

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 60

November 16, 2018

No. 28, pp. 92-101

IN THIS ISSUE

M. M., A MINOR, BY TRACY SHEFFER, ESQ.,
GUARDIAN AD LITEM VS. GETTYSBURG LODGE NO.
1526, LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE, INC.,
D/B/A GETTYSBURG MOOSE 1526/CHAPTER 182
AND ROBERT BENJAMIN CARBAUGH

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.

LEGAL NOTICE

On November 1, 2018, a Registration of Fictitious Name was filed with the Pennsylvania Department of State Bureau of Corporations and Charitable Organizations enabling BELL REAL ESTATE, INC. to do business as SOUTH PENN REALTY. Bell Real Estate, Inc. and South Penn Realty's principal office address and place of business is 8438 Carlisle Pike, PO Box 422, York Springs, PA, 17372. This Registration of Fictitious Name was filed for Bell Real Estate, Inc., by and through its agent, Marc A. Scaringi, Esq., of Scaringi Law., 2000 Linglestown Road, Suite 106, Harrisburg, PA 17110.

11/16

M. M., A MINOR, BY TRACY SHEFFER, ESQ.,
GUARDIAN AD LITEM VS. GETTYSBURG LODGE NO.
1526, LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE, INC.,
D/B/A GETTYSBURG MOOSE 1526/CHAPTER 182
AND ROBERT BENJAMIN CARBAUGH

1. In order to prevail on a dram shop claim, a plaintiff must prove (1) an employee or agent of the defendant served alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron in violation of the PA Liquor Code; and (2) the service of alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron was the proximate cause of injury to plaintiff.

2. A number of cases suggest that visible intoxication may be proven circumstantially. From Carbaugh's testimony about the exorbitant quantity he drank at the Moose Lodge, if believed by a jury, it could be inferred that he was visibly intoxicated while being served at the Moose Lodge.

3. This case is not "free and clear of doubt" on the issue of whether or not Defendant Gettysburg Moose served Carbaugh while he was visibly intoxicated. Plaintiff has provided barely enough testimony from which it could be inferred that Carbaugh could have been visibly intoxicated upon being served his last drink at the Gettysburg Moose. Plaintiff has just enough evidence to avoid summary judgment as to the question of service to a visibly intoxicated patron.

4. This Court has not been able to locate, and the parties have not cited, any controlling case law on the issue of whether a Dram Shop Act violation can be the proximate cause of a later sexual assault. This appears to be a case of first impression.

5. Resolving that question, for purposes of Summary Judgment consideration, in favor of the non-moving party leads to the conclusion that this criminal act was not significantly remote from the service of alcohol to Carbaugh.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 16-S-1295, M. M., A MINOR, BY TRACY
SHEFFER, ESQ., GUARDIAN AD LITEM VS. GETTYSBURG
LODGE NO. 1526, LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE, INC., D/B/A
GETTYSBURG MOOSE 1526/CHAPTER 182 AND ROBERT
BENJAMIN CARBAUGH

Benjamin Adreozzi, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff
Carol Ann Murphy, Esq., Attorney for Defendant
Tracy Sheffer, Esq., Guardian Ad Litem
Campbell, J. October 25, 2018

OPINION

Before this Court is Defendant Gettysburg Lodge No. 1526, Loyal Order of Moose, Inc. d/b/a Gettysburg Moose 1526/Chapter 182 (hereinafter referred to as "Gettysburg Moose") of Pennsylvania's Motion for Summary Judgment filed July 2, 2018. For the reasons stated herein, the attached Order denying Defendant's Motion for

Summary Judgment is entered.

BACKGROUND

This is a Dram Shop action by which Plaintiff seeks to hold Gettysburg Moose civilly liable for the sexual assault of minor Plaintiff, M.M. at about 3:30 A.M. on December 27, 2015. Defendant, Robert Carbaugh, pled guilty to the crime of involuntary deviate sexual intercourse, and is now incarcerated. Plaintiff alleges that Carbaugh was a patron of Gettysburg Moose on December 26, 2015 into the early morning hours of December 27, 2015. Plaintiff also alleges that an employee of Gettysburg Moose served Carbaugh alcohol while he was intoxicated. Hope Beaghan was the bartender the night of the incident, and said she came to work and replaced Cheryl Farlow, Carbaugh's girlfriend, as the bartender on duty. Plaintiff contests Ms. Beaghan's testimony and asserts Ms. Farlow was not scheduled to work nor did she work at the Gettysburg Moose that evening.

The amount of alcohol consumed by Carbaugh at the Gettysburg Moose is uncertain based on testimony given by Carbaugh and Hope Beaghan. Conflicting testimony has placed Carbaugh leaving the Gettysburg Moose anytime between the hours of 11:30 P.M. and 2:00 A.M. Carbaugh does not recall leaving the Gettysburg Moose, going home, stopping at any other locations, or even how he got home. Based on that testimony the sexual assault in this matter occurred anywhere between one and a half (1.5) to three and half (3.5) hours after Carbaugh left the Gettysburg Moose.

Defendant Gettysburg Moose seeks summary judgment arguing that (1) Plaintiff has failed to establish the negligence of the Gettysburg Moose in serving alcohol to Carbaugh while he was visibly intoxicated sufficient to impose liability under the Pennsylvania Liquor Code, and (2) service of alcohol to Carbaugh was not a proximate cause of the sexual assault upon the minor.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Under the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure, a court may enter summary judgment when there is no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. **Pa. R. Civ. P. 1035.2; *Strine v. Commonwealth*, 894 A.2d 733, 737**

(Pa. 2006). Summary judgment is only appropriate where the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, omissions and affidavits, and other materials demonstrate that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Roche v. Ugly Duckling Car Sales, Inc.*, 879 A.2d 785, 789 (Pa. Super. 2005) (quotations and citations omitted). The burden of demonstrating the lack of any genuine issue of material fact falls upon the moving party, and, in ruling on the motion, the court must consider the record in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Id.* However, where a motion for summary judgment has been supported with depositions, answers to interrogatories, or affidavits, the non-moving party may not rest on the mere allegations or denials in its pleadings. *Accu-Weather, Inc. v. Prospect Commc'ns Inc.*, 644 A.2d 1251, 1254 (Pa. Super. 1994). Rather, the non-moving party must by affidavit or in some other way provided for within the Rules of Civil Procedure, set forth specific facts showing that a genuine issue of material fact exists. *Id.* Summary judgment is only appropriate in those cases which are free and clear from doubt. *McConaughy v. Bldg. Components, Inc.*, 637 A.2d 1331, 1333 (Pa. 1994).

DISCUSSION

In order to prevail on a dram shop claim, a plaintiff must prove (1) an employee or agent of the defendant served alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron in violation of the PA Liquor Code; and (2) the service of alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron was the proximate cause of injury to plaintiff. *Fandozzi v. Kelly Hotel*, 711 A.2d 524, 525-26 (Pa. Super.1998).

Gettysburg Moose first asserts that Plaintiff has failed to produce evidence that Carbaugh was visibly intoxicated when an employee of Gettysburg Moose served him, and therefore Plaintiff cannot establish a cause of action under the Pennsylvania Liquor Code.

Section 4-493(1) of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code sets forth the basis for imposing liability on bars and taverns for negligent service of alcohol. Pursuant to the Pennsylvania Liquor Code a licensee, employee, agent, or the like will not be held liable for a patron's actions unless the patron served was visibly intoxicated or a minor. It is important to note that the patron must have been served by a

licensee when he or she was already visibly intoxicated in order to hold the licensee liable. *Fandozzi v. Kelly Hotel*, 711 A.2d at 527. When establishing visible intoxication, the plaintiff must prove the patron displayed signs of visible intoxication prior to being served his or her last drink. *McDonald v. Marriott*, 564 A.2d 1296, 1299 (Pa. Super. 1989). Visible intoxication is to be based upon what a person can see based on appearance when serving a patron rather than medical diagnoses such as blood alcohol level. *Johnson v. Harris*, 615 A.2d 771, 776 (Pa. Super. 1992) (citing *Laukemann v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 475 A.2d 955, 956-57 (Pa. Commw. 1984)). Further, direct evidence is not required, and dram shop liability can be determined absent direct eyewitness evidence that a patron was served alcohol at a time when he or she was visibly intoxicated. *Fandozzi v. Kelly Hotel*, 711 A.2d at 527.

Gettysburg Moose argues the Plaintiff has not produced any evidence that Carbaugh was visibly intoxicated when he was served alcohol as a patron at the Gettysburg Moose on the night of the incident. It is further argued by Gettysburg Moose that Carbaugh actually did not show any signs of visible intoxication.

In support of its motion, Defendant Moose Lodge points to the testimony of Hope Beaghan, the only bartender on duty the night of the incident. Ms. Beaghan was friendly with Carbaugh and was familiar with what Carbaugh looked and acted like when he was intoxicated. Ms. Beaghan testified that Carbaugh did not show any signs of visible intoxication, at any time during her interaction with him on the night in question. She also testified that Carbaugh was served one or two Jager bombs, as well as three beers before leaving the bar. Further, Ms. Beaghan testified that Carbaugh left the Gettysburg Moose between 11:30 PM and 12:00 AM; three to three and a half (3-3.5) hours before the assault on the minor. According to Ms. Beaghan, around 11:30 P.M. she asked Carbaugh to leave the bar after he got into an argument with another patron she feared would turn physical.

According to Carbaugh he also frequents the Flying Bull and Blue & Grey, two bars in Gettysburg both of which are in walking distance from the Gettysburg Moose. Carbaugh does not recall when he left the Gettysburg Moose, whether or not he stopped at any other bars on his way home, when he went home, or how he got home the night of the incident.

For those reasons, Gettysburg Moose contends that Plaintiff has failed to point to evidence which could establish Carbaugh was visibly intoxicated when served his last drink by Ms. Beaghan.

In contrast, Plaintiff claims that numerous signs were present to exhibit Carbaugh's intoxication. The first being his own testimony that he was grossly intoxicated after having an estimated twenty (20) beers, with a Jager Bomb per order. Specifically in the Requests for Admissions, Carbaugh answered he had twelve (12) beers and twelve (12) Jager Bombs, and could have drank more than that. He claims approximately one hundred dollars (\$100) was spent on alcoholic beverages at the Gettysburg Moose by Carbaugh on December 26, 2015. On a scale of one (1) to ten (10) Carbaugh ranked himself as a ten (10) indicating he was extremely intoxicated the night of the incident. Carbaugh told police he left the Gettysburg Moose between 1:30 and 2:00 A.M., and did not recall stopping anywhere else on the way home. After being taken into custody, Carbaugh was placed in the "detox tank" at the County jail.

Further, Plaintiff claims the testimony of Cheryl Farlow, and M.M. confirms that Carbaugh was intoxicated after leaving the Gettysburg Moose before the sexual assault occurred. During her forensic interview, M.M. who is nine-years-old (9) said Carbaugh was "really drunk," and harassed her while he was "like sleeping" as his eyes were closed during the encounter. Cheryl Farlow indicated she was home all night, and did not work at the Gettysburg Moose on December 26, 2015. She stated when Carbaugh came home around 3:00 A.M. the night of the incident he was drunk. She said she could smell the alcohol on Carbaugh, that he was stumbling slightly, and she could hardly understand what he was saying.

It is abundantly clear from the record that Carbaugh was highly intoxicated at the time he returned home and sexually assaulted the minor plaintiff. But the record is far less clear on the critical point of whether Carbaugh was visibly intoxicated at the time he was served alcohol at Defendant Gettysburg Moose Lodge. The testimony of Cheryl Farlow and M.M. establish that Carbaugh was severely intoxicated when he got home but neither can provide insight as to his condition while being served alcohol at the Moose Lodge.

Nonetheless, Carbaugh's testimony suggests he had a tremendous amount to drink at the Moose Lodge. A number of cases suggest that

visible intoxication may be proven circumstantially. From Carbaugh's testimony about the exorbitant quantity he drank at the Moose Lodge, if believed by a jury, it could be inferred that he was visibly intoxicated while being served at the Moose Lodge.

This case is not "free and clear of doubt" on the issue of whether or not Defendant Gettysburg Moose served Carbaugh while he was visibly intoxicated. Plaintiff has provided barely enough testimony from which it could be inferred that Carbaugh could have been visibly intoxicated upon being served his last drink at the Gettysburg Moose. Plaintiff has just enough evidence to avoid summary judgment as to the question of service to a visibly intoxicated patron. Several factors such as when Carbaugh left the Gettysburg Moose, and how much he had to drink would be better suited as questions for the jury. A genuine issue of fact has been raised.

The inquiry then turns to whether Plaintiff can establish the service of alcohol to Carbaugh while he was visibility intoxicated was the proximate cause of the assault on the minor. Gettysburg Moose argues that even if this Court determined Carbaugh was visibly intoxicated when served alcohol at the Gettysburg Moose, the Plaintiff has failed to establish the proximate cause between serving of the alcohol and the sexual assault of a minor, rendering summary judgment for the Gettysburg Moose appropriate.

A violation of the Dram Shop Act is "negligence per se and if the violation was the proximate cause of the plaintiff's injury, the defendant is liable for it." *Cron v. Sarjac, Inc.*, 714 A.2d 1024, 1025 (Pa. 1998). However, a breach of this statutory duty to refrain from serving alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron does not, by itself, prove a licensee's liability. *Miller v. Brass Rail Tavern*, 702 A.2d 1072, 1078 (Pa. Super. 1997).

Critically, proximate cause is a question of law that needs to be determined by the judge before being submitted to the jury as a question of factual cause. *Novak v. Jeannette Dist. Mem. Hosp.*, 600 A.2d 616, 618 (Pa. Super. 1991). To determine legal causation, the Court must decide whether the negligence was so remote that as a matter of law the licensee cannot be held legally responsible for the plaintiff's injuries caused by the patron *Id.* at 606. The defendant's wrongful conduct must be a substantial factor in bringing about the plaintiff's harm. *Dudley v. USX Corp.*, 606 A.2d 916, 923 (Pa.

Super. 1992). If an event that occurs seems highly extraordinary that defendant's conduct caused the harm, proximate cause will not be found. *Id.* Ultimately, this court must determine whether the Plaintiff's injury would have been foreseeable by an ordinary person as a natural and probable outcome of the act complained of. *Merritt v. City of Chester*, 496 A.2d 1220, 1221 (Pa. Super. 1985).

The Gettysburg Moose argues it could not have foreseen that serving alcohol to Carbaugh would have led to him commit a sexual assault. Further, Gettysburg Moose argues there was a three-hour lapse of time between when Carbaugh was served alcohol at the Gettysburg Moose and when the assault occurred, and therefore the service of alcohol was too remote in time from the assault to have been a substantial factor in causing the incident. For those reasons, Gettysburg Moose contends that Plaintiff cannot establish the service of alcohol to Carbaugh while he was visibly intoxicated was the proximate cause of the sexual assault, and therefore no cause of action has been established against the Gettysburg Moose.

Plaintiff, on the other hand, argues that courts have held that criminal acts are "natural and probable outcomes" of a Dram Shop Act violation, and criminal acts should include sexual assaults. Plaintiff maintains that it is reasonable to foresee that over-serving alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron could result in a later sexual assault. It is Plaintiff's contention that the Gettysburg Moose is liable for Carbaugh's sexual assault of the minor plaintiff because the abuse allegedly would not have occurred but for the extreme intoxication that took place at its establishment. Pointing to Plaintiff's expert report, Plaintiff claims it is foreseeable that a heavily intoxicated individual, like Carbaugh on the night of December 26, 2015, could commit a sexual assault against a minor. For those reasons, Plaintiff contends that proximate cause has been established sufficient to survive Gettysburg Moose's Motion for Summary Judgment.

This Court has not been able to locate, and the parties have not cited, any controlling case law on the issue of whether a Dram Shop Act violation can be the proximate cause of a later sexual assault. This appears to be a case of first impression.

Courts have routinely recognized that criminal behavior can result from drinking alcohol in excess. It is clearly foreseeable that serving alcohol to an intoxicated patron could soon thereafter result in an

injury causing motor vehicle accident. Sadly, injury-causing, DUI-related motor vehicle accidents are an all too common occurrence. So it is reasonable to impose liability on the licensee for such harm. It is also foreseeable that serving alcohol to a visibly intoxicated patron could lead to a physical altercation, such as a fight or stabbing, with another patron. The foreseeability of intoxicated individuals getting into physical fights is reflected in the fact that many establishments employ “bouncers” to keep physical altercations under control. Indeed, according to Hope Beaghan she asked Carbaugh to leave the Gettysburg Moose for fear that the verbal confrontation he was in could turn physical.

Here, Carbaugh has testified that the only reason he assaulted M.M. was his extreme intoxication. Plaintiff’s expert also lends support to the idea that extreme alcohol intoxication lowers inhibitions and may cause people to engage in aberrant behavior, including sexual misconduct.

Further, on the issue of remoteness in time, there is conflicting evidence as to when Carbaugh left Moose Lodge and whether he made any stops before heading home and assaulting the child. Resolving that question, for purposes of Summary Judgment consideration, in favor of the non-moving party leads to the conclusion that the criminal act was not significantly remote from the service of alcohol to Carbaugh.

It is not for this Court to determine the accuracy of the proffered evidence, or to make findings of fact, nor decide what weight the evidence is entitled to receive. Plaintiff need not establish causation by a preponderance of the evidence to withstand a motion for summary judgment. Rather, a plaintiff must point to evidence in the record which suggests that the case is not free from doubt and that a jury may evaluate the evidence and conclude that defendant’s negligence is the factual cause of injury to the plaintiff. To be foreseeable, it is not necessary for a licensee to anticipate a specific harm to a specifically identified individual.

This Court must consider the entire record in the light most favorable to the Plaintiff as the non-moving party. All doubts must be resolved against the moving party. *Pennsylvania State University vs. County of Centre*, 615 A.2d 303 (Pa. 1997). This Court cannot say that the case is free of doubt on the issue of proximate cause such that

Defendant is entitled to Judgment as a matter of law. The questions of whether Defendant Moose Lodge served Carbaugh while he was visibly intoxicated, thereby establishing negligence per se, and whether that negligence was a factual cause of his sexual assault on the minor are questions best decided by a jury. Therefore, Plaintiff's claims survive Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Therefore, for the reasons stated herein, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED, and the attached Order is entered.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 25th day of October, 2018, upon consideration of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief in Support filed July 2, 2018, and Plaintiff's Response and Brief in Opposition filed July 6, 2018, it is hereby ordered that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment 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 LORETTA G. MCGLAUGHLIN, DEC'D**

Late of Liberty Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Treva A. Bowders, c/o R. Thomas Murphy, Esq., R. Thomas Murphy & Associates, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

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

ESTATE OF JUNE A. MILLER, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Eugene E. Miller, Jr. and Lori A. Smith, c/o Amy S. Loper, Esq., 2002 S. Queen Street, York, PA 17403

Attorney: Amy S. Loper, Esq., 2002 S. Queen Street, York, PA 17403

ESTATE OF KATHERINE M. SPANGLER, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Patricia L. Pendleton, 250 Vista Valley Rd., Washington, PA 15301

Attorney: Keith R. Nonemaker, Esq., Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst & Hart, LLP, 40 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF JAMES L. WALLS, DEC'D

Late of Mt Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Charles H Walls, 3241 Baltimore Pike, Littlestown, PA 17340

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF MABEL E. BERKHEIMER, a/k/a MABEL DAYHOFF BERKHEIMER, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Debra A. Neiderer, 1460 New Chester Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

ESTATE OF MICHAEL LAWRENCE FAIR, DEC'D

Late of Hamiltonban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Martine Bourque, c/o Robert L. McQuaide, Esq., Barley Snyder, 123 Baltimore Street, Suite 101, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF JOAN M. RUDISILL, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Steven L. Rudisill, 280 Jefferson St., Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF EARL A. SHANK, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Diann M. Yealy, 422 Providence Drive, McSherrystown, PA 17344

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

ESTATE OF MICHAEL J. SWISHER, DEC'D

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Sherry A. Johnson, 47 White Oak Tree Road, York Springs, PA 17372

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

THIRD PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF RAY STEPHEN BELTZ, DEC'D**

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Raymond C. Beltz, Jr., c/o R. Thomas Murphy, Esq., R. Thomas Murphy & Associates, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

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

ESTATE OF WALTER D. BUREL, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Lorraine C. Caruso, 728 Heritage Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Carol Lee Fritchley, 10960 Peach Ridge Road, Athens, OH 45701

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

ESTATE OF ANNA C. ROHRBAUGH, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix C.T.A.: Jill R. Rohrbaugh, 300 Clearview Road, Hanover, Pennsylvania 17331

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

ESTATE OF ROBERT S. WEIKERT, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Barbara A. Weikert, 139 Hunters Trail, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Phillips & Phillips, 101 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to all interested persons that the following matters shall be terminated after 30 days of this publication date unless a party to the proceeding requests a hearing from the appropriate Magisterial District Court, pursuant to the Adams County Rules of Judicial Administration 160.

Office of the Court Administrator
Adams County Courthouse
117 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
(717) 337-9846

District Court 51-3-01

	Affiant	Defendant	Docket #	Charge	Title, Section
1.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Jose Luis Alvares	NT-12-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 5 1393-11
2.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Efego Montiel Acosta	NT-13-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 5 1393-11
3.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Maria Felix Alvares	NT-14-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 5 1393-11
4.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Jose Aguilar	NT-30-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 5 1393-11
5.	Ofcr. Carricato	Brittany Bow	NT-90-15	Harassment	18, 2709A1
6.	Ofcr. L. Weikert	Michael Davis	NT-173-15	Crim. Trespass	18, 3503B1i
7.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Wayne M. Dubbs	NT-295-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 5 1393-11
8.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Omar Molina-Laureano	NT-327-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 5 1393-11
9.	Ofcr. Carricato	Johnny Herbert	NT-342-15	Sol. Lic. Reqd.	LO 15 501
10.	Tpr. Hochberg	Keila Murphy	NT-488-15	Retail Theft	18, 3929A1
11.	Tpr. Haun	Donald Brown	NT-491-15	Pub. Drunken.	18, 5505A1
12.	Ofcr. B. Weikert	Bryan Deemer	NT-518-15	Harassment	18, 2709A3
13.	Walter Powell	Pete Lundgren	NT-687-06	Hist. Dist. Ord.	Chpt. 11, 104D

District Court 51-3-02

	Affiant	Defendant	Docket #	Charge	Title, Section
1.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Wesley A. Hayes	NT-35-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 2011-1, 5
2.	Kennies Market	Shannon Clark	NT-112-15	Bad Checks	18, 4105A1
3.	Myers Meat	Ralph Stull	NT-149-15	Bad Checks	18, 4105A1
4.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Hugo Guckert	NT-256-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 2011-06, 6
5.	Funt	Khiary J. Jackson	NT-294-15	Dis. Conduct	18, 5503A1
6.	Gilberto	Deandre D. Moore	NT-380-15	Hawk./Peddl.	LO 31-2
7.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Nolvia Beatty	NT-421-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 2011-5C
8.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Cesar Vinueza	NT-469-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 2011-7D
9.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Pedro Alvarado	NT-474-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 2011-1, D
10.	Runkle's	Sharon A. Gettys	NT-528-15	Bad Checks	18, 4105A1
11.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Giselle Rodriguez	NT-563-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO2011-4,194-6
12.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Michael D. Smith	NT-566-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO2011-4,194-6
13.	Yoder	Dwayne Dorsey	NT-676-15	Harassment	18, 2709A3
14.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Susan M. Moninaro	NT-717-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 2011 5C
15.	Kile	Shelly L. Barnhouse	NT-76-15	Pub. Drunken.	18, 5505

District Court 51-3-03

	Affiant	Defendant	Docket #	Charge	Title, Section
1.	Haag	Douglas Jess	NT-891-14	Pub.Drunken.	18, 5505
2.	Conewago Valley SD	Jody Jury	NT-89-15	Truancy	24, 13-1333A1
3.	Hamme	Scott Livingston	NT-144-15	RemovalSnow	LO 264,72
4.	Gettel	Getty Realty Corp	NT-482-15	SignNotAppr.	LO 150-75
5.	Gettel	Getty Realty Corp	NT-483-15	Acc. Of Garb.	LO 122,5
6.	Gettel	Getty Realty Corp	NT-484-15	Weeds/Grass	LO 142,1C
7.	Geiman	Laura Dejesus Rosario	NT-575-15	Dis. Conduct	18, 5503A1
8.	Gracey	Ameriquet Mortgage Ser.	NT-666-15	Sign/House	LO 20,122
9.	Ogle	Fresh Start Auto Sales	NT-770-15	False Alarms	18, 7511C1
10.	Avery	Hector Candelario	NT-787-15	Cruelty/Anim.	18, 5511C1

Continued from page 4

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to all interested persons that the following matters shall be terminated after 30 days of this publication date unless a party to the proceeding requests a hearing from the appropriate Magisterial District Court, pursuant to the Adams County Rules of Judicial Administration 160.

Office of the Court Administrator
Adams County Courthouse
117 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
(717) 337-9846

District Court 51-3-04

	<u>Affiant</u>	<u>Defendant</u>	<u>Docket #</u>	<u>Charge</u>	<u>Title, Section</u>
1.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Charles D. Whitlow	NT-677-14	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
2.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Brook Kessler	NT-696-14	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
3.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Kevin A. Karppala	NT-65-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
4.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Stephani Nelson	NT-66-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
5.	Franklin Twp. Supervisors	Sherin Mee	NT-384-15	Fail Pump Sep.	LO 126-23, 26
6.	Franklin Twp. Supervisors	Larry L. Swope	NT-386-15	Fail Pump Sep.	LO 126-23, 26
7.	Darryl R. Sanders, PGC	Raymond C. Easterday	NT-445-15	Equip. Req.	30, 5123A5
8.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Kathleen M. Branson	NT-539-15	Fail Com. Audit	LO 32, 5
9.	Robin Brant, PA Fish/Boat	Branden M. Breeden	NT-566-15	Control. Prop.	30, 741A5
10.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Meghan P. Stroup	NT-679-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
11.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Kirsten L. Gumienny	NT-716-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
12.	York Adams Tax Bureau	David W. Dudderar, Jr.	NT-724-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901
13.	York Adams Tax Bureau	Austin L. Bayne	NT-727-15	Fail File In.Tax	LO 901