

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 54

August 3, 2012

No. 12, pp. 83-92

IN THIS ISSUE

LATIMORE TWP VS. SINGH ET AL

This opinion is continued from the last issue (July 27, 2012).

Helping families achieve
their long-range financial
goals is our business.

Christine Settle
Assistant Vice President
& Trust Officer



**Trust and investment services from
a bank with a long history of trust.**

For more information or a free
consultation, please call 717.339.5058.



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, John W. Phillips, Esq., Editor and Business Manager.

Business Office – 117 BALTIMORE ST RM 305 GETTYSBURG PA 17325-2313. Telephone: (717) 334-1553

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

All rights reserved.

FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to the provisions of Sec. 311 of the Act of Assembly of December 16, 1982, as amended, 54 Pa. C.S.A. 311, that an application for registration of a fictitious name was filed on July 13, 2012, with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg for the conducting of a business under the fictitious name of SIDNEY AT WILLOUGHBY RUN with its principal office or place of business at 101 East King Street, East Berlin, Pennsylvania 17316. The name and address of the entity owning or interest- ed in said business is Lucky Mushroom, LLC, c/o Restaurant Sidney, 101 East King Street, East Berlin, Pennsylvania 17316.

Jennifer B. Hipp, Esq.
One West Main Street
Shiremanstown, PA 17011

8/3

INCORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, for INDEPENDENT AG EQUIPMENT, INC. on July 24, 2012. The said corporation has been incorporated under the provi- sions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988 of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

8/3

INCORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation for BALTIMORE STREET SCOOTERS, INC. were filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on July 9, 2012, under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988 of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst & Hart
Solicitor

8/3

DISCUSSION

In land use appeals where the Court takes additional evidence, as is the case in the instant matter, this Court is required to conduct its own review de novo. *Borough of Jenkintown v. Bd. of Comm'rs of Abington Twp.*, 858 A.2d 136, 139 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2004).

Because of the extent to which the issues in this consolidated matter are interrelated, this Court will first address the issues contained within the Owners' land use appeal from the Township's decision to deny the Owners' application for approval of their final land development plan.

Pursuant to Section 1101 of the Zoning Ordinance, "[N]o building or other structure shall be erected...without a permit therefore issued by the Zoning Officer." **2008 Latimore Township Zoning Ordinance Section 1101.** Permit applications must include information including, but not limited to, the proposed use of the structure per Section 1102. Furthermore, those "permits shall be issued only in conformity with the provisions of [the] Ordinance." *Id.* Section 1108 of the Zoning Ordinance states that "failure to obtain a Zoning Permit ... shall be a violation of [the] Ordinance and [is] punishable under Section 1111 of [the] Ordinance." *Id.* at Section 1108. Section 1111 of the Ordinance states that each day a violation is continued constitutes a separate offense and allows for fines of not more than \$1,000 to be imposed upon parties found in violation of the Ordinance. *Id.* at Section 1111. Furthermore, Section 1112 of the Ordinance provides the Township with the authority to, in addition to other remedies, initiate any other appropriate actions or proceedings in any case where a structure is erected or used in violation of the Ordinance. *Id.* at 1112.

In this case, the Owners, by way of the September 3, 2009 letter sent by Shambaugh, were informed that the Township did not have a record of an application for a zoning permit or for such a permit being issued for the modular structure located behind the convenience store on the Property. The Owners have admitted that they placed the modular structure on the Property without seeking or obtaining a zoning permit.

Also within the September 3, 2009 letter, the Owners were instructed that they had 90 days from the date of the letter to come into compliance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

In the letter, it was stated that in order to be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, the Owners would need to either remove the structure or submit a land development plan along with a zoning permit application to the Township.

On December 3, 2009, exactly at the end of the 90-day period provided in Shambaugh's September 3, 2009 letter, Owners submitted to the Township a final land development plan (Plan) for the Property. The Owners' purpose in preparing and submitting the Plan was to bring the Property into compliance with the Ordinance. However, despite complying with a portion of the Township's requirements, at the conclusion of the 90-day period, the Owners still had not sought or obtained a zoning permit from the Township for the modular structure they had placed on the Property.

Due to the Owners' failure to come into compliance with the Ordinance within the 90-day period, the Board issued an Enforcement Notice, dated December 7, 2009, which informed the Owners that they were in violation of the Ordinance. Specifically, the Enforcement Notice stated that by placing the modular structure on the property without a zoning permit or building permit, the Owners were in violation of Section 1108 of the Ordinance. The Enforcement Notice further provided that all steps for compliance must be commenced and completed within thirty (30) days from the date of the Notice. As will be discussed later in greater detail, the Notice also informed the Owners of their right to appeal the Notice within 30 days from the date of the Notice.

The Owners failed to submit an application for a zoning permit for the structure by the December 3, 2009 compliance date established in the September 3, 2009 zoning violation letter. That failure alone constitutes sufficient grounds for a zoning violation pursuant to the requirements of Sections 1101 and 1108 of the Ordinance.

However, due to the fact that the Owners had submitted the Plan within the 90-day period, the Township considered the submission as an attempt at compliance and conducted a review of the Plan. During a special session meeting on June 17, 2010, the Board took official action and denied the Plan. It is from this denial that the Owners filed their land use appeal.

In their appeal, the Owners first argue that a land development plan should not have been required because of the classification of

the structure, and as a result, the Township abused its discretion by requiring one to be submitted.

The Owners contend that their placement of the structure on the Property does not constitute a “land development” under the terms of the SALDO. In defining what actions constitute “land development,” Article II(34) states, in relevant part, that a “land development” is an improvement of one lot involving “a single non-residential building on a lot or lots regardless of the number of occupants or tenure.” **1992 Latimore Township SALDO**, Article II(34). The 1992 SALDO does not provide a definition for what constitutes a building, however, it does provide a definition for the term “structure.” *Id.* at paragraph 69. The SALDO defines “structure” as “anything constructed or erected with a fixed location on the ground or attached to something having a fixed location on the ground, including but not limited to, buildings, factories, sheds, cabins, and other similar items.” *Id.*

The Owners assert that the structure they placed on the Property is not affixed to the ground and therefore cannot be considered to be a building under the SALDO. Therefore, due to the structure’s alleged failure to qualify as a building, the Owners assert that it is not a land development. No land development plan should have been required, and the Township’s requirement for one to be submitted constitutes an abuse of discretion.

The Township asserts, however, that the Owners’ use of the structure for living and sleeping purposes created a de facto circumstance where there were two principal uses of the Property – a legal commercial business use and an illegal single-family dwelling use.

Section 901 of the 1992 SALDO states, “[P]ermits required by the Township for the erection or alteration of buildings ... or use of the land shall not be issued by [the Township] until it has been ascertained that the site ... is in accordance with [the SALDO].” **1992 Latimore Township SALDO**, Section 901. Pursuant to Sections 304-A(25) and 306-A(26) of the 1992 SALDO, “statements of the intended use of all lots” are required to be included in all preliminary and final land development plans, respectively. *Id.* at Sections 304-A(25), 306-A(26). Additionally, “such permits shall be issued only after it has been determined that the ... use conforms to the site description as indicated by the approved and recorded Final Plan.”

Id. (emphasis added). Accordingly, the Township asserts that it was justified in requiring the land development plan because it was necessary to ascertain the actual use or uses of the structure and the Property before it could issue any permits.

Based upon the evidence and testimony presented, this Court has determined that although the physical properties of the improvement suggest that it should, at a minimum, be classified as a structure, the Owners' use of the structure most closely resembles that of a dwelling.

This Court recognizes that the structure alone does not fulfill the technical requirements of what is considered a "dwelling" under the Zoning Ordinance. **2008 Latimore Township Zoning Ordinance**, Section 202. Pursuant to the Ordinance, a "dwelling" must be "resting directly on and securely anchored to a concrete or bonded masonry foundation extending below the frost level." *Id.* In this case, the structure is sitting atop the existing macadam directly behind the convenience store and is not directly resting on, or affixed to, that macadam. Although the Ordinance allows for modular housing to be included within the scope of what is considered a dwelling, the structure in this case does not fall within the criteria stated in the Ordinance. See, *Id.*

However, even though the physical nature of the structure itself does not fit within the text of the Ordinance's definition of what constitutes a dwelling, the Owners' use of the structure clearly conforms more closely with the uses traditionally associated with a dwelling than those associated with a traditional storage facility. Specifically, the Owners' admitted regular use of a fully-made king or queen size bed, satellite television, kitchen table set, and refrigerator within the structure certainly suggests that it is not a mere "utility shed" as Owners contend. For that matter, it is difficult for this Court to accept that a place in which individuals are able to keep food in a refrigerator, eat at a kitchen table, sleep in a fully-made king or queen size bed, and watch satellite television should ever be characterized as a "utility shed." However, it is also difficult for this Court to consider a structure that has no running water, plumbing, bathroom, permanent cooking facilities, or heating and cooling systems as a "single-family dwelling."

The impact of the latter issues is significantly lessened, however, when one considers that bathroom/shower facilities, a kitchen, and

laundry facilities are located inside the convenience store only a few steps from the structure. The Township has no record of receiving building permit applications for the construction of either the shower or laundry facilities on the Property. Owners assert that these shower and laundry facilities were built by the Goldens, the original owners of the property, well before any Zoning Ordinances were in existence and, therefore, the facilities should be grandfathered into the current Ordinance.

Somewhat paradoxically, it is the substantial confusion regarding the actual use of the Property and the structure that provides this Court with the clearest direction towards its decision that the Township was justified in requiring the Owners to file a Land Development Plan as part of the process of acquiring a zoning permit.

At the time the Township learned of the existence of the structure in mid- to late August 2009, it was aware of the following: that the structure had been illegally placed on the Property without a permit, that the structure contained a bed and other household amenities, that the windows were covered with curtains, and that the Owners' son had answered the door to the structure when the structure was investigated. Pursuant to this knowledge, the Township, understandably, had a number of serious questions and concerns regarding the actual use of the Property and the structure—the most important of which was the possible existence of an illegal residential use in an area zoned exclusively for Commercial-Industrial use. See, **2008 Latimore Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 452.**

In light of these concerns, the Township made the decision to require a land development plan, in conjunction with a zoning permit application, from the Owners before issuing a zoning permit for the structure. **Township Exhibit 7.** By requiring a land development plan, the Township ensured that the uncertainty regarding the actual nature of the use of the structure would be resolved because of the requirements of Section 901 of the 1992 SALDO, discussed *supra*. This Court feels that the Township's decision to require a land development plan as part of the Owners' zoning permitting process was proper because, in light of a very complex use issue, the land development plan provides the Owners with an opportunity to present a full and unfiltered explanation of the use at issue while simultaneously resolving the Township's questions and concerns. Therefore,

this Court finds that the Township did not abuse its discretion when it required the Owners to submit a land development plan as part of the zoning permitting process.

Despite their current objections to the requirement, the Owners acquiesced to the Township's request and submitted a land development plan within the 90-day submission period granted by the Township in their September 3, 2009 letter to the Owners. This Court finds it counterintuitive that the Owners would choose to abide by the requirement of the Township that they opposed while simultaneously failing to comply with the requirement, the submission of a zoning permit application, to which they had no objection.

Notwithstanding the validity of the Township's decision to require the Owners to file a land development plan, the issue of the Owners' failure to file a timely zoning permit application remains.

As mentioned supra, Section 1101 of the Zoning Ordinance provides that "[n]o building or other structure shall be erected ... without a permit therefore issued by the Zoning Officer." **2008 Latimore Township Zoning Ordinance**, Section 1101. Furthermore, Section 1108 of the Zoning Ordinance states that "failure to obtain a Zoning Permit ... shall be a violation of [the] Ordinance." *Id.* at Section 1108.

In this case, the Owners admitted to intentionally erecting a structure without having previously sought or received a building or zoning permit from the Township authorizing them to do so. In the September 3, 2009 letter, the Township notified the Owners of their responsibility to submit a zoning permit application and provided them with a 90-day period in which to do so. At the conclusion of that 90-day period, the Owners had not submitted any such application to the Township. Consequently, on December 7, 2009, the Township issued an Enforcement Notice against the Owners for violating Section 1108 of the Ordinance.

The Owners' illegal placement of the structure without a permit and subsequent failure to submit a zoning permit application within the 90-day period offered by the Township is alone sufficient to validate the Township's Enforcement Notice. Therefore, this Court has determined that, irrespective of the Township's decision to require a land development plan, the Township's December 7, 2009 Enforcement Notice was validly issued and should be upheld.

Contained within the Enforcement Notice is a statement informing the Owners of their right to appeal the Notice to the Latimore Township Zoning Hearing Board within 30 days of the date of the Notice.

Owners assert that they, by way of a December 23, 2009 letter from Jerry LaRue to the Township's Board of Supervisors, appealed the Notice within the 30-day period and should therefore be granted a hearing before the Zoning Hearing Board. LaRue states that the letter was written in response to the engineering comments made by the Township regarding the land development plan LaRue prepared for the Owners and submitted on December 3, 2009. In the letter, LaRue makes several statements concerning the past use of the Property, the applicability of the Zoning Ordinance to those past uses, and the Owners' plans to only revise their Plan to address the structure.

Conversely, the Township contends that Owners failed to file an appeal of the Notice because LaRue's letter was insufficient to constitute a letter of appeal, and the Owners are therefore not entitled to a hearing on that issue before the Zoning Hearing Board.

This Court agrees with the Township's position and finds that LaRue's letter was insufficient to constitute a letter of appeal and, thus, that the Owners failed to file a timely appeal of the Notice and are therefore not entitled to a hearing before the Zoning Hearing Board.

This Court finds LaRue's letter insufficient for multiple reasons. First, and most importantly, LaRue did not possess standing to file an appeal of the Notice. In order to have standing to appeal an order or decision, an individual must be aggrieved by the order or decision that is being sought to be appealed. *Thompson v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of Horsham Twp.*, 963 A.2d 622, 624 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2009). Generally, an individual is aggrieved when he can present evidence that he has "a direct, immediate, substantial or pecuniary interest in the subject matter of the litigation." *Id.* A remote or speculative interest in the subject matter at issue is not generally sufficient to warrant an individual aggrieved status. *Id.* at footnote 2 (citing *William Penn Parking Garage, Inc. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 346 A.2d 269 (Pa. 1975)).

In this case, Jerry LaRue possesses no discernable interest in the subject matter at issue. The language of the Notice specifically states that the Owners were the only persons against whom the Township intended to take action. **Township Exhibit 8**. LaRue was simply

hired by the Owners to prepare a Land Development Plan of the Property for them. No part of LaRue's employment was affected, much less adversely, by the Enforcement Notice.

Secondly is the issue regarding whether LaRue ever received a copy of the Township's Enforcement Notice. The Notice provides that "any person receiving a copy of this Enforcement Notice" has the right to file an appeal within 30 days of the date of the Notice.

Township Ex. 8. The Owners are the only individuals listed on the Notice itself and there was no evidence presented to this Court to suggest that any individuals other than the Owners received a copy of the Notice from the Township. As they are the only persons listed on the Notice as having any action being taken against them by the Township, this Court finds that the only persons receiving a copy of the Notice from the Township are the Owners.

Finally, Owners contend that LaRue was acting on their behalf when he sent the letter to the Township. Even if this Court accepted that assertion, the letter itself is insufficient to constitute an appeal. The Enforcement Notice is never mentioned in LaRue's letter and no logical inference can be made that would lead one to believe that the letter was intended to function as an appeal of the Notice. On its face, the letter appears to be exactly what it purports to be – a response from LaRue regarding engineering comments made by the Township on the land development plan he submitted on December 3 – and not a notice of appeal.

Therefore, for the aforementioned reasons, this Court finds that the Owners failed to file an appeal of the Township's December 7, 2009 Enforcement Notice.

Procedurally, the Owners' failure to appeal the Notice has certain, specific consequences with regard to the disposition of the instant matter. It is well-settled that "a landowner's failure to appeal the notice of violation results in a final adjudication that the landowner violated the zoning ordinance." *Woll v. Monaghan Twp.*, 948 A.2d 933, 937 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2008). Additionally, the landowner's failure to appeal means "he may not later deny there was a violation." *Id.* Furthermore, "If after receiving [the] enforcement notice, the landowner continues to violate the zoning ordinance without appealing the enforcement notice, Section 616.6(c)(6) of the MPC entitles a municipality to either initiate district justice action for sanctions or

file a complaint in equity to enjoin the landowner from further violations.” *Id.* In addition, by virtue of the failure to appeal, the landowner is precluded from raising defenses in the municipality’s equitable action to enforce compliance with the zoning ordinance that could have been raised before the zoning hearing board. *Twp. of Concord v. Concord Ranch, Inc.*, 664 A.2d 640, 648 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1995).

In this case, the Township filed such an equitable action against the Owners which is the matter originally docketed at 2010-S-1343. On July 30, 2010, a judgment in favor of the Township was entered by Magisterial District Judge John C. Zepp, and it is from this judgment that the Owners appeal in the consolidated matter presently before this Court.

Ordinarily, before an injunction is granted, there are certain prerequisites that must be met. Generally, it is necessary to prove that: 1) the injunction is necessary to prevent immediate irreparable harm that is incurable by awarding damages; 2) that greater injury would result by refusing the injunction than by granting it; 3) granting the injunction will restore the parties to their respective statuses as existed immediately before the alleged wrongful conduct took place; 4) that the activity sought to be restrained is ripe and actionable; 5) that the injunction is reasonably tailored to abate the offending activity; and 6) the injunction is not against the public interest. *Paupack Twp. Bd. of Supervisors vs. Lake Moc-A-Tek, Inc.*, 863 A.2d 615, 617 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2004). If any of these prerequisites fail, the injunction will not be issued. *Id.*

However, in zoning situations, such as the one present in the instant matter, where a landowner has failed to appeal a zoning enforcement notice, it is well-settled that the “municipality need only prove a violation of its ordinance to establish its entitlement to an injunction” and the need for irreparable harm to be demonstrated is not applicable. *Id.* As discussed supra, pursuant to the MPC, the enforcement notice becomes a final adjudication of the stated violation as a result of the Owners’ failure to appeal it. *Woll v. Monaghan Twp.*, 948 A.2d 933, 937 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2008). Thus, the Owners are found to be in violation of the Ordinance, and the Township is entitled to the injunction it sought.

Accordingly, for the aforementioned reasons, this Court grants the Township's request for preliminary injunctive relief with an award of attorney's fees and costs as enumerated in the Findings of Fact. With regard to the Township's denial of the Owners' Land Development Plan, this Court affirms the Township's decision to require a land development plan as part of the zoning permitting process, and, in light of the zoning violations still occurring at the property, also affirms the Township's decision to deny the Owners' proposed Final Land Development Plan.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th day of January 2012, upon consideration of the evidence, briefs, and responses thereto submitted to this Court by the parties in their respective capacities in this combined matter, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. In the land use appeal originally docketed at No. 1202, the decision of the Latimore Township Board of Supervisors to deny Appellants' Final Plat approval is AFFIRMED.
2. In the civil matter originally docketed at No. 1343, this Court GRANTS the Township's request for preliminary injunctive relief, with an award of attorney's fees and costs.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 13th day of February 2012, upon consideration of Latimore Township's Petition for Reconsideration, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Latimore Township's Petition for Reconsideration of this Court's January 27, 2012 Order is GRANTED.
2. In order to properly reflect the additional costs incurred by Latimore Township in this matter, Finding of Fact No. 35 in this Court's January 27, 2012 Opinion shall be changed to state: "The Township has expended \$16,695.33 in legal fees and costs through September 12, 2011 in this matter."

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 WALTER D. CLAPSADDLE a/k/a WALTER DAVID CLAPSADDLE, DEC'D

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Jean H. Clapsaddle, 1745 Highland Avenue Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF EARL D. FRIES, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Craig L. Fries, 33 North Carolina Avenue, Sinking Spring, PA 19608

Attorney: Stephen J. Gring, Esq., Treeview Corporate Center, 2 Meridian Boulevard, Suite 100, Wyomissing, PA 19610

ESTATE OF RONALD LEE HUDZICK a/k/a RONALD L. HUDZICK a/k/a RONN HUDZICK, DEC'D

Late of Union Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Paul David Hudzick, 245 Wren Street, Indiana, PA 15701

Attorney: Wayne A. Kablack, Esq., Simpson, Kablack & Bell, LLC, 834 Philadelphia Street, Suite 200, Indiana, PA 15701

ESTATE OF ROBERT S. PLANK a/k/a ROBERT SAMUEL PLANK, DEC'D

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Robert M. Plank, 629 Natural Dam Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Christina M. Simpson, Esq., 28 East High Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

SECOND PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF ROGER R. DEVILBISS, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Littlestown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representatives: Vickie L. Wisner, 138 Boyer Street, Littlestown, PA 17340; Michael David Devilbiss, 3729 Old Taneytown Road, Taneytown, MD 21787

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

ESTATE OF ARDIS MARIE HOLLABAUGH, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Attorney: Murrel R. Walters III, Esq., 54 East Main Street, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

ESTATE OF NANCY NEWSOM KREBS, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Thomas John Andrew Krebs, 930 Cortleigh Drive, York, PA 17402

ESTATE OF HENRY CLEVELAND REAVER JR., DEC'D

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Thomas Henry Reaver, 245 Krug Road, Littlestown, PA 17340; Helen Joyce Unger, 115 North Queen Street, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

ESTATE OF GLORIA A. SHRADER, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Stephen J. Shrader, 328 Kohler Mill Road, New Oxford, PA 17350; Roberta A. Poist, 334 Hanover Street, New Oxford, PA 17350

Attorney: Ronald J. Hagarman, Esq., 110 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF HOPE M. WEIR a/k/a HOPE MARIE WEIR, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: David Richard Weir, 122 East Middle Street, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Katrina M. Luedtke, Esq., Mooney & Associates, 115 Carlisle Street, New Oxford, PA 17350

THIRD PUBLICATION

ESTATE OF JERRY W. JUSTICE, DEC'D

Late of Highland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Jeanette D. Showers, 585 Knoxlyn-Orrtanna Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF CHELSEA MARIE McFALLS, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Valerie J. McFalls, c/o Samuel A. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Samuel A. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF STEVEN J. PRILLAMAN, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Donald W. Kiessling, c/o Paul G. Lutz, Esq., 110 South Northern Way, York, PA 17402-3737

Attorney: Paul G. Lutz, Esq., 110 South Northern Way, York, PA 17402-3737

ESTATE OF JOHN A. RAFFENSPERGER, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: David C. Houck, 175 South Main Street, Arendtsville, PA 17303; Wesley E. Staub, 116 Accomac Road, York, PA 17406

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

