

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 63

March 11, 2022

No. 45, pp. 133-138

IN THIS ISSUE

NEIL FISHEL AND JAMIE FISHEL VS.
LAND AND SEA SERVICES, LLC

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.

NOTICE BY THE ADAMS COUNTY
CLERK OF COURTS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to all heirs, legatees and other persons concerned that the following account with statements of proposed distribution filed therewith have been filed in the Office of Adams County Clerk of Courts and will be presented to the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County-Orphans' Court, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, for confirmation of accounts entering decrees of distribution on 03/18/2022 at 8:30 a.m.

TOFT—Orphans' Court Action Number OC-3-2020. First and Final Account of KATHLEEN TOFT, EXECUTRIX. Estate of DONALD F. TOFT JR., late of Adams County, Pennsylvania.

WEAVER—Orphans' Court Action Number OC-59-2021. First and Final Account of WILLIAM C. HONDOS, ADMINISTRATOR. Estate of BENJAMIN N. WEAVER, late of Adams County, Pennsylvania.

EVERHART—Orphans' Court Action Number OC-14-2022. First and Final Account of RONALD C. HOFF & STEVE M. WATTS, CO-EXECUTORS. Estate of JOHN E. EVERHART, late of Adams County, Pennsylvania.

Kelly A. Lawver
Clerk of Courts

3/4 & 3/11



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



ADAMS COUNTY
COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

25 South 4th Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
www.adamscountycf.org



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

NEIL FISHEL AND JAMIE FISHEL VS.
LAND AND SEA SERVICES, LLC

1. Beginning on June 27, 2018, Defendant conducted various inspections of the construction at Plaintiffs' property. Apparently, the inspections failed to uncover various defects in the construction.

2. Defendant raises a number of Preliminary Objections to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. First Defendant contends the Amended Complaint suffers from lack of specificity. Defendant next demurs to the Amended Complaint on the basis it is legally insufficient to establish that Defendant owed or breached a duty to Plaintiffs. Finally, Defendant argues that Amended Complaint fails to conform to law because it does not make out a *prima facie* case of negligence.

3. Plaintiffs plead sufficient facts to avoid Defendant's charge of lack of specificity.

4. [T]he Amended Complaint contains enough facts to permit the inference that Defendant was negligent in performing a duty owed to Plaintiffs.

5. The gist of Defendant's final argument is that the Amended Complaint fails to conform to law because it does not make out a *prima facie* case of negligence. In particular, Defendant asserts that the Complaint: (1) does not properly plead Defendant owned a duty to Plaintiffs, (2) does not plead Defendant breached a duty to Plaintiffs, and (3) does not plead Defendant caused harm to Plaintiffs. This Preliminary Objection is essentially a reworded demurrer to the Amended Complaint rather than an objection that the Amended Complaint contains a formal error such that it fails to conform to law. As Defendant's Preliminary Objection in the nature of a demurrer has already been denied, there is no need for further discussion.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 2020-SU-394, NEIL FISHEL AND JAMIE
FISHEL VS. LAND AND SEA SERVICES, LLC

Thomas S. Beckley, Esquire, Attorney for Plaintiffs

Lee J. Janicsek, Esquire, Attorney for Defendant

George, P. J., January 20, 2022

OPINION

Before the Court for disposition are the Preliminary Objections of Land and Sea Services, LLC ("Defendant") to the First Amended Complaint filed by Neil and Jamie Fishel ("Plaintiffs").¹ For the reasons set forth below, the Preliminary Objections are overruled.

On April 13, 2018, Plaintiffs entered into a written contract with a builder, S and S Home Improvements, Inc. ("S and S"), to construct a new home on Plaintiffs' property at 480 Baltimore Road, Latimore

¹ For purposes of addressing the Preliminary Objections, the Court accepts "as true all well-pleaded material, relevant facts, and every inference fairly deducible from those facts." *Cnty. of Allegheny v. Commonwealth*, 490 A.2d 402, 408 (Pa. 1985) (internal citations omitted).

Township, Pennsylvania.² Defendant is a limited liability company that provides residential building code inspections to properties in various communities including Latimore Township, Pennsylvania. Beginning on June 27, 2018, Defendant conducted various inspections of the construction at Plaintiffs' property. Apparently, the inspections failed to uncover various defects in the construction. Plaintiffs claim they have been damaged by Defendant's "failure to notify [them]...of the defective work and/or failure to refuse to reject S and S's work...because their house still has [Residential] Code violations that have yet to be fixed."³ Plaintiffs also claim they have suffered serious personal financial difficulties as a result of Defendant's negligence; the defects in the construction allegedly forced Plaintiffs to incur additional costs that ultimately resulted in personal bankruptcy and the "destr[uction]" of their credit rating.⁴ Plaintiffs therefore seek no less than \$92,955.14 in damages to compensate them for the cost of bringing their property into compliance with the applicable Residential Code.

Defendant raises a number of Preliminary Objections to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.⁵ First, Defendant contends the Amended Complaint suffers from lack of specificity. Defendant next demurs to the Amended Complaint on the basis it is legally insufficient to establish that Defendant owed or breached a duty to Plaintiffs. Finally, Defendant argues the Amended Complaint fails to conform to law because it does not make out a *prima facie* case of negligence.

In its first Preliminary Objection, Defendant argues that the Amended Complaint does not properly plead that it owed a duty to

² This action was commenced by a Praecipe for a Writ of Summons filed on May 14, 2020. On August 18, 2021, Plaintiffs filed the original Complaint in this matter, and Defendant subsequently raised Preliminary Objections. This Court sustained the Preliminary Objections on the basis of lack of specificity pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(3). On November 24, 2021, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Complaint, to which Defendant raised the instant Preliminary Objections.

³ Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ¶ 15.

⁴ Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ¶¶ 30–31.

⁵ Although Defendant's first Preliminary Objection is styled as a single preliminary objection, it raises two distinct issues: (1) lack of specificity in the pleading and (2) legal insufficiency of the pleading. As will be discussed in this Opinion, these are separate arguments requiring separate legal analysis. Thus, joining them as a single preliminary objection is improper and unnecessarily increases the risk of confusing the issues.

Plaintiffs or that it breached such duty. In addition, Defendant contends the Amended Complaint does not properly plead special damages as required by Pa.R.C.P. 1019(f).

A party to a lawsuit may raise a preliminary objection on the ground of “insufficient specificity in a pleading” pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(3). As a fact pleading state, Pennsylvania requires a pleading party to define issues and identify “every act or performance essential to” the cause of action set forth in the complaint. *Estate of Swift v. Ne. Hosp. of Phila.*, 690 A.2d 719, 723 (Pa. Super. 1997). The Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require that the material facts on which a cause of action is based “be stated in a concise and summary form.” Pa.R.C.P. 1019(a). The purpose of Pa.R.C.P. 1019(a) is to require the pleading party to disclose material facts sufficient to enable the adverse party to prepare a defense. *Baker v. Rangos*, 324 A.2d 498, 505–06 (Pa. Super. 1974). Thus, a complaint must formulate the issues by fully summarizing the material facts essential to support the claim. *Cassell v. Shellenberger*, 514 A.2d 163, 165 (Pa. Super. 1986). As the Superior Court of Pennsylvania has recognized,

[t]he pertinent question under Rule 1028(a)(3) is “whether the complaint is sufficiently clear to enable the defendant to prepare his defense,” or “whether the plaintiff’s complaint informs the defendant with accuracy and completeness of the specific basis on which recovery is sought so that he may know without question upon what grounds to make his defense.”

Rambo v. Greene, 906 A.2d 1232, 1236 (Pa. Super. 2006) (quoting *Ammlung v. City of Chester*, 302 A.2d 491, 498 n.36 (Pa. Super. 1973)).

Plaintiffs plead sufficient facts to avoid Defendant’s charge of lack of specificity. The Amended Complaint alleges Defendant conducted “inspections” of Plaintiffs’ property, which leaves open the possibility that Defendant owed Plaintiffs a duty under the Home Inspection Law. See 68 Pa.C.S. §§ 7502(a), 7504. The Amended Complaint further pleads Plaintiffs’ reliance on Defendant’s inspections, which also indicates Defendant’s duty to Plaintiffs. See *Bilt-Rite Contractors, Inc. v. The Architectural Studio*, 866 A.2d 270, 273 n.1, 285–86 (Pa. 2005); *Cantwell v. Allegheny Cnty.*, 483 A.2d

1350, 1353–54 (Pa. 1984). Furthermore, through its detailed description of the damage suffered by Plaintiffs and Defendant’s failure to avert such damage, the Amended Complaint sufficiently claims Defendant may have breached a duty to Plaintiffs.

For a similar reason, Plaintiffs also adequately plead special damages: the Amended Complaint identifies seven defects in Plaintiffs’ property that apparently went unnoticed by Defendant, states the basis for the damages requested, and supports its claim for damages by reference to attached Exhibits A and B (consisting of a contract for foundation repair and related documents and estimates of the cost of other repairs). This is sufficient to survive Defendant’s first Preliminary Objection.⁶

Similarly, the Amended Complaint makes out sufficient facts to avoid Defendant’s demurrer. A preliminary objection in the nature of a demurrer pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(4) “is a preliminary objection that the pleadings fail to set forth a cause of action upon which relief can be granted under any theory of law.” *Sutton v. Miller*, 592 A.2d 83, 87 (Pa. Super. 1991) (emphasis in original). A demurrer therefore requires the court to consider “whether, on the facts averred, the law indicates with certainty that no recovery is possible.” *Bayada Nurses, Inc. v. Commonwealth, Dep’t of Lab. & Indus.*, 8 A.3d 866, 871 (Pa. 2010). Thus,

[w]here it appears that the law will not permit recovery, the court may sustain preliminary objections in the nature of a demurrer. In making this decision, the court must accept as true all well pleaded material allegations and any reasonable inferences therefrom. However, a court need not accept as true conclusions of law, unwarranted inferences, allegations, or expressions of opinion.

Id. at 844 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). “Where a doubt exists as to whether a demurrer should be sustained, this doubt should be resolved in favor of overruling it.” *R.W. v. Manzek*, 888 A.2d 740, 749 (Pa. 2005).

As discussed above, the Amended Complaint contains enough facts to permit the inference that Defendant was negligent in

⁶ The Court notes that information regarding Plaintiffs’ damages can be supplemented through the discovery process.

performing a duty owed to Plaintiffs. The Amended Complaint also supports the inference that such negligence caused damages to Plaintiffs. It certainly cannot be said that the factual situation outlined by the Amended Complaint is completely inconsistent with liability, as required for the Court to sustain Defendant's demurrer. *Sutton*, 592 A.2d at 87; see also *Krajsa v. Key Punch, Inc.*, 622 A.2d 355, 357 (Pa. Super. 1993) ("It is not necessary that the plaintiff identify the specific legal theory underlying the complaint."); *Wittrien v. Burkholder*, 965 A.2d 1229, 1232 (Pa. Super. 2009) ("In any negligence case, the plaintiff must prove duty, breach, causation and damages.").

In its final Preliminary Objection, raised pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2), Defendant contends the Amended Complaint fails to conform to law. A preliminary objection under Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2) that a pleading fails to conform to law is distinct from a preliminary objection in the nature of a demurrer. A preliminary objection under Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2) pertains to "the form of a pleading." *Bank of N.Y. Mellon v. Bach*, 159 A.3d 16, 21 (Pa. Super. 2017) (emphasis added). A preliminary objection in the nature of "a motion to strike a pleading" pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2) "is the proper way to object to formal errors in a pleading" and "may be granted when lack of conformity to a law or a rule of court occurs."⁷ *Lee v. Denner*, 76 Pa. D. & C.4th 181, 187 (Com. Pl. 2005); see also *Ellenbogen v. PNC Bank, N.A.*, 731 A.2d 175, 184–85 (Pa. Super. 1999); *Commonwealth ex rel. Sheppard v. Cent. Penn Nat'l Bank*, 375 A.2d 874, 877 (Pa. Commw. 1977)).

The gist of Defendant's final argument is that the Amended Complaint fails to conform to law because it does not make out a

⁷ Caselaw provides ample illustration of instances in which a preliminary objection under Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2) is appropriate. For instance, "[w]hen a defendant raises a waivable statute of limitations via preliminary objections [instead of in new matter pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1030(a)], the proper challenge is to file preliminary objections to strike the defendant's preliminary objections for failure of a pleading to conform to law or rule of court" pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2), not to demur pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(4). See *Devine v. Hutt*, 863 A.2d 1160, 1167 (Pa. Super. 2004). Similarly, an argument that a pleading fails to conform to law may be raised in a medical malpractice suit where it is disputed whether a plaintiff's complaint complies with a Rule of Civil Procedure applicable to professional liability actions. *Lawrence v. Malloy*, 74 Pa. D. & C.4th 361, 367–68 (Com. Pl. 2005).

prima facie case of negligence.⁸ In particular, Defendant asserts that the Complaint: (1) does not properly plead Defendant owed a duty to Plaintiffs, (2) does not plead Defendant breached a duty to Plaintiffs, and (3) does not plead Defendant caused harm to Plaintiffs. This Preliminary Objection is essentially a reworded demurrer to the Amended Complaint rather than an objection that the Amended Complaint contains a formal error such that it fails to conform to law.⁹ As Defendant's Preliminary Objection in the nature of a demurrer has already been denied, there is no need for further discussion.

In conclusion, the Amended Complaint sets out enough facts to inform Defendant of the allegations against which it must defend itself, which means the Amended Complaint does not fail for lack of specificity. In addition, the Amended Complaint pleads enough facts consistent with a recognized cause of action to avoid Defendant's demurrer.

For the foregoing reasons, the attached Order is entered.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 20th day of January, 2022, the Preliminary Objections of the Defendant to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint are hereby overruled. Defendant is directed to file a responsive pleading to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint within twenty (20) days of the date of this Order.

⁸ In order to establish a cause of action for negligence, the plaintiff must plead and prove: (1) "a duty to conform to a certain standard for the protection of others against unreasonable risks," (2) "the defendant's failure to conform to that standard," (3) "a causal connection between the conduct and the resulting injury," and (4) "actual loss or damage to the plaintiff." *Jones v. Plumer*, 226 A.3d 1037, 1039 (Pa. Super. 2020), *appeal denied*, 237 A.3d 407 (Pa. 2020).

⁹ This Court notes Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2) is an inappropriate basis for a preliminary objection based on Plaintiffs' alleged failure to plead a *prima facie* case of negligence. Defendant asserts the Amended Complaint fails to conform to law by failing to plead facts consistent with negligence, but such a defect would be grounds for a demurrer, not for an objection that the Amended Complaint fails to conform to law. In its final Preliminary Objection, Defendant essentially argues the Amended Complaint is legally insufficient, not that the Amended Complaint suffers from a formal error. Accordingly, Defendant's Preliminary Objection pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(2) cannot prevail. See *Bach*, 159 A.3d at 21.

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 MERLE E. BIEVENOUR, SR., DEC'D**

Late of Hamilton Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Merle E. Bievenour, Jr. and Gail S. Bievenour, 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

ESTATE OF VERA L. COFFEY, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Duane A. Keeney, 58 North Street, McSherrystown, PA 17344

Attorney: Arthur J. Becker, Jr., Esq., Becker Law Group, P.C., 529 Carlisle Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF RUTH A. CROOK, DEC'D

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

Executor: Eric D. Markle, c/o Rachel L. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Rachel L. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF JOSEPH A. FEAGA, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Keith P. Feaga, 41 Bryan Court, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Stephen A. Feaga, 248 Vincent Drive, McSherrystown, PA 17344

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

ESTATE OF VALERIE A. FISHER, DEC'D

Late of Freedom Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Nathan F. Bortner, c/o Jessica F. Greene, Esq., Walters & Galloway, PLLC 54 East Main Street, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Attorney: Jessica F. Greene, Esq., Walters & Galloway, PLLC 54 East Main Street, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

ESTATE OF LUCIENNE FRANK, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: William E. Frank, 5599 Hanover Road, Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF MARY CATHERINE GROFT a/k/a MARY C. GROFT, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: David J. Groft and Margaret A. Lawrence, 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 KENNETH L. HARTLAUB, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Michelle L. Rineman, 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 HELEN LOUISE MAITLAND, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Tedd A. Maitland, 1280 Herr's Ridge Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Eric W. Maitland, 427 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF THOMAS ARTHUR MERKEL a/k/a THOMAS A. MERKEL, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Lawrence R. Woltz, Jr., 240 Speelman Klinger Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF CARL H. NACE a/k/a CARL HENRY NACE, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Ellen Marie Shenk, 610 Fox Hollow Court, Spring Grove, PA 17362

ESTATE OF DELORES B. SHAFFER, DEC'D

Late of Union Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Mark B. Shaffer, 147 Elmwood Avenue, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Thomas E. Miller, Esq., Law Office of Thomas E. Miller, Esquire LLC, 249 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF CONNIE L. SIBERT, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Vicki M. Worley, 1009 Shafer Drive, Hanover, PA 17331; Steven A. Sibert, 670 Hunterstown Hampton Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Matthew L. Guthrie, Esq., Barley Snyder LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF RAY E. SIBERT, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Vicki M. Worley, 1009 Shafer Drive, Hanover, PA 17331; Steven A. Sibert, 670 Hunterstown Hampton Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Matthew L. Guthrie, Esq., Barley Snyder LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF CARROLL C. SLOTHOUR, JR., DEC'D

Late of Huntingdon Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Malcolm F. Slothour, 7383 Lincoln Highway, Abbottstown, PA 17301

Attorney: Thomas R. Nell, Esq., 130 W. King Street, Box 1019, East Berlin, PA 17316

ESTATE OF CAROLYN T. WEAVER, DEC'D

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Gregory G. Weaver, 259 Prospect Street, Westfield, NJ 07090; Brenda L. Deardorff, 2075 Old Carlisle Road, Aspers, PA 17304

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

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF JEFFREY L. BAMBERGER, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Tamara A. Bittle, 115 Irishtown Road, Hanover, PA 17331

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

SECOND PUBLICATION CONTINUED**ESTATE OF FRANCES H. BOYER a/k/a FRANCES JUNE BOYER, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Biglerville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Donna L. Roth, 65 Ridge Avenue, Biglerville, PA 17307

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

ESTATE OF JAMES E. BRYANT, JR., DEC'D

Late of Union Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Jodi A. Plank, 1040 Pine Grove Road, Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF STEVE M. BUSSEY, SR., DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Steve M. Bussey, Jr., 132 Lake Meade Drive, East Berlin, PA 17316; Scott Bussey, 512 York Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF PATRICIA V. GARDNER, DEC'D

Late of Tyrone Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Eva M. Gardner, 2776 Oxford Road, New Oxford, PA 17350; Annette S. Wilt, 192 Piney Hall Road, Airville, PA 17302

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

ESTATE OF CLAIR RICHARD HARTMAN a/k/a C. RICHARD HARTMAN, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Arendtsville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: William E. Hartman, 5056 Curtis Road, Hemlock, NY 14466

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

ESTATE OF SAMUEL H. HELSLEY, DEC'D

Late of Butler Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Beth H. Groninger, 101 Schoolfield Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013

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

ESTATE OF BLAINE F. SHOVER, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Chelsea A. Shover, c/o Nancy H. Meyers, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 79 St. Paul Drive, Chambersburg, PA 17201

Attorney: Nancy H. Meyers, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 79 St. Paul Drive, Chambersburg, PA 17201

ESTATE OF HELEN E. WILKINSON, DEC'D

Late of Butler Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Linda L. Wilkinson, 2008 Table Rock Road, Biglerville, PA 17307; William D. Wilkinson II, 1999 Table Rock Road, Biglerville, PA 17307

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

ESTATE OF TED SCOTT WILLIAMS, DEC'D

Late of Mount Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Todd Michael Williams, 36 Maple Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF SANDRA LEE WOOD, DEC'D

Late of Mount Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Robert N. Wood, 3765 Carlisle Pike, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

THIRD PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF WILLIAM J. CASHIN, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Patricia A. Cashin, c/o Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF MICHAEL DIVANNA, SR., DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Anthony DiVanna, 60 Poplar Hill Road, Covington, GA 30014

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

ESTATE OF KAREN J. KRATZ, DEC'D

Late of Mount Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Michael W. Kratz, 519 Grant Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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