

# Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 59

December 15, 2017

No. 32, pp. 164-172

## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA VS. VICTOR L. COPENHAVER

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

Business Office – 117 BALTIMORE STREET, ROOM 305, GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2313. Telephone: (717) 334-1553

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

All rights reserved.

---

NOTICE OF FICTITIOUS NAME  
REGISTRATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that an Application for Registration of Fictitious Name was filed with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of State on November 28, 2017 for: BRIERFIELD GUEST COTTAGES located at 1060 Belmont Rd., Gettysburg, PA 17325. This was filed in accordance with 54 Pa.C.S. § 311.

12/15

---

LEGAL NOTICE-ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the policyholders of the Protection Mutual Insurance Company of Littlestown will be held at the office located at 101 South Queen Street, in the Borough of Littlestown, PA, between the hours of 1:00 pm and 2:00 pm on January 13, 2018, for the purpose of electing directors, transacting any other business properly presented, and to vote on the amended and restated bylaws.

A copy of the proposed amended and restated bylaws can be obtained by calling the office of Protection Mutual Insurance Company of Littlestown at 717-359-5840.

Attest: Scott A. Hawk  
Secretary

12/15, 12/22, 12/29, & 1/5

---

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA VS.  
VICTOR L. COPENHAVER

1. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has very specifically held that sheriffs and sheriff deputies may not independently conduct suspicionless sobriety checkpoints. *Commonwealth v. Marconi*, 64 A.3d 1036, 1044 (Pa. 2013).

2. *Marconi* can be distinguished from other Supreme Court of Pennsylvania rulings specifically holding that deputy sheriff had the authority to issue a citation to defendant even though he did not personally observe defendant driving the vehicle and *Commonwealth v. Leet*, 641 A.2d 299 (Pa. 1994) holding that common law allows sheriffs and sheriff deputies to enforce the motor vehicle code as long as they complete the same type of training that is required of police officers.

3. Sheriffs and sheriff deputies have common law arrest powers and the authority to issue summonses for summary offenses and to make sight arrests for Vehicle Code violations involving breaches of the peace committed in their presence.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,  
PENNSYLVANIA, CP-01-CR-1070-2015, COMMONWEALTH  
OF PENNSYLVANIA VS. VICTOR L. COPENHAVER,

Miranda L. Blazek, Esq., Attorney for Commonwealth

Sean A. Mott, Esq., Attorney for Defendant

Campbell, J., November 20, 2017

OPINION PURSUANT TO Pa. R.A.P. 1925(a)

Appellant, Victor L. Copenhaver, appeals his convictions and this Court's September 18, 2017 Judgement of Sentence. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully requested that Appellant's convictions and this Court's judgment of sentence be affirmed.

Per Order of the Suppression Court dated January 12, 2016, the parties stipulated to the following<sup>1</sup>:

On August 31, 2015, Adams County Deputy Sheriff Timothy Beall conducted a vehicle stop of the vehicle operated by Appellant. The vehicle stop occurred as a result of the deputy sheriff observing the tailgate to the pickup truck operated by Appellant being in a down position. This caught his attention. He further observed that the registration on the pickup truck was expired, and

---

<sup>1</sup> See January 12, 2016 Order signed by the Honorable Michael George.

additionally, the registration number was identified as belonging to a vehicle other than the one on which it was attached. Deputy Sheriff Beall has the equivalent training and qualifications to a Pennsylvania police officer as he has undergone the Act 120 waiver course and is a former Maryland police officer. At the time of the vehicle stop, the deputy sheriff was acting in the capacity as a deputy sheriff in Adams County. The vehicle stop of Appellant's vehicle occurred within Adams County jurisdictional limits.

At trial, Sheriff Deputy Beall testified that after he stopped Appellant's vehicle he asked Appellant to produce his license, registration, and insurance information. Appellant flailed his hands in the air and stated that he didn't have a license and was suspended. While speaking with Appellant, Sheriff Deputy Beall observed an odor of alcohol and marijuana emanating from the passenger compartment of the vehicle. Sheriff Deputy Beall noticed that Appellant had blood shot eyes and slurred speech. Sheriff Deputy Beall asked Appellant to exit the vehicle. Appellant complied and stated, "I have a bowl in my pocket." Sheriff Deputy Beall took the smoking device out of Appellant's pocket. In addition, Sheriff Deputy Beall recovered suspected marijuana from the glove box in Appellant's vehicle. Sheriff Deputy Beall advised Appellant that he was going to conduct Standard Field Sobriety Tests (SFSTs) and then led Appellant to a flat, well-lit area. Appellant showed signs of impairment and stated that he could not complete the SFSTs. For Appellant's safety, Sheriff Deputy Beall concluded the SFSTs. Based on the totality of the circumstances, Sheriff Deputy Beall suspected that Appellant was under the influence of drugs, alcohol, or a combination of both. Sheriff Deputy Beall took Appellant into custody.

On July 12, 2017, after a bench trial, this Court found Appellant guilty<sup>2</sup> of Driving Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance, as

---

<sup>2</sup> This Court found Appellant not guilty of Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol, 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(a)(1), (Count 1) and dismissed the Driving Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance charge, 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(1)(i), (Count 2) that was based on unlawful blood testing under *Birchfield v. North Dakota*, 136 S. Ct. 2160 (2016). The Possession of Drug Paraphernalia charge (Count 6) had been previously withdrawn.

an ungraded misdemeanor (Count 3)<sup>3</sup>; Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol and a Controlled Substance, as an ungraded misdemeanor (Count 4)<sup>4</sup> ; Possession of a Small Amount of Marijuana, as an ungraded misdemeanor (Count 5)<sup>5</sup>; Registration/Certification of Title, as a summary offense (Count 7)<sup>6</sup>; Driving Without a License, as a summary offense (Count 8)<sup>7</sup> ; and Unauthorized Transfer or Use of Registration, as a summary offense (Count 9)<sup>8</sup>. On September 18, 2017, Appellant was sentenced on Count 4<sup>9</sup> to seventy-two (72) hours to six (6) months partial confinement at the Adams County Adult Correctional Complex.<sup>10</sup> The Sentencing Court sentenced Appellant to pay fines on Counts 5, 7, 8, and 9.

In his Concise Statement, Appellant asserts that this Court erred in denying Appellant's motion to suppress evidence obtained from an unlawful stop conducted by Sheriff Deputy Beall, that the evidence presented at trial was insufficient as a matter of law to convict Appellant of the two DUI offenses, that the verdict rendered at trial is contrary to the weight of the evidence, and that the findings of guilt under both 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2) and 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3) are legally inconsistent with the exclusive elements required by each.

Appellant first alleges that the suppression court erred in denying his motion for suppression of the evidence that resulted from Sheriff Deputy Beall's illegal stop in violation of Appellant's Fourth Amendment rights. Appellant further argues that Sheriff Deputy Beall did not have the authority to detain Appellant. In a suppression hearing, the Commonwealth has the burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence the admissibility of those items the accused seeks to preclude. *Commonwealth v. Ruey*, 892 A.2d 802, 807 (Pa. 2006).

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution guaran-

---

<sup>3</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2).

<sup>4</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3).

<sup>5</sup> 35 P.S. §780-113(a)(31)(i).

<sup>6</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 1301.

<sup>7</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 1501.

<sup>8</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 1372.

<sup>9</sup> Count 3 merged with Count 4 for sentencing purposes.

<sup>10</sup> Appellant was immediately eligible for work release provided that the pre-commitment process had been completed as directed and prior to commitment.

tees “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.”<sup>11</sup> The Fourth Amendment is applicable to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. *Commonwealth v. Kohl*, 615 A.2d 308, 311 (Pa. 1992). Pennsylvania’s Constitution specifically guarantees citizens the right to be “secure in their persons . . . from unreasonable searches and seizures.”<sup>12</sup> A search or seizure is reasonable only if “it is conducted pursuant to a search warrant issued by a magistrate upon a showing of probable cause.” *Kohl*, 615 A.2d at 313. When police obtain evidence in violation of an individual’s Fourth Amendment rights, the Commonwealth is precluded from using that evidence at trial. *Commonwealth v. Pratt*, 930 A.2d 561, 563 (Pa. Super. 2007). A police officer must have probable cause that a driver is in violation of some provision of the Motor Vehicle Code at the time of the stop. *Commonwealth v. Feczko*, 10 A.3d 1285, 1291 (Pa. Super. 2010). Section 1301(a) of the Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Code reads as follows: “Driving unregistered vehicle prohibited.--No person shall drive or move and no owner or motor carrier shall knowingly permit to be driven or moved upon any highway any vehicle which is not registered in this Commonwealth unless the vehicle is exempt from registration.”<sup>13</sup>

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has very specifically held that sheriffs and sheriff deputies may not independently conduct suspicionless sobriety checkpoints. *Commonwealth v. Marconi*, 64 A.3d 1036, 1044 (Pa. 2013). *Marconi* can be distinguished from other Supreme Court of Pennsylvania rulings specifically *Commonwealth v. Lockridge*, 810 A.2d 1191 (Pa. 2002)(holding that deputy sheriff had the authority to issue a citation to defendant even though he did not personally observe defendant driving the vehicle)) and *Commonwealth v. Leet*, 641 A.2d 299 (Pa. 1994)(holding that common law allows sheriffs and sheriff deputies to enforce the motor vehicle code as long as they complete the same type of training that is required of police officers)); but see *Commonwealth v. Roose*, 690 A.2d 268 (Pa. Super.1997)(holding that constables and deputy constables do not have the authority to make motor vehicle

---

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Const. amend. IV.

<sup>12</sup> Pa. Const. art. I, § 8.

<sup>13</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 1301(a).

stops and arrests for violations of the motor vehicle code)). Importantly, Marconi's holding is limited in that it specifically states that sheriffs and sheriff deputies cannot independently conduct suspicionless sobriety checkpoints. Marconi reiterates the Leet court's determination that sheriffs and sheriff deputies have common law arrest powers and the authority "to issue summonses for summary offenses and to make sight arrests for Vehicle Code violations involving breaches of the peace committed in their presence." *Marconi*, 64 A.3d at 1040.

Instantly, the parties stipulated to the facts of the stop as discussed supra, including the fact that Sheriff Deputy Beall initiated a traffic stop because he observed that the registration on Appellant's vehicle was not only expired but also belonged to a different vehicle. Importantly, the parties also stipulated to the fact that Sheriff Deputy Beall has the equivalent training and qualifications to a Pennsylvania police officer. Sheriff Deputy Beall personally observed Appellant violate the Motor Vehicle Code and had probable cause to stop and detain Appellant for this violation. As discussed supra, Sheriff Deputy Beall has common law authority to enforce the Motor Vehicle Code. Further, it was apparent that the registration that was attached to Appellant's vehicle was the registration for a different vehicle. Arguably, the vehicle could have been stolen, which is certainly a breach of the peace. Therefore, Sheriff Deputy Beall had the authority to conduct a vehicle stop for a violation of the Motor Vehicle Code.

Appellant next argues that the evidence presented at trial was insufficient as a matter of law to convict Appellant of the two DUI offenses. In reviewing a sufficiency of the evidence claim, the court must determine whether the evidence presented at trial and reasonable inferences drawn from the evidence, "when viewed in the light most favorable to the Commonwealth as verdict-winner, are sufficient to establish all elements of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt." *Commonwealth v. Jones*, 904 A.2d 24, 26 (Pa. Super. 2006) (citing *Commonwealth v. Stevenson*, 894 A.2d 759, 773 (Pa. Super. 2006)). "[W]hile a conviction must be based on more than mere suspicion or conjecture, the Commonwealth need not establish guilt to a mathematical certainty." *Commonwealth v. Hartle*, 894 A.2d

800, 804 (Pa. Super. 2006). “The evidence at trial need not preclude every possibility of innocence, and the fact-finder is free to resolve any doubts regarding a defendant’s guilt unless the evidence is so weak and inconclusive that as a matter of law no probability of fact may be drawn from the combined circumstances.” *Commonwealth v. Patterson*, 940 A.2d 493, 500 (Pa. Super. 2007) (citing *Commonwealth v. Emler*, 903 A.2d 1273, 1276 (Pa. Super. 2006)).

Moreover, the Commonwealth may use circumstantial evidence to meet its burden so long as the combination of evidence constitutes proof of every element beyond a reasonable doubt. *Commonwealth v. Gibbs*, 981 A.2d 274, 280 (Pa. Super. 2009); see also *Hartle*, 894 A.2d at 804 (citing *Commonwealth v. Thomas*, 867 A.2d 594, 597 (Pa. Super. 2005)). “When evaluating the credibility and weight of the evidence, the fact-finder is free to believe all, part or none of the evidence.” *Patterson*, 940 A.2d at 500. A reviewing court may not weigh the evidence and substitute its judgment for that of the fact finder. *Gibbs*, 981 A.2d at 280.

Appellant challenges the sufficiency of the evidence as it relates to his two DUI convictions: Driving Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance (Count 3)<sup>14</sup> and Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol and a Controlled Substance (Count 4)<sup>15</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2) states:

d) Controlled substances.--An individual may not drive, operate or be in actual physical control of the movement of a vehicle under any of the following circumstances:

(2) The individual is under the influence of a drug or combination of drugs to a degree which impairs the individual's ability to safely drive, operate or be in actual physical control of the movement of the vehicle.

75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3) states:

(d) Controlled substances.--An individual may not drive, operate or be in actual physical control of the movement of a vehicle under any of the following circumstances:

(3) The individual is under the combined influence of

---

<sup>14</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2).

<sup>15</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3).



alcohol and a drug or combination of drugs to a degree which impairs the individual's ability to safely drive, operate or be in actual physical control of the movement of the vehicle.

The evidence presented by the Commonwealth was sufficient to find Appellant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of violating both Section 3802(d)(2) and Section 3802(d)(3). At trial, the Commonwealth presented the following evidence and testimony: Appellant was driving and in actual physical control of his vehicle when Sheriff Deputy Beall stopped him.<sup>16</sup> Appellant had red eyes and slurred speech during his interaction with Sheriff Deputy Beall. Sheriff Deputy Beall<sup>17</sup> observed an odor of alcohol and marijuana emanating from the passenger compartment of the vehicle.<sup>18</sup> Appellant told Sheriff Deputy Beall that he had a smoking device, and Sheriff Deputy Beall recovered this smoking device from Appellant's person.<sup>19</sup> In addition, Sheriff Deputy Beall recovered suspected marijuana from the glove box in Appellant's vehicle.<sup>20</sup> During SFSTs, Appellant showed signs of impairment and stated that he could not complete the SFSTs, causing Sheriff Deputy Beall to conclude the SFSTs prematurely.<sup>21</sup> Sheriff Deputy Beall testified that based on the totality of the circumstances, he believed that Appellant was operating the vehicle under the influence of drugs, alcohol, or both.<sup>22</sup> Also, Sheriff Deputy Beall concluded that Appellant was incapable of safe driving.<sup>23</sup>

The direct and circumstantial evidence presented by the Commonwealth at trial was sufficient to show beyond a reasonable doubt that Appellant committed both DUI crimes. The evidence presented was far more than a "mere suspicion or conjecture" and was by no means "weak and inconclusive." The factfinder's guilty verdict reflected its judgement after considering the weight of the evidence. In viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the

---

<sup>16</sup> Trial Tr., pg. 5, July 12, 2017.

<sup>17</sup> Trial Tr., pgs. 6-7, July 12, 2017.

<sup>18</sup> Trial Tr., pg. 6, July 12, 2017.

<sup>19</sup> Trial Tr., pg. 8, July 12, 2017.

<sup>20</sup> Trial Tr., pg. 9, July 12, 2017.

<sup>21</sup> Trial Tr., pg. 13, July 12, 2017.

<sup>22</sup> Trial Tr., pgs. 13-14, July 12, 2017.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

Commonwealth, the evidence includes all of the offense elements and supports a guilty verdict for both Sections 3802(d)(2) and 3802(d)(3).

Appellant next alleges that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence. The trial court has complete discretion to address weight of the evidence claims. *Commonwealth v. Rivera*, 983 A.2d 1211, 1225 (Pa. 2009).

[A] new trial should not be granted because of a mere conflict in the testimony or because the judge on the same facts would have arrived at a different conclusion. Rather, the role of the trial court is to determine that notwithstanding all the evidence, certain facts are so clearly of greater weight that to ignore them, or to give them equal weight with all the facts, is to deny justice. A motion for a new trial on the grounds that the verdict is contrary to the weight of the evidence concedes that there is sufficient evidence to sustain the verdict; thus the trial court is under no obligation to view the evidence in the light most favorable to the verdict winner.

*Commonwealth v. Landis*, 89 A.3d 694, 699 (Pa. Super. 2014) (quoting *Commonwealth v. Rivera*, 983 A.2d 1211 (Pa. 2009)). It is well settled that the factfinder can believe all, part, or none of the evidence. *Commonwealth v. Scott*, 146 A.3d 775, 778 (Pa. Super. 2016) (citing *Commonwealth v. Britton*, 134 A.3d 83, 86 (Pa. Super. 2016)). A new trial based on the weight of the evidence is only warranted when “the [factfinder's] verdict is so contrary to the evidence that it shocks one's sense of justice.” *Commonwealth v. Houser*, 18 A.3d 1128, 1136 (Pa. 2011) (citing *Commonwealth v. Diggs*, 949 A.2d 873, 879 (Pa. 2008)).

Instantly, the trial court was the factfinder and determined that the evidence presented by the Commonwealth was credible, established the necessary elements of the offenses, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Appellant committed the offenses. The trial court found Sheriff Deputy Beall to be credible, and the Appellant did not present any controverting evidence. As the Superior Court of Pennsylvania has explained, “...there is a logical inconsistency in asking a trial judge to conclude that [his] verdict shocked [his] own

conscience” when addressing weight of the evidence claims in non-jury trials. *Commonwealth v. Walsh*, 36 A.3d 613, 622 n. 5 (Pa. Super. 2012). Therefore, the trial court properly denied Appellant’s post sentence motion.<sup>24</sup>

Lastly, Appellant argues that the findings of guilt under both 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2) and 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3) are legally inconsistent with the exclusive elements required by each. The elements of each statute stated supra are not inconsistent with each other. Section 3802(d)(2) specifically states “under the influence of a drug or combination of drugs to a degree which impairs the individual's ability to safely drive...”<sup>25</sup> Section 3802(d)(3) specifically states “under the combined influence of alcohol and a drug or combination of drugs to a degree which impairs the individual's ability to safely drive...”<sup>26</sup> Based on the evidence presented at trial, the trial court determined that Appellant was impaired by marijuana and a combination of marijuana and alcohol.<sup>27</sup>

Therefore, for all of the reasons stated therein, it is respectfully requested that Appellant’s convictions and this Court’s September 18, 2017 Order be affirmed.

---

<sup>24</sup> See Appellant’s Post Sentence Motion, September 29, 2017.

<sup>25</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(2) (emphasis added).

<sup>26</sup> 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(d)(3) (emphasis added).

<sup>27</sup> This Court found that the Commonwealth did not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Appellant had consumed “...a sufficient amount of alcohol such that the individual is rendered incapable of safely driving...” 75 Pa. C.S. § 3802(a)(1), which is why it acquitted Appellant of Count 1.



**ESTATE NOTICES**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that in the estates 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 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 LYNN ELLEN GRAY, DEC'D**

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Richard L. Gray, 215 Montclair Rd., Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF BRIAN MICHAEL LEONARD, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of McSherrystown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Diane M. Leonard, 660 Cricket Lane, McSherrystown, PA 17344

Attorney: Amy E.W. Ehrhart, Esq., 118 Carlisle St., Suite 202, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF JANET S. MICKLEY a/k/a JANET MAE MICKLEY, DEC'D**

Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Wayne E. Mickley, 15 Jack Road, Orttanna, PA 17353

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

**ESTATE OF LILLIAN C. MILLER, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Robert F. Miller and Lee A. Miller, 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 ANNA E. MYERS, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Micheal Myers and Joanne Miller, 41 Maple Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Amy S. Loper, Esq., O'Donnell & Barr Law Group, LLP, 11 Carlisle Street, Suite 301, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF CHARLES W. ROGERS, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Patricia A. Rogers, P.O. Box 776, Funkstown, MD 21734

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

**SECOND PUBLICATION****ESTATE OF RUTH ALICE BLACK a/k/a RUTH A. BLACK a/k/a RUTH BLACK, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Cathy A. Wilson, 446 W. King Street, Abbottstown, PA 17301; Cindy A. Black, 446 W. King Street, Abbottstown, PA 17301

Attorney: John J. Mooney, III, Esq., Mooney & Associates, 230 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF LOUISE E. HEEBNER, a/k/a LOUISE ELIZABETH HEEBNER, DEC'D**

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Mark J. Heebner, 4995 Oxford Road, York Springs, PA 17372

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

**ESTATE OF KENNETH J. KOLENDA, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Carroll Valley, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Mary Lorraine Kolenda a/k/a Mary Lorraine Davidson, 3 Spur Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320

Attorney: Robert L. McQuaide, Esq., Suite 204, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF JUDY GLORIA LINDEBORG, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Personal Representative: Don Beadon, 1524 Old Harrisburg Rd., Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF DOROTHY J. SNEAD, A/K/A DOROTHY JANE SNEAD, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Margaret J. Miller, c/o Richard H. Mylin, III, Esq., 2025 E. Market Street, York, Pennsylvania 17402

Attorney: Richard H. Mylin, III, Esq., 2025 E. Market Street, York, Pennsylvania 17402

**ESTATE OF RUTH V. WRIGHT, DEC'D**

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Wendy B. Kane, 1075 Boyds School Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Gary E. Hartman, Esq., Hartman & Yannetti, 126 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**THIRD PUBLICATION****ESTATE OF CAROLYN J. DIPPERY, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Kerry J. Bishop, c/o Barbara Entwistle, Esq., Entwistle & Roberts, 37 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Barbara Entwistle, Esq., Entwistle & Roberts, 37 West Middle Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**ESTATE OF ELSON C. GRIM, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Arendtsville, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Jane L. Grim, P.O. Box 519, Arendtsville, PA 17303

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

**ESTATE OF DORIS M. ROHRBAUGH, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Karen S. Nelson, c/o Stonesifer and Kelley, a division of Barley Snyder, 14 Center Square, Hanover, Pennsylvania 17331

Attorney: Stonesifer and Kelley, a division of Barley Snyder, 14 Center Square, Hanover, Pennsylvania 17331

**ESTATE OF ROBERT MELVIN ROUNTZAHN, DEC'D**

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Vicki L. Long, c/o Scott A. Ruth, Esq., 123 Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott A. Ruth, Esq., 123 Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331

