specific crimes that the police had probable cause to believe the defendant committed." **Commonwealth v. Green**, 204 A.3d 469, 481 (Pa. Super. 2019).

"[S]earch warrants 'should be read in a commonsense fashion and should not be invalidated by hypertechnical interpretations.'" **Commonwealth v. Kane**, 210 A.3d 324, 332 (Pa. Super. 2019) (quoting **Commonwealth v. Rega**, 933 A.2d 997, 1012 (Pa. 2007)). Explicit incorporation of an affidavit of probable cause can sufficiently narrow the scope of a warrant. **Commonwealth v. Soto**, No. 793 MDA 2018, 2019 WL 3857771, at \*5–6 (Pa. Super. Aug. 16, 2019).

In **Commonwealth v. Green**, 204 A.3d 469 (Pa. Super. 2019), the Superior Court denied the defendant's motion to suppress evidence of

possession of child pornography. **Id.** at 482. The defendant in **Green** argued that “the search warrant . . . was overbroad because it allowed the police to search all files on electronic devices found at the residence, regardless of whether the devices were used for criminal purposes[.]” **Id.** at 480. “The trial court denied the motion to suppress because ‘the search warrant sought only “evidence relating to the possession and/or distribution of child pornography”’” and “concluded that the warrant’s scope was ‘sufficiently narrow as to exclude evidence of non-criminal behavior.’” **Id.** at 481. The Superior Court agreed with the trial court and found that “[t]he warrant contained a general description of electronic items to be seized, but permitted the seized devices to be searched only for ‘evidence relating to the possession and/or distribution of child pornography.’” **Id.** at 482.

**Commonwealth v. Green** is controlling in this case. As in **Green**, Defendant was under investigation for the possession and/or distribution of child pornography, and a search warrant was issued. In both cases, police seized and searched electronic device(s) as well as files appearing to contain child pornography. Both cases also included an incorporated affidavit of probable cause that contained similar language, authorizing the search and seizure of property and evidence related to violations of Title 18 §6312, which make it a crime for any person to knowingly produce, distribute, receive, or possess child pornography.

Detective Beyer’s search warrant and incorporated affidavit provided sufficient facts for the magisterial district judge to reasonably determine that the search warrant was for the purpose of seizing cellular devices and authorizing the search of the data on such devices for evidence of child pornography.

The second issue presented is whether the search warrant and incorporated affidavit of probable cause contained legally sufficient probable cause.

In **Commonwealth v. Sharp**, 683 A.2d 1219 (Pa. Super. 1996) the Superior Court set forth the proper standard to determine whether sufficient probable cause to support a search warrant exists:

In determining whether probable cause exists to issue a search warrant, Pennsylvania applied the “totality of the circumstances” test as set out in **Illinois v. Gates**, 462 U.S. 213, 103 S.Ct. 2317, 76 L.Ed.2d. 527 (1983) and



adopted in **Commonwealth v. Gray**, 509 Pa. 476, 503 A.2d 921 (1985). **Singleton**, 412 Pa.Super. at 551, 603 A.2d at 1072. The duty of an appellate court is to “ensure that the magistrate had a ‘substantial basis for concluding that probable cause existed.’” **Id.** at **552**, 603 A.2d at 1073 (citations omitted). We are guided by these standards:

An affidavit for a search warrant is to be tested by this court with common sense and a realistic manner, and not subjected to overly technical interpretations; the magistrate’s determination of probable cause is to be accorded great deference on review. The law is clear that before a search warrant may issue, facts supported by oath or affirmation must be presented to the issuing officer which will justify a finding of probable cause. For the warrant to be constitutionally valid, the issuing officer must conclude that probable cause exists at the time the warrant is issued. Such a conclusion may not be made arbitrarily and must be based on facts which are closely related in time to the date the warrant is issued.

**Commonwealth v. Vergotz**, 420 Pa.Super. 440, 445-46, 616 A.2d 1379, 1382 (1992), alloc. denied, 534 Pa. 648, 627 A.2d 179 (1993) (citations omitted).

An affidavit of probable cause must include facts from which a magistrate can determine the time frame within which the supporting information was acquired. **Edmunds**, 526 Pa. at 382, 586 A.2d at 891. “A search warrant is defective if the issuing authority is not supplied with a time frame upon which to ascertain when the affiant obtained the information from the informant and when the informant himself witnessed the criminal acts detailed in the affidavit of probable cause.” **Commonwealth v. Murphy**, 427 Pa. Super. 578, 581-81, 629 A.2d 1020, 1021 (1993), alloc. denied, 537 Pa. 648, 644 A.2d 734 (1994).

**Id.** at 1223. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court “has repeatedly emphasized that an issuing authority need only make a common-sense determination that there was ‘fair probability’ that evidence of

a crime would be found at the place sought to be searched.” **Commonwealth v. Lyons**, 79 A.3d 1053, 1065 (Pa. 2013) (citations omitted).

Defendant contends that the search warrant contained insufficient probable cause because the only facts provided were from Defendant’s biased, soon-to-be ex-wife. However, Defendant incorrectly treats the information from Shelly Shannon as if the information came from an unnamed confidential informant. All the cases cited by Defendant concerning this issue are inapposite because they involve information received from an unnamed confidential informant rather than from an identified citizen. (See **Commonwealth v. Clark**, 28 A.3d 1284 (Pa. 2011); **Commonwealth v. Sanchez**, 907 A.2d 477 (Pa. 2006); **Commonwealth v. Gray**, 503 A.2d 921 (Pa. 1985); and **Commonwealth v. Baker**, 615 A.2d 23 (Pa. 1992)).

Defendant’s reliance on the above-referenced cases is misplaced. The search warrant was not based upon information from an unnamed confidential source, but rather came directly from Defendant’s wife, who lived with Defendant and was named in the search warrant. Defendant’s wife observed child pornography on Defendant’s cellular telephone on January 17, 2021 and provided this information to Detective Beyer on January 20, 2021. Defendant’s wife advised Detective Beyer that she and Defendant were going through a divorce, and Detective Beyer outlined this potential bias in the search warrant affidavit. Therefore, Detective Beyer outlined the basis of knowledge of the evidence of a crime (Shelly Shannon’s personal observation of child pornography on Defendant’s cellular telephone), when the witness observed this evidence of a crime (three days before the search warrant was signed and executed) and outlined the potential bias of the eyewitness for the magisterial district judge to consider.

In assessing an informant’s reliability, a presumption exists that the information is trustworthy when it has been provided by an identified witness. **Commonwealth v. Waltson**, 703 A.2d 518, 522 (Pa. Super. 1997). As set forth in **Commonwealth v. Weidenmoyer**, 539 A.2d 1291 (Pa. 1988):

It may be fairly stated that where an informant is not a paid, unknown tipster but instead an identified eyewitness to a crime who voluntarily reports his observations

to the police, the trustworthiness of such a person may be presumed. See **Commonwealth v. Reel**, 499 Pa. 381, 453 A.2d 923 (1982); **Commonwealth v. Sudler**, 496 Pa. 295, 436 A.2d (1981); **Commonwealth v. Stokes**, 480 Pa. 38, 389 A.2d 74 (1978); **United States v. Rollins**, 522 F.2d 160 (2d Cir. 1975); **United States v. Burke**, 517 F.2d 377 (2d Cir, 1975); **United States v. Simmons**, 444 F.Supp. 500 (E.D.Pa.1978); LaFave, Search and Seizure, § 3.4 (1978). The reason for such a presumption is well-articulated by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in **State v. Paszek**, 50 Wis.2d 619, 184 N.W.2d 836 (1971).

[A]n ordinary citizen who reports a crime which has been committed in his presence, or that a crime is being or will be committed, stands on much different ground than a police informer. He is a witness to criminal activity who acts with an intent to aid the police in law enforcement because of his concern for society or for his own safety. He does not expect any gain or concessions in exchange for his information. An informer of this type usually would not have more than one opportunity to supply information to the police, thereby precluding proof of his reliability by pointing to previous accurate information which he has supplied.

**Id.** at 1295.

**Commonwealth v. Waltson**, supra, is analogous to the facts of this case and provides guidance. In **Waltson**, the Pennsylvania State Police responded to a domestic dispute at the defendant's residence, where they encountered the defendant's girlfriend, who advised that she lived with the defendant and that the defendant was growing marijuana in the basement of the house. **Waltson**, 703 A.2d at 519. Based solely on the information from the girlfriend, a search warrant was issued. **Id.** In ruling that there was sufficient probable cause for the issuance of the search warrant, the Superior Court in **Waltson** stated:

In assessing an informant's reliability, we note that when the informant is not a "paid unknown tipster but instead an identified eyewitness to a crime who voluntarily

reports [her] observations to the police, the trustworthiness of such a person may be presumed.” **Commonwealth v. Weidenmoyer**, 518 Pa. 2, 9, 539 A.2d 1291, 1295 (1988). Furthermore, the willingness of an eyewitness to reveal incriminatory information enhances her reliability. **Commonwealth v. Yacoubian**, 339 Pa.Super. 413,489 A.2d 228 (1985).

Here, Nance revealed her name and allowed it to be used on the affidavit in support of the warrant. Nance implicated herself in criminal activity when she admitted that she had lived in a house that was home to a marijuana growing operation. Keeping in mind the deference we give to the issuing magistrate when reviewing the propriety of search warrants, we find the issuing magistrate did not err in finding there was a probability of criminal activity and probable cause to issue the search warrant.

**Id.** at 522. See also **Commonwealth v. Lyons**, 79 A.3d 1053, 1057–58, 1064–65 (Pa. 2013).

Based on the totality of the circumstances, Detective Beyer provided sufficient evidence in his search warrant and incorporated affidavit of probable cause to allow the issuing authority to conclude that evidence of child pornography probably would be found on Defendant’s cellular telephones. “Keeping in mind the deference [courts] give to the issuing magistrate when reviewing the propriety of search warrants,” the Court finds that the magisterial district judge took into account the potential bias of Defendant’s wife “in finding there was a probability of criminal activity and probable cause to issue the search warrant.” See **Waltson**, 703 A.2d at 522.

Therefore, Defendant’s Motion for Suppression of Evidence is denied. Accordingly, the attached Order will be entered.

#### ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 15th day of September, 2021, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, Defendant’s Motion to Suppress is hereby 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 PHYLLIS CUNNINGHAM, DEC'D**

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Randy Dell a/k/a James Randy Dell, 51 East Locust Street, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: G. Steven McKonly, Esq., 119 Baltimore Street, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF WILLIAM D. DAILEY, DEC'D**

Late of Germany Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Robin Novak and Leslie Rosendale, 101 Quail Court, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

**ESTATE OF ARLENE M. EVANS, DEC'D**

Late of Germany Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Christine M. Martin, 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 JOHN G. NOEL, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representatives: William L. Noel, 2825 Centennial Road, Hanover, PA 17331; Patricia L. Eckenrode, 10 Monroe Street, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: G. Steven McKonly, Esq., 119 Baltimore Street, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF FRANKLIN W. SHULL, SR., a/k/a FRANKLIN W. SHULL, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Bonnie Willard, 14406 Tower Road, Waynesboro, PA 17268

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

**SECOND PUBLICATION****ESTATE OF MARJORIE JUNE BRADLEY, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Calvin Lundell Bradley, 800 Granite Station Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Robert E. Campbell, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF LESTER EUGENE GABLE, JR., a/k/a LESTER E. GABLE, JR., DEC'D**

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

Executor: Jodi L. Plank, 104 4th Street, East Berlin, PA 17318

**ESTATE OF TERRY LEE HAWK, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Arlene F. Helm, 1317 Frederick Pike, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

**ESTATE OF NANCY M. KRANIAS, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Catherine K. Leedy, 95 Harvest Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF ERIC D. LINDEMAN, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Rita Frealing a/k/a Rita C. Frealing-Lindeman, 261 S. Washington Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF LARRY E. McCLEAF, SR., DEC'D**

Late of Berwick Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Larry E. McCleaf, Jr., 1161 Ledge Drive, York, PA 17408

Attorney: Clayton A. Lingg, Esq., Mooney Law, 230 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF SARA J. MOODY, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Bonneauville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Sara M. Moody-Wilhelm, 110 Jessica Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF CLARENCE E. SCOTT, SR., DEC'D**

Late of Highland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Clarence E. Scott, Jr., 490 Quaker Hill Road, Union Bridge, MD 21791

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

**ESTATE OF JEFFREY J. WOOD, SR. a/k/a JEFFREY JOHN WOOD, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: James U. Wood, c/o Kevin G. Robinson, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 28 E. Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Kevin G. Robinson, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 28 E. Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**THIRD PUBLICATION****ESTATE OF KENNETH O. TRACY, JR., DEC'D**

Late of Latimore Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Michelle L. Tracy, 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



# 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](mailto:rserpe@adamscountycf.org)



25 South 4th Street  
Gettysburg, PA 17325  
[www.adamscountycf.org](http://www.adamscountycf.org)



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