

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 61

October 11, 2019

No. 23, pp. 61-72

IN THIS ISSUE

BOROUGH OF GETTYSBURG VS. INTERNATIONAL
BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 776,
POLICE LABOR ORGANIZATION

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.

INCORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on September 17, 2019, for the purpose of obtaining a Certificate of Incorporation organized under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law, approved December 21, 1988, P.L. 1444, as amended. The name of the corporation is ENTWISTLE & ROBERTS, PC. The purpose or purposes for which the corporation is incorporated is to provide competent legal services to clients and in connection therewith the corporation shall have unlimited power to engage in and do any lawful act concerning any or all lawful business for which a professional corporation providing legal services may be incorporated under said Business Corporation Law.

Barbara Jo Entwistle, President
Entwistle & Roberts, PC

10/11

NOTICE

The Tax Claim Bureau of Adams County, Pennsylvania, hereby gives notice that it presented a Consolidated Return of Sale to the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County, Pennsylvania, on October 7, 2019, of the Upset Tax Sale of real estate for delinquent taxes held by the Bureau on September 19, 2019, pursuant to due notices required by the Real Estate Tax Sale law of 1947, as amended. The Court confirmed this Return Nisi on October 7, 2019. Any owner or lien creditor may file exceptions or objections to the Return within thirty (30) days after October 7, 2019. If no exceptions or objections are filed by that date, the Return will be confirmed absolutely.

Adams County Tax Claim Bureau
By: Daryl G. Crum, Director

10/11

**BOROUGH OF GETTYSBURG VS. INTERNATIONAL
BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 776, POLICE
LABOR ORGANIZATION**

1. On November 14, 2017, the Borough notified Officer Michael Carricato (“the Grievant”) of his termination from the Gettysburg Borough Police Department (“the Department”). On November 20, 2017, Respondent filed a grievance. The Borough denied the grievance and the matter proceeded to arbitration.

2. On May 9, 2019, Arbitrator James M. Darby, Esquire (the “Arbitrator”) sustained the grievance, finding the Borough did not have just cause to terminate the Grievant. The Arbitrator ordered the Grievant to be immediately reinstated and made whole with respect to pay and benefits (minus interim earnings), subject to his satisfying all physical fitness for duty requirements, as well as any necessary training obligations.

3. The Borough hired the Grievant as a police officer in March 2014. In March 2017, the Department referred a criminal investigation involving the Grievant to the Adams County District Attorney’s (“DA’s”) Office.

4. On October 10, 2017, DA Sinnett sent a letter to Chief Dougherty stating the following: “... As a result of that investigation, while not complete, it is the position of this office that we will not participate in any future cases which are based solely upon the uncorroborated observations and testimony of Officer Michael Carricato...”

5. Chief Dougherty shared the contents of Sinnett’s letter with Borough Manager Charles Gable. Thereafter, on November 8, 2017, Gable and Streecher conducted a *Loudermill* hearing for the Grievant, who attended with his Union representative.

6. Chief Dougherty did not appear to testify at the hearing. The Borough attempted to introduce a memo by Dougherty outlining the details of his conversation with the Grievant at the October 30 meeting. The Union objected to the same on hearsay grounds and the Arbitrator sustained the objection.

7. Based on the *Loudermill* decision, the Arbitrator concluded “the evidence herein fails to demonstrate that the Grievant received an adequate explanation regarding the facts underlying his termination prior to this discharge.” Based on this Court’s review of the record, the Arbitrator’s Opinion and Award, and the legal mandate that this Court’s scope of review of a grievance arbitration award is in the nature of narrow certiorari, this Court finds the Arbitrator did not exceed his powers.

8. As “it was a decision pertaining to the admission or exclusion of evidence, which is within the Arbitrator’s discretion, the Arbitrator’s decision to exclude improper hearsay evidence did not implicate a constitutional procedural due process right. Thus, the Borough’s second argument is rejected.

9. The Borough asks this Court to expand the narrow certiorari scope of review to include the use of a public policy consideration to vacate an arbitration award. This argument was addressed and rejected by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ... Therefore, this Court has no authority to expand the narrow certiorari scope of review.

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 2019-SU-687, BOROUGH OF GETTYSBURG
VS. INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
LOCAL 776, POLICE LABOR ORGANIZATION.**

Gretchen K. Love, Esquire, Attorney for Petitioner
Irwin W. Aronson, Esquire, Attorney for Respondent
Wagner, J., September 20, 2019

OPINION

Before this Court for disposition is Petitioner the Borough of Gettysburg's Petition to Vacate Grievance Award, filed June 6, 2019. For the reasons set forth herein, Petitioner's Petition is hereby denied.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner, the Borough of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania ("the Borough") is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania operating subject to the Pennsylvania Borough's Code. Respondent, the International Brotherhood of Chauffeurs, Teamsters and Helpers, Teamsters Local Union No. 776 ("Respondent") is a Police Labor Organization for the purposes for the instant matter, and is the exclusive collective bargaining representative of an appropriate bargaining unit of sworn police officers employed by the Borough. At all times relevant to the instant matter, the Borough and Respondent were parties to a collective bargaining agreement effective from January 1, 2015 through and including December 31, 2017.

On November 14, 2017, the Borough notified Officer Michael Carricato ("the Grievant") of his termination from the Gettysburg Borough Police Department ("the Department"). On November 20, 2017, Respondent filed a grievance. The Borough denied the grievance and the matter proceeded to arbitration. A hearing was held in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania on November 16, 2018, where both parties were present and afforded a full opportunity to present testimony, exhibits, and argument in support of their respective positions.

On May 9, 2019, Arbitrator James M. Darby, Esquire, ("the Arbitrator") sustained the grievance, finding the Borough did not have just cause to terminate the Grievant. The Arbitrator ordered the Grievant be immediately reinstated and made whole with respect to pay and benefits (minus interim earnings), subject to his satisfying all physical fitness for duty requirements, as well as any necessary training obligations.

The Borough filed its Petition to Vacate Arbitration Award on June 6, 2019 and its Brief in Support of Petition to Vacate Grievance

Arbitration Award on July 31, 2019. Respondent filed its Brief in Opposition to Petitioner's Petition to Vacate Arbitration award on September 6, 2019.

FACTS¹

The Borough hired the Grievant as a police officer in March 2014. In March 2017 the Department referred a criminal investigation involving the Grievant to the Adams County District Attorney's ("DA's") Office. The record does not disclose the alleged crime involved, nor any of the facts underlying the same. At or around this same time the Department placed the Grievant on administrative leave with pay. The Department later determined it would return the Grievant to active duty in early October 2017 and notified the DA's Office.

The record shows that Adams County DA Brian Sinnett had periodic conversations with then-Chief Joseph Dougherty prior to the Grievant's return to work. This included discussions concerning the DA's Office's determination that it would not prosecute any matters based solely upon the observations and testimony of the Grievant. Chief Dougherty shared these discussions with Mayor Theodore Streeter. On October 3, 2017, upon the Grievant being returned to active duty (with no patrol duties) Mayor Streeter sent a letter to DA Sinnett asking that he put his determination in writing.² There is no evidence indicating that anyone from the Borough or the Department objected to the DA's decision to refuse to utilize the Grievant as the sole witness in any future prosecutions.

On October 10, 2017, DA Sinnett sent a letter to Chief Dougherty stating the following:

I am in receipt of a letter dated October 3, 2017 from Mayor Theodore Streeter regarding Officer Michael Carricato's return to active duty. As you are aware, your department referred a criminal investigation involving this officer to my office and we have proceeded accord-

¹ The Arbitrator's May 9, 2019 Opinion and Award included his factual findings, which this Court is legally bound to accept and is incorporated in this Court's Opinion. See **Town of McCandless v. McCandless Police Officer's Assn.**, 901 A.2d 991, 1000 (Pa. 2006).

² DA Sinnett testified that he was not asked by anyone to write a letter regarding his concerns. (Transcript p. 50).

ingly. As a result of that investigation, while not complete, it is the position of this office that we will not participate in any future cases which are based solely upon the uncorroborated observations and testimony of Officer Michael Carricato. This is as a result of our pending investigation and information revealed as part of that as well as the deliberative process of the District Attorney.

I know you and I have discussed these matters periodically with some detail throughout the investigation. I wish to stress that I am sharing this with you solely as a law enforcement colleague and as the head of your police department. Please do not disseminate this letter or the information contained therein to any other non-law enforcement entity. I cannot stress this enough. Dissemination would result in this office potentially failing to interact with your department as a whole going forward.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you at your convenience.

(Borough Exhibit 3.)

Chief Dougherty shared the contents of Sinnett's letter with Borough Manager Charles Gable. Dougherty then met with the Grievant on October 30, 2017 (Borough Exhibit 5).³ Thereafter, on November 8, 2017, Gable and Streeter conducted a *Loudermill* hearing for the Grievant, who attended with his Union representative.

[During the Arbitration hearing], Gable testified that at the *Loudermill* hearing he informed the Grievant "of the information I had received via the Mayor and Chief Dougherty" (Transcript. P 79). On cross-examination, he averred that "the Grievant was made aware that we were aware of the contents of the Sinnett letter" (Transcript p. 86). Gable also testified that at the *Loudermill* hearing the Union asked him for a copy of the charges against the Grievant and he denied the request "because he did not have a copy of the letter" (Transcript pp. 86-87).

³ Chief Dougherty did not appear to testify at the hearing. The Borough attempted to introduce a memo by Dougherty outlining the details of his conversation with the Grievant at the October 30 meeting. The Union objected to the same on hearsay grounds and the Arbitrator sustained the objection. (Transcript pp. 60-74).

After the November 8 *Loudermill* meeting, Gable met with Borough Council and recommended that Grievant be terminated “based on information I received about DA Sinnett’s letter via the mayor and the chief” (Transcript p. 81). Borough Council then voted to terminate the Grievant’s employment.

By letter dated November 14, 2017, Gable notified the Grievant of his termination from employment. In Gable’s letter he formed the Grievant as follows:

The purpose of this correspondence is to advise you that the Gettysburg Borough Council voted at its last regularly scheduled meeting to terminate your employment. Borough Council took this action after it was advised of communication received by Chief Joseph Dougherty from the Adams County District Attorney. It is my understanding that the content of the District Attorney’s communication was shared with you in a meeting that occurred on October 30, 2017.

You were provided with the opportunity to share any information that you deemed to be relevant regarding the District Attorney’s communication with Mayor Streeter and myself on November 8, 2017. Instead of doing so, your Union Representative indicated that you could not respond to the issue because you had not been informed of the content of the District Attorney’s letter. Subsequent to the November 8, 2017 meeting, Mayor Streeter placed you on unpaid suspension pending the outcome of a final decision from Borough Council regarding your employment status.

Borough Council carefully considered this matter and it has determined that you cannot continue to perform the duties of the police officer position. This determination is based on the District Attorney’s decision that he would no longer prosecute cases which are based solely upon your observations or testimony. Your inability to perform the duties of your position, regardless of the reason, must result in your termination as there are no other vacant or available positions for which you are qualified and for

which you possess the necessary qualifications in the Borough's Police Department.

As previously stated, it is the Borough's position that your termination is not disciplinary in nature. However, the Borough is providing you with the enclosed Statement of Charges required under the Borough Code, if applicable.

(Borough Exhibit 5, P. 1.)

The Statement of Charges attached to the November 14, 2017 letter state as follows:

1. As a police officer for the Borough of Gettysburg, Carricato is responsible for enforcement of the Pennsylvania Crimes Code under the supervision of the Borough Chief of Police and the Adams County District Attorney's Office.
2. An essential function or duty of the position of police officer is to file criminal charges and/or make arrests in accordance with Pennsylvania law and to testify in criminal prosecutions involving the same. The District Attorney's Office has discretion to determine the specific criminal charges that are filed after the evidence or observations are captured by an arresting officer. The District Attorney's Office determines what criminal charges will be prosecuted.
3. The District Attorney of Adams County has indicated that he will not prosecute cases in the future which are based on uncorroborated observations and testimony of Carricato.
4. As a patrol officer, Carricato works independently responding to calls for assistance or engaging in proactive patrolling. In doing so, Carricato independently observes criminal conduct and files criminal charges based on information he has received or gathered during the course of his patrol duties.
5. There are no other available or vacant positions in the police department which do not require interaction with and testimony for the Adams County District Attorney.
6. The District Attorney's determination that he will not prosecute cases involving Carricato as the sole witness of criminal conduct significantly impairs Carricato's ability to perform the duties of a Borough police officer.

7. The Borough Code and the Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service Commission of Gettysburg Borough permit removal from office due to neglect or violation of any official duty and/or conduct unbecoming of a police officer. 8 Pa.C.S. §1190(a)(2),(4); Civil Service Rules and Regulations, Section 6.3.
8. It is the decision of the management and administration of Gettysburg Borough that Carricato be removed from the position of patrol officer in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service Commission of Gettysburg Borough and applicable law.

(Borough Exhibit 5, p.3.)

At the instant arbitration hearing, DA Sinnett testified that between March 2017 and the date of his letter (while the Grievant was on administrative leave) the DA's office relied on the Grievant as a witness on multiple occasions.⁴ He stated that the DA's office did not provide defense counsel with any exculpatory information regarding the Grievant's credibility as a witness in those instances. Sinnett also averred that by sending his letter to the Borough he did not intend for the Borough to terminate the Grievant's employment.

Department Interim Chief Carl Segatti testified that he has a complement of 13 officers, two per shift, who perform solo patrols 24 hours per day. For "serious" calls more than one officer responds. He stated officers testify in court "[w]ith great regularity" and that swearing and taking oaths is part of the officer's job description (Transcript pp. 97-99). Segatti introduced the Department's General Order #0204 and the Commonwealth's Municipal Police Officers' Education and Training Commission ("MOEPTC") post listing all of the police officers' duties (Borough Exhibits 6-7).⁵ On cross-examination he stated that testifying in court is "a relatively small

⁴ After the Borough served a subpoena on DA Sinnett to testify at the arbitration hearing, he filed a Petition to Quash and for Protective Order with this Court on the grounds that, inter alia, he would be required to disclose information protected under the Criminal History Record Information Act ("CHRIA"). On November 15, 2018, [this Court] denied the Petition to Quash and directed DA Sinnett to appear and testify. [This Court] also issued a protective order precluding the DA from being required to disclose any information protected by CHRIA or covered by the deliberative process privilege. (Borough Exhibit 2.)

⁵ The parties' Agreement at Article V, entitled "Duties of Police Officers" also lists the negotiated responsibilities of Department officers (Joint Exhibit 1, p.2).

amount of [an officer's] total activity” with 75% of the time spent on patrol, with the remaining time encompassed (Transcript pp. 114-115).

LEGAL STANDARD

As set forth in **N. Berks Reg'l Police Comm'n v. Berks Cty. Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge #71**, 196 A.3d 715 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2018):

It is well-settled that a judicial review of a grievance arbitration award arising under Act 111 is in the nature of narrow certiorari. *Town of McCandless v. McCandless Police Officers Ass'n*, 901 A.2d 991, 996 (Pa. 2006). “[T]he narrow certiorari scope of review limits courts to reviewing questions concerning: (1) the jurisdiction of the arbitrators; (2) the regularity of the proceedings; (3) an excess of the arbitrator’s powers; and (4) deprivation of constitutional rights.” *Pa. State Police v. Pa. State Trooper’s Ass’n (Betancourt)*, 656 A.2d 83, 89-90 (Pa. 1995). “An arbitrator’s powers are limited. He or she may not mandate that an illegal act be carried out; he or she may only require a public employer to do that which the employer can do voluntarily.” *Id.* at 90 (citing *City of Washington v. Police Dep’t of City of Washington*, 259 A.2d 437, 442 (Pa. 1969)). An arbitrator’s award “must encompass only terms and conditions of employment and may not address issues outside of that realm.” *Id.* Further, a mere error of law would be insufficient to support a court’s decision to reverse an Act 111 arbitrator’s award.

Id.

Id. at 721.

“An error of law alone will not warrant reversal under the narrow certiorari scope of review.” **Appeal of Upper Providence Police Delaware Cty. Lodge No. 27 Fraternal Order of Police**, 526 A.2d 315, 321 (Pa. 1987).

As set forth in **Pennsylvania State Police v. Pennsylvania State Trooper Association (Betancourt)**, 656 A.2d 83 (Pa. 1995):

The narrow certiorari test has sometimes been referred to as a “standard of review” by this Court and lower courts; this is incorrect. As this Court recently set out in **Morrison v. Commonwealth, Department of Public Welfare, 646 A.2d 565 (Pa. 1994)**, “scope of review” and “standard of review” are two distinct legal concepts. “Scope of review” refers to “‘the confines within which an appellate court must conduct its examination.’ (citation omitted). In other words, it refers to the matters (or “what”) the appellate court is permitted to examine.” **Id. at 570**. “Standard of review,” on the other hand, “refers to the manner in which (or “how”) that examination is conducted.” **Id.** As narrow certiorari sets the confines in which an appellate court may conduct its examination, it sets a scope of review, and not a standard of review.

Id. at Footnote 4.

DISCUSSION

The Arbitrator, in his Opinion and Award, found that the Borough failed to provide the Grievant adequate procedural due process prior to terminating his employment and sustained the grievance without addressing the substantive merits of the Borough’s termination decision. The Borough argues that (1) the Arbitrator exceeded his powers, (2) the Borough was denied its fundamental right to procedural due process and, (3) the standard of review for Act 111 cases should be extended to encompass a public policy exception.

First, the Borough argues that the Arbitrator exceeded his powers when he reinstated the Grievant. Specifically, the Borough argues that the excess of powers prong of narrow certiorari is squarely implicated because (1) the Arbitrator exceeded his power by creating a new set of diminished job duties in conflict with the bargained for terms of the CBA, (2) the Arbitrator infringed on the Borough’s inherent managerial rights, and (3) the Arbitrator exceeded his powers when he addressed issues that were waived by the Union and not properly before him.

As set forth in **Northern Berks Regional Police Commission v. Berks County Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 71**, judicial

review of a grievance arbitration award arising under Act 111 is in the nature of narrow certiorari. As the Commonwealth Court stated in **City of Scranton v. E.B. Jermyn Lodge No. 2 of the Fraternal Order of Police**, 903 A.2d 129 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2006), appeal denied, 919 A.2d 959 (Pa. 2007):

[W]hat is in excess of the arbitrator’s powers...is not whether the decision is unwise, manifestly unreasonable, burdens the taxpayer, is against public policy or is an error of law; an arbitrator only exceeds his power if he mandates that an illegal act be carried out or requires a public employer to do that which the employer could not do voluntarily.

Id. at 135.

In **Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill**, 470 U.S. 532 (1985), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that since public employees have a property interest in their employment, there are certain procedural due process requirements that must be met before their employers can terminate them. “The tenured public employee is entitled to oral or written notice of the charges against him, an explanation of the employer’s evidence, and an opportunity to present his side of the story.” **Id.** at 546. “Here, the pretermination hearing need not definitively resolve the propriety of the discharge. It should be an initial check against mistaken decisions – essentially, a determination of whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the charges against the employee are true and support the proposed action.” **Id.** at 545, 546.

Based on the **Loudermill** decision, the Arbitrator concluded “the evidence herein fails to demonstrate that the Grievant received an adequate explanation regarding the facts underlying his termination prior to his discharge.” (Decision of **Arbitrator**, May 9, 2019, page 12). Based on this Court’s review of the record, the Arbitrator’s Opinion and Award, and the legal mandate that this Court’s scope of review of a grievance arbitration award is in the nature of narrow certiorari, this Court finds the Arbitrator did not exceed his powers.

Next, the Borough argues that it was denied its fundamental constitutional right to procedural due process when the Arbitrator excluded Chief Dougherty’s October 30, 2017 Memorandum of Record from admission into evidence at the arbitration hearing on the basis of hearsay. The Borough relies heavily upon **City of**

Philadelphia v. Fraternal Order of Police Lodge No. 5 (Breary), 985 A.2d 1259 (Pa. 2009) in support of its argument that the Arbitrator deprived the Borough of its constitutional right to procedural due process.

In **Breary**, prior to the grievance arbitration, the City was issued a subpoena directing it to provide various documents related to the discipline of the grievant to the FOP. The City failed to comply with the subpoena and the arbitrator granted a request from the FOP precluding the City from presenting any testimony or evidence that was subject to disclosure under the subpoena. This precluded the City from presenting any evidence in the arbitration hearing, resulting in the grievance being sustained.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court in **Breary** discussed the role of the arbitrator in ruling on issues of evidence and stated “arbitrators must decide evidentiary questions such as hearsay and relevancy; and, the exclusion of evidence pursuant to such a ruling does not typically involve notions of due process.” **Id.** at 1268. The court in **Breary** ruled:

Accordingly while we agree with the FOP that review of a simple “evidentiary question” would run far afield of narrow certiorari, the heart of this matter concerns the propriety of an extreme discovery sanction precluding further action in this case, and, therefore, a valid constitutional claim involving the most basic of rights: due process of law. Thus, pursuant to **Betancourt**, we find that we may examine whether the arbitrator’s discovery sanction, which constructively precluded the City from presenting a case-in-chief, violated the City’s right to procedural due process.

Id. at 1269.

Breary is clearly distinguished from the instant case. In this case, the Arbitrator correctly made a hearsay evidentiary ruling on the admissibility of Chief Dougherty’s October 30, 2017 Memorandum of Record. Such a “review of a ‘simple evidentiary’ question would run far afield of narrow certiorari.” **Id.** As “it was a decision pertaining to the admission or exclusion of evidence, which is within the arbitrator’s discretion,” **Id.** at 1275, (citing **AFSCME District Council 88 v. County of Lehigh**, 798 A.2d 804, 808 (Pa. Cmwlth.

2002), the Arbitrator’s decision to exclude improper hearsay evidence did not implicate a constitutional procedural due process right. Thus, the Borough’s second argument is rejected.

The Borough asks this Court to expand the narrow certiorari scope of review to include the use of a public policy consideration to vacate an arbitration award. This argument was addressed and rejected by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in **Pa. State Police v. Pa. State Trooper’s Ass’n (Smith & Johnson)**, 741 A.2d 1248, 1252-53 (Pa. 1999) where the Pennsylvania Supreme Court stated:

We are unable to accept this position. Broadening the narrow certiorari scope of review to include a provision which would allow the courts to interfere with an arbitrator’s award whenever that award could be deemed to be violative of “public policy” – however that nebulous concept may be defined by a particular appellate court – would greatly expand the scope of review in these matters. If we were to adopt the ... recommendation to include this ill-defined term within the narrow certiorari scope of review, we would markedly increase the judiciary’s role in Act 111 arbitration awards. This would undercut the legislature’s intent of preventing protracted litigation in this arena.

Id. at 1252-53. Therefore, this Court has no authority to expand the narrow certiorari scope of review.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 20th day of September 2019, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, Petitioner’s Petition to Vacate Grievance Award is hereby Denied.

ESTATE NOTICES

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

FIRST PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF GERTRUDE E. BOHN, DEC'D**

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Darla J. Lenker, 20 South Park Street, Dallastown, PA 17313

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

ESTATE OF HELEN L. CROUSE, a/k/a HELEN LOUISE CROUSE, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Andrew R. Crouse, 40 S. Stratton Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

ESTATE OF ROSALIE A. DAVIS, DEC'D

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Charles W. Davis, 335 Greenbrier Road, York Springs, PA 17372

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

ESTATE OF MYRTLE MAE WILKINSON LITTLE, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Dwight D. Little, 271 Orphanage Road, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

ESTATE OF JAMES L. RYNARD a/k/a JAMES LLOYD RYNARD, DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Cathy R. Church, 65 Maple Avenue, West Orange, NJ 07052

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

ESTATE OF KATHY A. STRAILE, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Arendtsville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Kristen B. Noren, 1202 Yverdon Drive, Camp Hill, PA 17011

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

ESTATE OF ELSIE L. WIRE, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Bonnie G. Mathews, 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

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF JEAN L. ARNSBERGER, a/k/a JEAN LOUISE ARNSBERGER, DEC'D**

Late of Union Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Bonnie J. Murren, 7 Meadowview Drive Littlestown, PA 17340

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

ESTATE OF ROBERT CHARLES BARE, DEC'D

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administrator: Sherman C. Toppin, 1800 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 300, Philadelphia, PA 19103

Attorney: Sherman C. Toppin, Esq., Sherman Toppin Law Firm, LLC, 1800 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 300, Philadelphia, PA 19103

ESTATE OF FRED I. EBERSOLE DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Jeffrey R. Ebersole, Michael D. Ebersole and Beth Ann Ensor, 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 JAYNE L. FORBES, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Joan E. Wessel, 1235 New Chester Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

ESTATE OF FRED A. MILLER, SR., DEC'D

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Jennifer L. Horst, c/o Lisa Marie Coyne, Esq., Coyne & Coyne, P.C., 3901 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011-4227

Attorney: Lisa Marie Coyne, Esq., Coyne & Coyne, P.C., 3901 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011-4227

ESTATE OF DONALD R. MOUL, DEC'D

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Dennis Moul, 375 Heritage Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Daniel Moul, 45 Sandy Court, Hanover, PA 17331

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

ESTATE OF JANET E. SMITH, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Stephanie Blettner, 7 Meadowview Drive, Littlestown, PA 17340

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

THIRD PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF ROBERT L. MILLER, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Katherine E. Miller, 725 Chambersburg Road, Apt. E, Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF SHIRLEY M. SHAEFFER a/k/a SHIRLEY MAE SHAEFFER, DEC'D

Late of Mount Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Tony L. Shaeffer, 35 California Road, Littlestown, PA 17340; Jo Ann Crouse, 1924 Whitehall Road, Littlestown, PA 17340

Attorney: Todd A. King, Esq., Salzmann Hughes, P.C., 112 Baltimore Street, Suite 1, Gettysburg, PA 17325-2311

ESTATE OF LINDELL CARL SMITH, DEC'D

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Lindell C. Smith, Jr., P.O. Box 106, East Berlin, PA 17316

Attorney: John J. Murphy III, Esq., Patrono & Murphy, LLC, 28 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

THIRD PUBLICATION CONTINUED

ESTATE OF DORIS L. STAUB, DEC'D

Late of Germany Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Wayne B. Staub, P.O. Box 4487, Camp Connell, CA 95223

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

ESTATE OF FRANCHOT E. STRICKHOUSER, DEC'D

Late of Menallen Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Michael W. Strickhouser, c/o R. Thomas Murphy, Esq., R. Thomas Murphy & Associates, P.C. 237 East Queen Street, Chambersburg, PA 17201

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



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
www.adamscountycf.org

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