

Adams County **Legal Journal**

Vol. 66

January 31, 2025

No. 40

IN THIS ISSUE:

MICHAEL F. WOODS

v.

**ROBERT NEIDERERR, JOSEPH VONSAS,
AND JESSICA FREIERT**

Invest With Experience

The right financial partner will help you plan for the future and manage investments with your best interest in mind. Our disciplined, common sense approach to investment management is customized to meet your objectives.

acnb.com | 1.888.334.2262



**Trust & Investment
Services**

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; Dr. B. Bohleke (since 2019), Business Manager.

Business Office – 117 BALTIMORE STREET, ROOM 305, GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2313. Telephone: (717) 337-9812

Copyright© 1959 by Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., for Adams County Bar Association, Gettysburg, PA 17325.
All rights reserved.

<p>IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ADAMS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL ACTION—EQUITY NO. 2025-SU-0038</p> <p>Conewago Township PLAINTIFF</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Estate of Serena Coffman, her Heirs and Assigns, and Estate of Nadine Adams, her Heirs and Assigns</p> <p>DEFENDANTS</p> <p>NOTICE</p> <p>TO: The Estate of Serena Coffman, her Heirs and Assigns, and the Estate of Nadine Adams, her Heirs and Assigns</p> <p>PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a pleading seeking relief against the Estate of Serena Coffman, her heirs and assigns, and the Estate of Nadine Adams, her heirs and assigns has been filed in the above- captioned matter. The nature of the relief being sought is as follows:</p> <p>The Plaintiff has filed a Complaint in Equity requesting that the Court issue an Order that authorizes the following actions with respect to the property located at 5607 Hanover Road, Hanover, PA 17331 (the "Property") which is comprised of two adjoining parcels – more particularly described as Parcel ID 08K14-0108---000 ("Parcel 1") and Parcel ID 08K14-108A--- 000 ("Parcel 2") (collectively, "the Property"): (i) demolish and remove the</p>	<p>structure located on Parcel 1 because it is unsafe for human occupation and an attractive nuisance; (ii) permit the Plaintiff to enter the Property, demolish, and remove the Structure located on Parcel 1 of the Property; and (iii) assess against the Property the Plaintiff's costs in enforcing the Township's ordinances along with the costs incurred in demolishing and Removing the structure on Parcel 1 of the Property.</p> <p>If you wish to defend, you must enter a written appearance personally or by attorney and file your defenses or objections in writing with the court. You are warned that if you fail to do so the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you without further notice for the relief requested by the Plaintiff. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you.</p> <p>YOU SHOULD TAKE THIS PAPER TO YOUR LAWYER AT ONCE. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A LAWYER, GO TO OR TELEPHONE THE OFFICE SET FORTH BELOW. THIS OFFICE CAN PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT HIRING A LAWYER.</p> <p>IF YOU CANNOT AFFORD TO HIRE A LAWYER, THIS OFFICE MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION</p>	<p>ABOUT AGENCIES THAT MAY OFFER LEGAL SERVICES TO ELIGIBLE PERSONS AT A REDUCED FEE OR NO FEE.</p> <p>Court Administrator Adams County Courthouse 111-117 Baltimore Street Gettysburg, PA 17325 Telephone: (717) 337-9846</p> <p>BY: E. Lee Stinnett II, Esquire Attorney I.D. No. 307128 Elizabeth L. Kramer, Esquire Attorney I.D. No. 324651 1801 Market Street, Suite 300 Camp Hill, PA 17011 Phone: (717) 234-6700 Fax: (717) 249-7334 Attorneys for Plaintiff</p> <p>1/31</p>
--	--	--

MICHAEL F. WOODS v. ROBERT NEIDERERR, JOSEPH
VONSAS AND JESSICA FREIERT

1. This case arises out of Plaintiff's and Defendants' relationships via their mutual involvement with McSherrystown Borough Council. Plaintiff avers that on or about December 5, 2023, Defendant VonSas, while visiting a private residence in Adams County, made a statement to two unidentified individuals that Plaintiff unlawfully took nine-thousand dollars (\$9,000) of Borough property.
2. In support of his claims for false light, Plaintiff avers that the aforementioned statements made by each party placed Plaintiff before the public in a false light which was highly offensive to a reasonable person and that the Defendants acted with knowledge or in reckless disregard for the falsity of their statements.
3. Therefore, Defendant VonSas, while qualified as a high public official, has not been shown conclusively to have been acting within the course or scope of his official duties as to justify immunity at this preliminary stage.
4. Here, Defendant maintains that Plaintiff fails to plead that the false light in which he was placed would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. Plaintiff's pleading alleges that each Defendant made statements to third parties that ascribed to him criminal conduct, *i.e.* theft or unlawful taking. There is little doubt that a reasonable person would find being ascribed such conduct highly offensive.
5. Plaintiff does not list boilerplate allegations without facts specific to support his claims. Plaintiff's Complaint provides Defendants with notice of his claims and the facts he alleges to support those claims to an extent to allow Defendant, at this preliminary stage, to properly respond.
6. As to Counts III and IV, Defendant's objection for lack of specificity in the Complaint alleges Plaintiff's pleading regarding Friert was overly vague in that it lacks dates, how and to whom

her statements were publicized, and how they relate to Plaintiff. We must agree.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 2024-SU-0892.

Edward A. Paskey, Esquire, Attorney for Plaintiff
Isaac P. Wakefield, Esquire, Attorney for Defendants
Campbell, P. J., Jan. 13, 2025

OPINION

Before this Court are Defendants' Preliminary Objections to Plaintiff's Complaint. For the reasons set forth herein, the attached Order sustaining in part and overruling in part Defendant's Preliminary Objections is entered.

BACKGROUND

On August 19, 2024, Michael F. Woods ("Plaintiff"), filed a Civil Complaint against Joseph VonSas, Jessica Freiert, and Robert Neidererr ("Defendants"). Plaintiff's Complaint contained six counts. Counts I, III, and V contain Plaintiff's claims for slander per se against each Defendant individually. Counts II, IV, and VI contain Plaintiff's claims for false light against each Defendant individually.

This case arises out of Plaintiff and Defendants' relationships via their mutual involvement with McSherrystown Borough Council. Plaintiff avers that on or about December 5, 2023, Defendant VonSas, while visiting a private residence in Adams County, made a statement to two unidentified individuals that Plaintiff unlawfully took nine-thousand dollars (\$9,000) of Borough property. Plaintiff avers that since December 27, 2023, Defendant Freiert has made statements publicly to unidentified third parties wherein she accused Plaintiff of "destroying or stealing" Borough property. Plaintiff refers specifically to a March 13, 2024, public meeting wherein Freiert stated, "this week [she] was able to get all of the files and things to adequately do her job," which Plaintiff avers calls back to other statements Freiert is to have made regarding Plaintiff stealing or destroying Borough property. Plaintiff avers that on January 10,

2024, Defendant Neidererr made a statement at a public meeting accusing Plaintiff of destroying or stealing Borough police documents. In support of his claims for false light, Plaintiff avers that the aforementioned statements made by each party placed Plaintiff before the public in a false light which was highly offensive to a reasonable person and that the Defendants acted with knowledge or in reckless disregard for the falsity of their statements.

On September 13, 2024, Defendants filed Preliminary Objections to Plaintiff's Complaint. Defendants filed four (4) preliminary objections. By Order of Court dated September 16, 2024, the Court directed that disposition of Defendants' Preliminary Objections would proceed in accordance with Pa.R.Civ.P. 1028 and Adams County Local Rule 1028(c). On September 23, 2024, Defendants filed their Brief in Support and on October 17, 2024 Plaintiff filed a Reply and brief in Opposition to Defendant's Preliminary Objections. Oral argument was held on December 10, 2024. Defendants' Preliminary Objections are now ripe for disposition.

LEGAL STANDARD

Under Pennsylvania law, preliminary objections in the nature of a demurrer test the legal sufficiency of the complaint. **Feingold v. Hendrzak**, 15 A.3d 937, 941 (Pa. Super. 2011). When considering preliminary objections, the Court must accept as true all well-pleaded material facts set forth in the complaint and all reasonable inferences that may be drawn from those facts. **Ballroom, LLC v. Commonwealth**, 984 A.2d 582, 586 n.3 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2009). Preliminary Objections will be sustained where the case is clear and free from doubt. **Rambo v. Greene**, 906 A.2d 1232, 1235 (Pa. Super. 2006).

DISCUSSION

A. Immunity Defenses

Defendants' third Preliminary Objection raises two immunity defenses: the common law doctrine of high public official immunity and the Political Subdivision Tort Claims Act. As sustaining this

objection would render Defendants' remaining objections moot, the Court will address this objection foremost.

1. High Public Official Immunity

Defendants' third preliminary objection as to Counts I through VI of Plaintiff's Complaint maintains that the Defendants are high public officials and therefore entitled to immunity from the tort claims set forth by Plaintiff.

Under Pennsylvania common law, high public officials are absolutely immune from civil suits arising from statements made in the course of their official duties and within the scope of their authority. **Kuzel v. Krause**, 658 A.2d 856 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1995). This absolute immunity applies even when the statements are made with malice or are false. **Lindner v. Mollan**, 677 A.2d 1194, 1195 (Pa. 1996). Borough council members qualify as high public officials under Pennsylvania law. *See* **Hall v. Kiger**, 795 A.2d 497 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2002). Pennsylvania courts have ruled that a wide range of public officials, from those with wide ranging and those with minimal policy-making function, are high public officials. *See, e.g., Jonnet v. Bodick*, 244 A.2d 751 (Pa. 1968) (Township supervisor was a high public official for purposes of absolute privilege); **Suppan v. Kratzer**, 660 A.2d 226 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1995) (Mayor and Borough Council President were high public officials for purposes of absolute privilege); **Mosley v. Observer Publishing Co.**, 619 A.2d 343 (Pa. Super. 1993) (County Attorney was high public official for purposes of absolute privilege) (citations omitted).

Here, that Defendants are high public officials within the meaning of the doctrine is largely undisputed from the record. The question then remains whether each Defendant was acting within the scope and course of their official duties. In **Lindner v. Mollan**, our Supreme Court addressed whether remarks by a mayor to a councilman ("you're the village idiot.... You've been dipping into the till. I know for a fact. And you know I know[]") which were made at a televised public meeting were made within the course and scope of his authority as mayor and thus shielded him under the doctrine. 677 A.2d 1194, 1195 (Pa. 1996). The court affirmed the dismissal of

plaintiff's claim for slander, finding that the mayor's statements made during a public meeting, in discussion with members of the borough council, and about borough affairs were made in the course of his duties and scope of his authority as mayor. **Id.** at 1199.

Based on the pleadings, we cannot likewise find that Defendant has established that VonSas and Freiart are entitled to immunity under the doctrine. Accepting the pleading as true, Plaintiff has established that VonSas, while a council member, made statements while visiting a private residence, to two individuals who may or may not be affiliated with the Borough, that Plaintiff took Borough property unlawfully. Therefore, it is not clear VonSas was acting within the course and scope of his official duties in that instance.

As to Freiart, while her statements made at a public meeting would likely be protected by high public official immunity, any statements made outside of public meetings to other unidentified third parties could be unprotected. As plead, it is impossible to determine whether such statements would be protected. Conversely, Plaintiff's averments regarding Neidererr plead that he made a statement at a public meeting, to other council members, that Plaintiff unlawfully took Borough property. With regard to Neidererr, the facts as plead mirror those of **Lindner** to support a finding of immunity.

Therefore, Defendant VonSas, while qualified as a high public official, has not been shown conclusively to have been acting within the course or scope of his official duties as to justify immunity at this preliminary stage. With regard to Defendant Freiart, we cannot conclusively determine that any statements made outside of Borough council meetings to other unidentified individuals are protected under the doctrine. However, Defendant Neidererr's statements made at a council meeting, to other council members, about the handling of Borough property sufficiently establishes his immunity as a high public official acting within the scope and course of his duties as a borough council member.

2. Political Subdivision Tort Claims Act

Defendant's third objection also maintains that Defendants are immune from state law tort claims of slander and false light pursuant to the Political Subdivision Tort Claims Act ("the Act").

The Act provides that "[e]xcept as otherwise provided in this subchapter, no local agency shall be liable for any damages on account of any injury to a person or property caused by any act of the local agency or an employee thereof or any other person." 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8541. A borough is a "local agency" entitled to governmental immunity pursuant to the Act, unless one or more of the enumerated exceptions apply. **Sider v. Borough of Waynesboro**, 933 A.2d 681 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2007). "An employee of a local agency is liable for civil damages on account of any injury to a person or property caused by acts of the employee which are within the scope of his office or duties only to the same extent as his employing local agency and subject to the limitations imposed by this subchapter." 42 Pa.C.S. § 8545. The Act does not shield local agency employees from acts that constitute a crime, actual fraud, actual malice or willful misconduct. 42 Pa.C.S. §§ 8542(a)(2), 8550.

However, "a court's inquiry does not end with a determination of whether the alleged wrongful conduct falls within the scope of a local agency employee's duties or is reasonably related to those duties. *See Petula v. Mellody*, 631 A.2d 762 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1993)(citing **Malia v. Monchak**, 543 A.2d 184, 189 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1988). Rather, if the court determines the alleged wrongful conduct falls within the scope of the local agency employee's duties, the court must then examine the plaintiff's complaint to determine if the alleged wrongful conduct constitutes willful misconduct within the meaning of 42 Pa.C.S. § 8550. **Id.** If the court so determines, then the employee has waived his right to assert immunity to defamation on the basis that the alleged wrongful conduct was within or reasonably related to their duties." **Balletta v. Spadoni**, 47 A.3d 183, 195–96 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012). For purposes of Section 8550 of the Act, "willful misconduct" means establishing that the actor "desired to bring about the result that followed, or at least that he was aware that it was substantially certain to ensue. **R.H.S. v. Allegheny Cnty. Dep't of Human Servs.**, 936 A.2d 1218 (Pa.

Commw. Ct. 2007) (citing **Evans v. Phila. Transp. Co.**, 212 A.2d 440, 443 (Pa. 1965)).

Here, it is undisputed that each Defendant is an employee of a local agency and would therefore be entitled to immunity under the Act for conduct that falls within the scope of their duties or is reasonably related to those duties. Notably, Plaintiff has filed this action against these Defendants individually and not within their official capacities as Borough employees. Nevertheless, the crux of the factual basis of these allegations arises out of the parties' mutual employment with McSherrystown Borough, regarding knowledge obtained through work with the Borough and conduct which occurred during Borough council meetings. Therefore, an analysis of the viability of Plaintiff's claims pursuant to the Act is necessary.

Defendants argue that their statements fall within the scope of their official duties and qualify them for immunity because their statements reference a Borough employee and knowledge they obtained through their work for the Borough. Plaintiff has plead, with respect to each Defendant, that they acted with knowledge or reckless disregard for the falsity of their statements. Defendant VonSas is alleged to have made statements to third parties, while in a private residence, accusing Plaintiff of unauthorized removal of Borough funds. Defendant Freiert is alleged to have made statements at public meetings and in other unspecified instances about Plaintiff's unauthorized removal or destruction of Borough property. Plaintiff's pleading regarding Freiert making any statements at a public meeting wherein she did not mention Plaintiff by name, alone, could not survive a demurrer as they are insufficient as to identify whether there is indicia of actual malice or willful misconduct.

Therefore, the Act does not bar Plaintiff's claims with regard to Defendant VonSas. Plaintiff must plead with greater specificity as to the other instances involving Defendant Freiert. Given, the above discussed findings relating to Defendant Neidererr we need only address the remaining preliminary objections with respect to VonSas and Freiert.

B. Legal Sufficiency of Claims

1. Failure to State a Claim for Slander per se – Counts I, III, V

Defendant's first objection in the nature of a demurrer is for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(4) with regards to Counts I, III, and V for slander per se.

"Statements by a defendant imputing to the plaintiff a criminal offense, punishable by imprisonment, or conduct incompatible with the Plaintiff's business constitutes slander per se." **Brinich v. Jencka**, 757 A.2d 388, 397 (Pa. Super. 2000). When a communication constitutes slander per se, a plaintiff is not required to prove special harm, i.e., pecuniary loss. Rather, "a defendant who publishes a statement which can be considered slander *per se* is liable for the proven, actual harm the publication causes." **Walker v. Grand Central Sanitation, Inc.**, 634 A.2d 237, 244 (Pa. Super. 1993), *appeal denied*, 539 Pa. 652, 651 A.2d 539 (1994) (adopting Restatement (Second) of Torts § 621).

Here, Plaintiff plead that on a date certain Defendant VonSas was present in the home of two individuals in Adams County. Plaintiff plead, if not verbatim, that Defendant VonSas stated to these two individuals that Plaintiff took nine-thousand dollars (\$9,000) which was not his property from the Borough. This statement made by the Defendant as pleaded imputes criminal conduct of theft to Plaintiff. Plaintiff averred that those who heard the statements understood them to mean Plaintiff was a "thief."

Similarly, the factual averments with regard to Defendant Freiert specify that since December 27, 2023, Freiert has on numerous occasions made statements to third parties that Plaintiff had taken or destroyed Borough property. The allegations as plead are not so vague as to preclude a viable claim for slander per se.

Therefore, Defendant's first Preliminary Objection is overruled as to Counts I and III.

2. Failure to State a Claim for False Light – Counts II, IV, VI

Defendants second preliminary objection in the nature of a demurrer is for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(4) with regards to Counts II, IV, and VI for false light.

To properly plead a cause of action for false light, a plaintiff must plead that the “false light in which the other was placed would be highly offensive to a reasonable person” and “the actor had knowledge of or acted in reckless disregard as to the falsity of the publicized matter and the false light in which the other would be placed.” **Krajewski v. Gusoff**, 53 A.3d 793, 806 (Pa. Super. 2012) (citing Restatement (Second) Torts § 652E). “It is only when there is such a major misrepresentation of his character, history, activities or beliefs that serious offense may reasonably be expected to be taken by a reasonable man in his position, that there is a cause of action for invasion of privacy.” **Id.** at 807.

Here, Defendant maintains that Plaintiff fails to plead that the false light in which he was placed would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. Plaintiff’s pleading alleges that each Defendant made statements to third parties that ascribed to him criminal conduct, *i.e.* theft or unlawful taking. There is little doubt that a reasonable person would find being ascribed such conduct highly offensive. Similarly, the Court can reasonably infer from the pleading that third parties hearing such statements would conclude that Plaintiff was pilfering the public purse. This impression is further buttressed by the fact that each Defendant engages in Borough business and would ostensibly have access to information to corroborate such claims.

Therefore, Defendant’s objection as to Counts II and IV are overruled.

3. Lack of Specificity – Counts I - VI

Defendants next contend that each count of Plaintiff’s Complaint lacks the requisite specificity pursuant to the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil procedure. Pennsylvania Rule of Civil

Procedure 1028(a) allows Preliminary Objections for “insufficient specificity of a pleading[.]” Pa.R.Civ.P. 1028(a)(3). Additionally, Rule 1019(a) requires that “[t]he material facts on which a cause of action or defense is based shall be stated in a concise and summary form.” Pa.R.Civ.P. 1019(a). “To be legally sufficient, ‘a complaint must not only give the defendant notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is and the grounds upon which it rests, but the complaint must also formulate the issues by summarizing those facts essential to support the claim.’” **Cataranzo v. Pennell**, 238 A.3d 504, 507 (Pa. Super. 2020) (quoting **Feingold v. Hendrzak**, 15 A.3d 937, 942 (Pa. Super. 2011)). A pleading is defective if it only has boilerplate allegations without sufficient facts. **Hortman v. Hortman**, 285 A.3d 916 (Pa. Super. 2022). We shall address each cause of action by Defendant.

As to Counts I and II, Defendant's objection for lack of specificity in the Complaint alleges the pleading lacks the requisite specificity pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1019(f) because Plaintiff does not plead: the location of the home wherein Defendant VonSas is to have made his defamatory statements, the identity of the two individuals who heard these statements, the content of the statements, nor how Plaintiff suffered harm as a result of Defendant VonSas’ statements.

To the contrary, Plaintiff pleads two specific causes of action and provides specific, factual allegations surrounding both. Plaintiff does not list boilerplate allegations without facts specific to support his claims. Plaintiff’s Complaint provides Defendants with notice of his claims and the facts he alleges to support those claims to an extent to allow Defendant, at this preliminary stage, to properly respond.

As to Counts III and IV, Defendant's objection for lack of specificity in the Complaint alleges Plaintiff’s pleading regarding Freiert was overly vague in that it lacks dates, how and to whom her statements were publicized and how they relate to Plaintiff. We must agree. Plaintiff’s Complaint merely pleads that Freiert has “repeatedly publicized knowingly false statements about Woods to third parties by accusing him of destroying or stealing property of the Borough...” Plaintiff’s allegations are overly vague and provide Defendant almost no notice as to the content of the allegations, to whom they were made, or any supporting facts.

Defendant's Preliminary Objection for lack of specificity as to Counts V and VI is rendered moot by this Court's finding as to Defendant's third Preliminary Objection.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, for the reasons set forth herein, the attached Order is entered. Plaintiff has twenty (20) days to file an Amended Complaint. All parties are directed to proceed with this case in accordance with the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure and local rules of this Court.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 13th day of January, 2025, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's Preliminary Objection for failure to state a claim for slander per se as to Count V is moot.
2. Defendant's Preliminary Objection for failure to state a claim for false light as to Count VI is moot.
3. Defendant's Preliminary Objection based on immunity is **Sustained** as to Counts V and VI.
4. Defendant's Preliminary Objection for lack of specificity is **Sustained** as to Counts III and IV.
5. Defendant's remaining Preliminary Objections are **Overruled**.
6. Plaintiff is granted twenty (20) days of the date of this Order to file an Amended Complaint.

ESTATE/TRUST NOTICES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that in the estates/trust of the decedents set forth below, the Register of Wills has granted letters, testamentary of or administration to the persons named. All persons having claims or demands against said estates/trust are requested to make known the same, and all persons indebted to said estates/trust are requested to make payment without delay to the executors or administrators or their attorneys named below.

FIRST PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF AUDREY J. BLACKSTONE, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Eric T. Blackstone, 785 Fairfield Station Rd., Fairfield, PA 17320

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

ESTATE OF SARAH L. BUCHER a/k/a SARAH BUCHER, DEC'D

Late of Bendersville Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-executors: Gregory A. Bucher, 1849A Biglerville Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Stephanie A. Janke, 218 George Street, Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF LARRY E. FOGLE, DEC'D

Late of Germany Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Angela Jo Topper, 75 North Queen Street, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

ESTATE OF MABEL VIOLA HARE, DEC'D

Late of Biglerville, Butler Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Tiffany L. Myers, 2970 Oxford Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

ESTATE OF MICHAEL LYNN HARE, DEC'D

Late of Biglerville, Butler Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Dorothy L. Hare, 224 Quaker Run Road, Biglerville, PA 17307

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

ESTATE OF JOANNA MYERS JONES, DEC'D

Late of Littlestown Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Leanna Goeckeritz Kikuta, 1717 Mott-Smith Dr., #1614, Honolulu, HI 96822

Attorney: Dennis M. Twigg, Esq., Hoffman, Comfort, Offutt, Scott, & Halstad, LLP, 24 North Court Street, Westminster, MD 21157

ESTATE OF DAVID B. KAGARISE, DEC'D

Late of Littlestown Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Deborah A. Kagarise, 116 Lumber St., Littlestown, PA 17340

Attorney: Kristen R. Matthews, Esq., Kristen Matthews Law, 14 E. Welsh Pool Rd., Exton, PA 19341

ESTATE OF REBA S. KEMPER a/k/a REBA SARAH KEMPER, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Dominic A. Montagnese, 624 N. Front St., Wormleysburg, PA 17043

Attorney: Dominic A. Montagnese, Esq., Cherewka Law P.C., 624 N. Front St., Wormleysburg, PA 17043

TRUST OF JOHN A. LEETI, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Trustee: Barry Laughman Trust, c/o ACNB Bank, P.O. Box 4566, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Adam D. Boyer, Esq., Barley Snyder, LLP, 123 Baltimore St., Suite 101, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF D. FRED MILLER, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-executors: Lester L. Miller & Larry E. Miller, c/o Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott L. Kelley, Esq., Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF GEORGE S. NAS, DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Virginia A. Thrasher, c/o Murphy & Childers, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

Attorney: Jared S. Childers, Esq., Murphy & Childers, P.C., 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

ESTATE OF DARLENE S. PLANK DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Frank D. Plank, c/o Entwistle & Roberts, P.C., 66 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Barbara Jo Entwistle, Esq., Entwistle & Roberts, P.C., 66 West Middle Street, Gettysburg PA 17325

ESTATE OF BRETT D. POHLMAN, DEC'D

Late of Mount Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Jennifer L. Pohlman, c/o Salzmahn Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore St., Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF PAULINE N. RUMMEL, DEC'D

Late of Mount Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Cindy Spangler, 1121

Cobblestone Court, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorneys: Crabbs & Crabbs, 202 Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331
717-637-9799

(FIRST PUBLICATION CONTINUED)

ESTATE OF JEFFREY R. SMALL, DEC'D
Late of Butler Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Vivian K. Small, 1610 Table Rock Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: David K. James III, Esq., 234 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF DOLORES PAULINE TAYLOR a/k/a DOLORES P. TAYLOR, DEC'D
Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Co-administratrices: Deborah A. Guither, 140 Barlow-Greenmount Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Kathryn L. Taylor, 702 Linden St., Clearfield, PA 16830
Attorney: Puhl & Thrasher, 220 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

SECOND PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF LINDA B. DABLER, DEC'D
Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Regan M. Williams, c/o The Hamme Law Firm, LLC, 1946 Carlisle Road, York, PA 17408
Attorney: Tessa Marie Myers, Esq., The Hamme Law Firm, LLC, 1946 Carlisle Road, York, PA 17408 717-764-5926

ESTATE OF STEVEN PAUL LITTEN, DEC'D
Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Deborah P. Litten, 14 N. Steeplechase, Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe, Rice, & Quinn, LLC, 47 West High Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF ROY K. MILLHIMES a/k/a ROY KENNETH MILLHIMES, DEC'D
Late of New Oxford Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Denise K. Storm, c/o Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 104 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: Paul B. Royer, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 104 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF LORA L. PAXTON, DEC'D
Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Personal Representative: Sue Ann Robinson, 310 Country Club Lane, Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: Teeter Law Office, 108 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF OTTO CHARLES SELLS, DEC'D
Late of Union Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Personal Representative: Kim Maureen Sells, 880 Orchard Lane, P.O. Box 182, Aspers, PA 17304
Attorney: Teeter Law Office, 108 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF JUNE E. WHITE, DEC'D
Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Co-executrices: Jan M. Sharrah, 2000 Goldenville Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Joyce E. Topper, 2681 Emmitsburg Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Jill E. Shaffer, 55 Shaffer Lane, Fairfield, PA 17320
Attorney: David K. James, III, Esq., 234 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

THIRD PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF ELMER FRED HUMBERT, DEC'D
Late of Latimore Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Administratrix: Myra B. Miller, 1259 Mud Run Road, York Springs, PA 17372
Attorney: Clayton A. Lingg, Esq., Mooney Law, 230 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF CHARLES J. KVECH a/k/a CHARLES JAMES KVECH, SR., DEC'D
Late of Union Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executor: Charles M. Kvech, c/o Elder Law Firm of Robert Clofine, 340 Pine Grove Commons, York, PA 17403
Attorney: Joy L. Kolodzi, Esq., Elder Law Firm of Robert Clofine, 340 Pine Grove Commons, York, PA 17403

ESTATE OF CHARLOTTE L. LEER, DEC'D
Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Carolyn L. Minich, 785 Humer Street, Enola, PA 17025
Attorney: David K. James III, Esq., 234 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF GARY L. LEISTER a/k/a GARY LEE LEISTER, DEC'D
Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executor: Nicholas L. Leister, c/o 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 STEVE A. NEIDERER, DEC'D
Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Executrix: Stephanie L. Neiderer, c/o 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 BARBARA JANE SIMPSON, DEC'D
Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Administrator: Cory L. Simpson, 52 Oak Drive, Hanover, PA 17331
Attorney: Clayton A. Lingg, Esq., Mooney Law, 230 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF RICKY GENE SMITH, DEC'D
Late of Dickinson Township, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania
Administratrix: April Marie Smith, c/o Martson Law Offices, 10 East High Street, Carlisle, PA 17013
Attorney: Brandon T. Hughey, Esq., Martson Law Offices, 10 East High Street, Carlisle, PA 17013

(THIRD PUBLICATION CONTINUED)

ESTATE OF GREGORY E. TOPPER,
DEC'D

Late of Aspers, Menallen Township,
Adams County, Pennsylvania
Co-executors: Daniel R. Topper, 1065
Zeigler Road, Wellsville, PA 17365;
Cheyenne R. Small, 8257 Orchard
Road, Thomasville, PA 17364
Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe,
Rice, & Quinn, LLC, 47 West High
Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF JOHN J. WORMLEY, DEC'D

Late of Gettysburg, Cumberland
Township, Adams County,
Pennsylvania
Co-executrices: Jolene R. Wolf, 1085
Wolf Road, East Berlin, PA 17316;
Janel L. Wormley, 27 Pioneer Lane,
Gettysburg, PA 17325
Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe,
Rice, & Quinn, LLC, 47 West High
Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**Chances are, your clients have certain organizations and
causes they care deeply about.**

Show them you get it.

Help your clients 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 our community. Good for you.