



# Chester County Law Reporter

(USPS 102-900)

*The Official Legal Publication for Chester County*

Vol. 73

WEST CHESTER, PENNSYLVANIA, MAY 22, 2025

No. 21

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### 73 CHESTER COUNTY REPORTS

#### Commonwealth v. Reynolds

*Bias and motive – Inevitable discovery – Independent source –  
Evidence of other acts – Motion in limine* . . . . . 150 (2025)

**Classified Ads. . . . . 11**

Meeting Space - *West Chester*

Active Practice to Transition - *Media, PA*

**Legal Notices**

**See Table of Contents. . . . .1**

# Chester County Law Reporter

(USPS 102-900)

*Reporting the Decisions of the Divisions of the Court of the Fifteenth Judicial District of Pennsylvania,  
Composed of Chester County, Officially Designated by the Rule Thereof as the Legal Periodical for the  
Publication of Legal Notices*

**Owned and Published by**  
**CHESTER COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION**  
**15 West Gay Street, 2nd Floor, West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380**

**www.chescobar.org**  
**lawreporter@chescobar.org**

**Telephone: 610/692-1889 Fax: 610/692-9546**

**Richard Meanix, Editor**

*Assistant Editor*

Patrick M. McKenna, Esquire  
Richard Meanix, Chairperson-Publications Committee

Subscription Rate \$100.00 for CCBA Members; \$200.00 for Nonmembers CCBA  
Periodicals Postage Paid at West Chester, Pennsylvania  
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to  
Chester County Law Reporter, 15 West Gay Street, 2nd Floor, West Chester, PA 19380

The **CHESTER COUNTY LAW REPORTER** is published every Thursday.  
**The Deadline for submission of all notices is 12:00 noon on Tuesday, 10 days prior to the following Thursday publication.** Notices must be submitted in typewritten form OR form provided by the Office of the **Law Reporter** and are published exactly as submitted by the advertiser. Neither the Law Reporter nor the printer will assume any responsibility to edit, make spelling corrections, eliminate errors in grammar or make any changes in content.

Copyright ©2025 CCBA — All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by electronic, mechanical, photocopy, or any other means without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

---

---

## 2025 CCBA Officers

James Doyle, *President*  
Curt Norcini, *Vice President*  
Robert A. Burke, *Treasurer*  
Maria Janoski, *Secretary*  
Donald Lynn,  
*Immediate Past President*

## Executive Director

Gregory Nardi

## 2025 CCBA Directors

Patrick J. Gallo, Jr. (2025)  
Max O'Keefe (2025)  
Andrea M. Cardamone (2026)  
Rosanna I. Chiple (2026)  
Wesley W. Legg (2026)  
Basil Joy (2027)  
Hon. Louis Anthony Mincarelli (2027)  
Hon. Deborah Ryan (2027)

## 2025 YLD Division

Lauren A. Nehra, *Chair*  
Asha Steele-Chartier, *Chair-Elect*  
Ryan M. Jennings, *Immediate Past Chair*

**Commonwealth v. Reynolds**

Bias and motive – Inevitable discovery – Independent source – Evidence of other acts  
– Motion in limine

1. All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by law.
2. Evidence is relevant if (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.
3. The credibility of a witness may be impeached by any evidence relevant to that issue, except as otherwise provided by statute or the Rules of Evidence.
4. Bias is the relationship between a party and witness which might lead the witness to slant, unconsciously or otherwise, his testimony in favor of or against a party.
5. In Pennsylvania, a witness may be cross-examined as to any matter tending to show the interest or bias of that witness so that a jury can properly evaluate the witness' credibility.
6. Any witness may be impeached by showing his bias or hostility, or by proving facts which would make such feelings probable.
7. Fruits of an unconstitutional search are admissible in cases where the prosecution can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the information ultimately or inevitably would have been discovered by lawful means.
8. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court expanded the rights of individuals to have their privacy safeguarded pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the Pennsylvania Constitution to deter police misconduct and also to safeguard privacy and the requirement that warrants shall be issued only upon probable cause.
9. When it can be established by a preponderance of the evidence that the illegally obtained evidence ultimately or inevitably would have been discovered by lawful means, the evidence is admissible.
10. Although the suppression remedy extends to both indirect and direct products of unconstitutional invasions, suppression is not appropriate when the chain of causation proceeding from the unlawful conduct has become so attenuated or has been interrupted by some intervening circumstance so as to remove the taint imposed upon that evidence by the original illegality.
11. Application of the independent source doctrine is proper only in the very limited circumstances where the independent source is truly independent from both the tainted evidence and the police or investigative team which engaged in the misconduct by which the tainted evidence was discovered.
12. The government cannot illegally seize documents and photographs, read and obtain knowledge from them, return those documents, and then attempt to procure them through legal means.
13. If the government's knowledge is gained from an independent source, it may be used however, knowledge gained by the Government's own wrong cannot be used by it.

14. The question of whether evidence from the poisonous tree must be suppressed centers on, if, granting establishment of the primary illegality, the evidence to which instant objection is made has been come at by exploitation of that illegality or instead by means sufficiently distinguishable to be purged of the primary taint.
15. Evidence of any other crime, wrong, or act is not admissible to prove a person's character in order to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character. However, this evidence may be admissible for another purpose, such as proving motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident. In a criminal case, this evidence is admissible only if the probative value of the evidence outweighs its potential for unfair prejudice.
16. Cases may be tried together when evidence of each of the offenses would be admissible in a separate trial for the other. Moreover, evidence of each offense is admissible in a trial for others to show intent, absence of mistake or accident, common plan or scheme, or the like.

P.McK.

C.C.P. Chester County, Criminal Division, No. CP-15-CR-0001803-2022;  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Warren Even Reynolds

Erin Patricia O'Brien for the Commonwealth  
Vincent P. DiFabio for defendant  
Binder, J., December 30, 2024:-

---

[73 Ches. Co. Rep. **Commonwealth v. Reynolds**

---

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

vs.

WARREN EVEN REYNOLDS

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

NO. CP-15-CR-0001803-2022

---

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 30th day of December, 2024, after consideration of (1) Commonwealth's Motion to Introduce Evidence of Bias and Motive filed April 12, 2024; (2) Defendant's Motion Regarding the Admissibility of Letters Illegally Seized by Law Enforcement filed May 23, 2024; (3) Commonwealth's Motion to Introduce Evidence of Other Acts Pursuant to Pa.R.E. 404(b) filed April 12, 2024; and (4) Defendant's Motion in Limine filed January 29, 2024, any responses thereto, and oral argument on October 8, 2024, for the reasons in the attached memorandum, it is hereby **ORDERED** as detailed in the Memorandum.

**BY THE COURT:**/s/ **BRET M. BINDER, J.**

**BACKGROUND**

Presently before this court are the: (1) Commonwealth's Motion to Introduce Evidence of Bias and Motive filed April 12, 2024; (2) Defendant's Motion Regarding the Admissibility of Letters Illegally Seized by Law Enforcement filed May 23, 2024; (3) Commonwealth's Motion to Introduce Evidence of Other Acts Pursuant to Pa.R.E. 404(b) filed April 12, 2024; and (4) Defendant's Motion in Limine filed January 29, 2024.

**1. Commonwealth Motion to Introduce Evidence of Bias and Motive**

On April 12, 2024, the Commonwealth filed a Motion to Introduce Evidence of the Bias and Motive of a Witness. Specifically, the Commonwealth seeks to introduce evidence that Defendant's wife has a motive to lie based on her prior actions known to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth's Motion does not specify specific information it wishes to introduce but instead gives a general investigatory background of this case including a 2013 child pornography investigation into Defendant, an interview with the alleged victim (Defendant's wife's daughter) along with statements by Defendant's wife at that time, a 2020 interview, a recorded conversation between Defendant's wife and the alleged victim, etc.

The Commonwealth generally posits that "The necessity of evidence related to the prior investigation and her actions and statements throughout render this evidence relevant and admissible in this trial." Given that this court cannot anticipate how testimony will develop at trial, it is impossible for this court to rule at the current time. Moreover, most of the background given by the Commonwealth goes to its relevance and/or probative versus prejudicial value of the facts alleged and not to the motive or bias of a witness.

This court will note for the parties that "[a]ll relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by law." Pa.R.E. 402. Moreover, "[e]vidence is relevant if (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action." Pa.R.E. 401. Here, many of the facts recited by the Commonwealth are potentially relevant to the case. A further question will exist if the evidence's probative value is outweighed by unfair prejudice, Pa.R.E. 403, but, again, this court cannot know how testimony will develop at trial. Accordingly, this court will reserve ruling until specific requests to introduce evidence and any objections are made during the course of trial.

At oral argument, the Commonwealth focused on bias and motive of Defendant's wife due to her financial reliance on Defendant. Again, this court will need to hear the questions framed to Defendant's wife on the stand; however, bias is an area where Pennsylvania courts have been liberal in allowing the introduction of evidence for purposes of impeachment. See Pa.R.E. 607(b) ("The credibility of a witness may be impeached by any evidence relevant to that issue, except as

---

**[73 Ches. Co. Rep. Commonwealth v. Reynolds**

---

otherwise provided by statute or these rules.”); see also United States v. Abel, 469 U.S. 45, 52 (1984) (defining bias as “the relationship between a party and witness which might lead the witness to slant, unconsciously or otherwise, his testimony in favor of or against a party.”); Commonwealth v. Bridges, 757 A.2d 859, 875 (Pa. 2000) (“In Pennsylvania, a witness may be cross-examined as to any matter tending to show the interest or bias of that witness so that a jury can properly evaluate the witness’ credibility.”); Commonwealth v. Collins, 545 A.2d 882, 885 (Pa. 1988) (“Our law clearly establishes that any witness may be impeached by showing his bias or hostility, or by proving facts which would make such feelings probable.”). This has been held to include the financial interest of a witness. See e.g., Hatfield v. Continental Imports, Inc., 610 A.2d 446 (Pa. 1992) (allowing introduction of a “Mary Carter” agreement to show financial interest of a testifying witness).

Accordingly, to the extent the Commonwealth wishes to establish the financial reliance on or financial benefit received by Defendant’s wife from Defendant, this court will be inclined to allow such questions and testimony provided that Defendant cannot validly make a Pa.R.E. 403 argument about unfair prejudice to the specific question. To the extent the Commonwealth wishes to introduce evidence of Defendant’s wife’s other statements from 2013 on, this Court will reserve ruling but notes the liberal Pa.R.E. 607(b) standard if her testimony during trial is inconsistent with any prior statements, recorded calls, or the like.

## **2. Motion Regarding the Admissibility of Letters Illegally Seized by Law Enforcement**

On May 23, 2024, Defendant filed a Motion on the “Admissibility of Letters Illegally Seized by Law Enforcement, and Any Reference to Said Letters.” At issue are five letters recovered from Defendant’s home during a wellness check in which it was believed that Defendant had attempted suicide. Specifically, on August 29, 2019, police were dispatched to 973 Penn Green Road, New Garden Township, PA to assist EMS after Defendant’s wife called 911 with concern about Defendant’s well-being. Another individual at the property informed police that the Defendant was unconscious in the upstairs bathroom and invited the police into the residence. An officer met Defendant appearing unsteady and confused and dressed only in a towel. Emergency Medical Services then took Defendant to the hospital and police performed a safety sweep of the area, including the bathroom. Therein, an officer found an open vodka bottle, lit candles, a cigarette, a prescription bottle for the antidepressant alprazolam, an unopened bottle of ZzzQuil cough medicine, and, importantly, five labeled letters either in envelopes or folded over.<sup>1</sup> The officer photographed the bathroom and took the five letters addressed to various members of Defendant’s family or friends. The officer ultimately opened the envelopes and read

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent Defendant attempts to state that there is no evidence of this being a suicide attempt, this court disagrees and finds that the totality of the circumstances listed above suggest at the least an individual contemplating suicide.

the contents thereof, which appeared to be suicide notes written by Defendant (the “Letters”). Thereafter, the police took the notes into evidence, photographed them, and returned them to Defendant’s wife several days after the incident. Defendant’s wife gave one of the Letters to the alleged victim, who read it and turned the letter over to the Commonwealth.

Defendant filed a “Pre-Trial Motion to Suppress Evidence” on June 14, 2023 regarding the police seizure and potential use of the Letters. On November 13, 2023, the Honorable David F. Bortner granted the Motion to Suppress the letters recovered from Defendant’s home. See 11/13/2023 Order. Specifically, Judge Bortner analyzed the emergency aid exception to the warrant requirement and pursuant to Commonwealth v. Wilmer, 194 A.3d 564 (Pa. 2018) (holding that where an initial entry into a home based on emergency aid did not violate the Fourth Amendment but the emergency ended because the individual in danger of falling off a roof had, in fact, fallen, the emergency terminated and law enforcement was required to leave the premises immediately). Similarly, here, Judge Bortner held that this case is analogous and that the police unlawfully seized the Letters as the emergency had ended before their seizure and that the evidence should be suppressed. 11/13/2023 Order, fn. 1, p. 4.

The Commonwealth now argues that, although Judge Bortner suppressed the police use of such evidence, the letters are admissible through either: (a) the inevitable discovery doctrine given that Defendant’s wife is a private citizen who gave the particular letter at issue to the alleged victim, her daughter; or (b) the independent source doctrine. Notably, the 11/13/2023 Order does not address either theory of admissibility but suppresses police use of the evidence illegally seized and searched.

At oral argument about the legality of the seizure of the Letters, Judge Bortner in contemplation of his anticipated change to senior status specifically noted that “. . . I do think the trial judge ought to be the person to have a crack at motion-in-limine type issues, which I think are not far below the surface here.” Notes of Testimony, August 14, 2023, p. 81 (generally discussing admissibility of the Letters through non-police possession and the inevitable discovery/independent source doctrine). Judge Bortner’s 11/13/2023 Order does not address either theory of admissibility; rather, it focuses on the police use of the Letters and the legality of the initial seizure. As such, this court finds that the issue of admissibility of the letters through the alleged victim’s possession is ripe and has not yet been addressed in this matter. This court will turn to the two doctrines at issue – inevitable discovery and independent source.

The U.S. Supreme Court adopted and defined the inevitable discovery exception to the exclusionary rule in Nix v. Williams, 467 U.S. 431, 444 (1984) (holding that fruits of an unconstitutional search are admissible in cases where “the prosecution can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the information ultimately or inevitably would have been discovered by lawful means.”). However, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in Commonwealth v. Mason, 637 A.2d 251, 256 (Pa. 1993) expanded the rights of individuals to have their privacy safeguarded pursuant



---

[73 Ches. Co. Rep. **Commonwealth v. Reynolds**

---

to Article I, Section 8 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. In discussing that the Pennsylvania Constitution offers greater protection the Court noted that “. . . our task is not merely to deter police misconduct, but also to safeguard privacy and the requirement that warrants shall be issued only upon probable cause[.]” Id.

Most cases discussing the application of this doctrine involve warrantless searches where the police had sufficient information to obtain a search warrant but did not. See e.g., Commonwealth v. Perel, 107 A.3d 185, 196 (Pa.Super. 2014) (holding that “Police must demonstrate that the evidence **would** have been discovered absent the police misconduct, not simply that they somehow **could** have lawfully discovered it.”); Commonwealth v. Berkheimer, 57 A.3d 171, 176 (Pa. Super. 2012) (en banc) (holding that although the smell of burnt marijuana would have justified the obtaining of a warrant, failure to do so results in the evidence being suppressed – “the Commonwealth only can avoid suppression by demonstrating a source truly independent from both the tainted evidence **and** the police or investigative team which engaged in the misconduct.”) (citing Mason, supra., 637 A.2d at 257-58).

Presently, the Commonwealth argues that Defendant’s wife would have inevitably discovered the letters in her husband’s bathroom and she is the one who provided the letters to the alleged victim, her daughter. “When it can be established ‘by a preponderance of the evidence that the illegally obtained evidence ultimately or inevitably would have been discovered by lawful means, then the evidence is admissible.’” Commonwealth v. Colon, 248 A.3d 465, \*7 (Pa.Super. 2021) (quoting Commonwealth v. Gonzalez, 979 A.2d 879, 890 (Pa.Super. 2009)) (citing Commonwealth v. Bailey, 986 A.2d 860, 862 (Pa.Super. 2009)).

The Commonwealth also argued for the application of the related independent source doctrine. Specifically, Defendant’s wife is the source of the delivery of the letter at issue to the alleged victim and the alleged victim is the one in possession of and cognizant of the contents of the letter. These actions are independent of any police seizure or reading of the letters. On the one hand, the police were the ones to hand the letter to the Defendant’s wife but, on the other hand, the police did not control or direct her actions from there.

The Superior Court summarized well the standard for the independent source doctrine in Commonwealth v. Santiago, 160 A.3d 814, 828 (Pa.Super. 2017):

Although the suppression remedy extends to both indirect and direct products of unconstitutional invasions, see Crews, 445 U.S. at 470, 100 S.Ct. 1244 (quoting Silverthorne), suppression is not appropriate “when the chain of causation proceeding from the unlawful conduct has become so attenuated or has been interrupted by some intervening circumstance so as to remove the ‘taint’ imposed upon that evidence by the original illegality.” Id. at 471, 100 S.Ct. 1244.

Case law for an analogous scenario to the one in the case *sub judice* appears

scant. Rather, most case law involves an illegal search where another officer or department possessed sufficient information to lawfully search or seize evidence. See e.g. Commonwealth v. Lloyd, 948 A.2d 875 (Pa.Super. 2008) (holding that police sergeant's search warrant in investigation for blood alcohol test results was supported by independent probable cause and suppression was not warranted despite the district attorney's office prior improper use of a subpoena for those same records).

Accordingly, the question before this court is whether or not the taint of the illegal seizure and search of the envelopes still exists when the police have returned the illegally seized items to a Defendant's spouse. There is no indication in the record that the police directed Defendant's wife to read the letters, turn the letters over to their addressee, or otherwise tainted or directed Defendant's wife's actions.

The evidence presented by the Commonwealth consists of the testimony of Officer Alexander Reed, who during the August 29, 2019 wellness check was an officer with the Southern Chester County Regional Police Department. See 8/14/2023 Transcript of Oral Argument before Judge Bortner. Officer Reed arrived at Defendant's home pursuant to a call from Defendant's wife who indicated she was not at the home. Id. An individual believed to be a caretaker of the property met Officer Reed and told him Defendant was upstairs and unconscious. Id. Officer Reed encountered Defendant in a towel, glassy-eyed, and slurring speech upstairs either in the bathroom or just outside of it. Id. After ensuring Defendant was transported by EMS for medical treatment, securing the property, and seizing/reading the notes, Officer Reed spoke to Defendant's wife who had arrived on the scene. Id. Defendant's wife stated that she called the caretaker to check on Defendant as she was worried about his safety. Defendant's wife remained in the home after Defendant had been put in the ambulance. Id. Defendant's wife additionally gave information either orally or through her license showing her address to be the same as Defendant's. Id.

The Commonwealth posits that Defendant's wife stayed in Defendant's home and would have gone into the bathroom to clean or check it and found the letters. With the letters in hand, she would have given them to the named individuals on the front of the envelope and the alleged victim would have received the letter. The Commonwealth further argues that any taint from an illegal seizure was removed when the police returned the letter at issue to the alleged victim to Defendant's wife (it was not Officer Reed but another Officer who returned the letters).

In Commonwealth v. Melendez, 676 A.2d 226, 231 (Pa.1996) (citations modified), the Pennsylvania Supreme Court held:

Our emphasis on the importance of privacy in Pennsylvania jurisprudence and the fact that the illegal police invasion was of a home left open the question of whether [Commonwealth v. Mason], 637 A.2d 251 (Pa. 1993)] was to be understood as requiring an absolute exclusion of evidence which was illegally seized in warrantless police intrusions of a home, or whether the illegally seized evidence might be salvaged through exceptions

to the warrant requirement such as the independent source rule. Today we resolve that question and clarify *Mason* by holding that such illegally seized evidence may be admitted into evidence through exceptions to the warrant requirement such as the independent source rule. However, although the independent source rule would allow for the admission of illegally seized evidence, it has no application in this case.

Mr. Justice Cappy, concurring in *Mason*, voiced a concern that unless the independent source doctrine was more firmly limited than we had done in *Mason*, police officers would be likely to believe that if they first requested a warrant, they could then conduct an illegal entry and escape suppression of the evidence which they would later seize pursuant to the warrant. It would appear that his concern was well founded, and we hereby adopt the limitation of the independent source rule which Mr. Justice Cappy proposed in *Mason*:

[A]pplication of the “independent source doctrine” is proper only in the very limited circumstances where the “independent source” is *truly independent from both the tainted evidence and the police or investigative team which engaged in the misconduct by which the tainted evidence was discovered.*

637 A.2d at 257–58 (emphasis in original). Applying this rule to the present case, there is no source of the evidence in question that is “truly independent” of either the tainted evidence or the police who engaged in the misconduct. The evidence must, therefore, be suppressed.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court further expounded on the issue of taint from an originally illegal seizure of evidence in *Commonwealth v. Shabazz*, 166 A.3d 278, 289 (Pa. 2017). “The inquiry simply is whether the evidence was obtained via exploitation of the initial illegality.” The Court went on to determine that where an illegal search of a car pursuant to a traffic stop occurred and the defendant fled the scene, there was not a sufficient break in the causal chain between the illegal seizure and the search of the vehicle. *Id.* at 290.

The question before this court is whether the taint from the illegal seizure of the letters has been removed by virtue of returning it to a spouse of the defendant. In other words, has the causal chain between the illegal seizure and the reading of the letter by the alleged victim been broken. This type of question is long-standing. The U.S. Supreme Court held in *Silverthorne Lumber Co. v. U.S.*, 251 U.S. 385 (1920), that the government cannot illegally seize documents and photographs, read and obtain

knowledge from them, return those documents, and then attempt to procure them through legal means. *Id.* at 391-92. However, the Court also recognized that if the knowledge is gained from an independent source, it may be used however “knowledge gained by the Government’s own wrong cannot be used by it.” *Id.* at 392.

Here, there is no question that the original seizure was illegal.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, there is no question that the reading of the letters was illegal and the knowledge gained from reading them cannot be used. However, the record is devoid of any evidence that the Commonwealth used the information gained to direct Defendant’s spouse in any way in her actions of giving the letters to their named recipients nor in the alleged victim reading and ultimately possessing the letter. Accordingly, the sole issue is whether an illegal seizure taints the chain of custody from that point forward or if the actions of an unknown third party removes any taint.

In *Wong Sun v. United States*, 371 U.S. 471 (1963), the United States Supreme Court held that the question of whether evidence from the poisonous tree must be suppressed centers on, if, “granting establishment of the primary illegality, the evidence to which instant objection is made has been come at by exploitation of that illegality or instead by means sufficiently distinguishable to be purged of the primary taint.” *Id.* at 488 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

This court cannot find nor did the parties cite to any cases directly on point regarding illegally seized evidence being returned to a family member of a defendant and whether that is violative of any right – nor was such a right and violation thereof raised by Defendant. There is no doubt that Defendant’s spouse did not illegally seize nor illegally deliver the letter at issue to the alleged victim. Moreover, there can be no doubt that the police returned the letters to a seemingly appropriate individual and the record is devoid of any indication that the police directed or otherwise attempted to use Defendant’s spouse as its agent. Here: (1) the recipient of the evidence was Defendant’s spouse; (2) it is highly probable Defendant’s spouse who was at the home when Defendant was taken by the EMTs would have gone to the bathroom where the alleged suicide was attempted and found the letters at that time if left in place, and then, consistent with her actual actions upon receiving the Letters, given the inculpatory letter to the alleged victim; (3) no police misconduct is deterred from the police department’s return of Defendant’s possessions to Defendant’s wife nor does

---

<sup>2</sup> Presently the Letters were returned to private control, although that is not necessary to remove taint nor dispositive of the issue. *United States v. Herrold*, 962 F.2d 1131, 1143 (3d Cir.1992) is instructive:

The Supreme Court in *Murray* rejected the argument that objects “once seized cannot be cleanly resealed without returning the objects to private control,” 487 U.S. at 541-42, 108 S.Ct. at 2535 (quoting *United States v. Silvestri*, 787 F.2d at 739), and stated that under the independent source doctrine “re-seizure of tangible evidence already seized” is permissible “[s]o long as the later, lawful seizure is genuinely independent of an earlier tainted one.” *Id.* It would be dangerous to require officers to leave a fully-loaded, semi-automatic weapon unsecured until they obtained a warrant, and senseless to require the formality of physically re-seizing the gun already seized during the initial entry. Thus, the only logical implication under *Murray* is that the gun is as admissible under the independent source doctrine as the other, non-dangerous evidence, seen during the initial entry but not seized until the warrant-authorized search.

any caselaw or statute appear to prohibit the return of illegally seized items to a family member; and (4) the taint was removed when the item was returned within the closed envelope without comment by police. Accordingly, this Court finds that the letter addressed to the alleged victim is admissible.

### **3. Motion to Introduce Evidence of Other Acts Pursuant to Pa.R.Evid. [sic] 404(B)**

The Commonwealth on April 12, 2024 filed a Motion to introduce evidence of prior bad acts, among them a 2013 investigation into Defendant's possession of child pornography materials and ultimate conviction thereof. Specifically, Defendant's wife hired a computer repair technician in 2013 to repair Defendant's computer. At that time, there was the discovery of child sexual abuse material (CSAM). The Commonwealth, in searching the premises, found CSAM stored along with the alleged victim's underwear (at that time, the alleged victim was approximately eight years old). Moreover, although the alleged victim denied in 2013 any sexual abuse by Defendant, she now alleges the abuse occurred during that time period.

The governing rule of evidence is Pa.R.E. 404(b). Subsection 1 provides, "Evidence of any other crime, wrong, or act is not admissible to prove a person's character in order to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character." Pa.R.E. 404(b)(1). However, subsection 2 states that "This evidence may be admissible for another purpose, such as proving motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident." Pa.R.E. 404(b)(2). The rule limits itself in providing that "In a criminal case this evidence is admissible only if the probative value of the evidence outweighs its potential for unfair prejudice."

The Commonwealth's Motion contains five parts although some parts are repetitive: (1) that the criminal charges in 2013 would have been subject to joinder with the current charges if the victim had disclosed in 2013 during the initial investigation; (2) that evidence of the Defendant's possession of CSAM and sexual contact with a separate victim ("Victim #2") is necessary to prove intent and to refute a defense of fabrication; (3) evidence of the 2013 investigation is relevant and necessary to evaluate credibility, bias, or motive of witnesses; (4) the Defendant's alleged continued sexual abuse of the victim in Delaware is relevant *res gestae* evidence; and (5) evidence of the Defendant's sexual contact with Victim 2 would be admissible in a trial for others because it demonstrates a common plan or scheme.

For the first argument, that the criminal charges in 2013 should be admitted, the Commonwealth in its Motion argues that the criminal charges ultimately filed from the 2013 investigation would have been subject to joinder pursuant to Pa.R.Crim.P. 582 if the alleged victim had disclosed in her 2013 interview her abuse at that time. However, according to this court's notes, the Commonwealth at oral argument made clear that it intends to introduce only CSAM and the alleged victim's underwear found in proximity and not the conviction due to the dates corresponding with the sexual abuse of the

alleged victim.

The evidence of the alleged victim's underwear in the possession of Defendant next to CSAM clearly evidence potentially indicative of opportunity, motive, preparation, and intent of Defendant. Accordingly, the Commonwealth shall be permitted to introduce evidence that the alleged victim's underwear was found next to CSAM in 2013. See Commonwealth v. Lomax, 8 A.2d 1264 (Pa.Super. 2010) (permitting testimony about prior rubbing against the victim by the Defendant in a rape trial as indicative of escalating course of sexual misconduct directed toward the victim). The exact mechanics of introducing that evidence and limitations on that evidence shall be discussed pre-trial or during trial between the parties and this court.

For its second argument, the Commonwealth argues that the evidence of the CSAM with the alleged victim's underwear from the same time-period would assist the trier of fact in determining Defendant's intentions, mental state, and motive. As discussed above, that evidence is admissible. The Commonwealth further argues that "evidence of his similar contact with the daughter of another paramour would serve to rebut a defense of fabrication and allow the jury to under[stand] the defendant's mental state and intent." Commonwealth's 4/12/2024 Motion, p. 15. The Commonwealth cites to a federal rule of evidence and related federal cases. Specifically, the Commonwealth cites to F.R.E. 414, which provides, "In a criminal case in which a defendant is accused of child molestation, the court may admit evidence that the defendant committed any other child molestation. The evidence may be considered on any matter to which it is relevant." Pennsylvania has not adopted F.R.E. 414; accordingly, we must look to Pennsylvania cases analyzing the admissibility of prior child sexual abuse or molestation in cases involving a different victim of child sexual abuse, generally an analysis conducted pursuant to Pa.R.E. 404.

The Commonwealth does correctly note that, pursuant to Pa.R.Crim.P. 582, cases may be tried together when evidence of each of the offenses would be admissible in a separate trial for the other. Moreover, evidence of each offense is admissible in a trial for others to show intent, absence of mistake or accident, common plan or scheme, or the like. See e.g., Commonwealth v. Donahue, 549 A.2d 121 (Pa. 1988); Commonwealth v. Lark, 543 A.2d 491 (Pa. 1988).

Here, the Defendant's similar sexual conduct includes, without limitation, the contact being with the daughter of a paramour at his Penn Green Road residence at a similar age with hickies being left on the victims. These similarities are sufficient evidence of the motive/intent of Defendant towards the alleged victim as well as a common plan or scheme – namely, identifying a victim that may be more trusting due to his relationship with the victim's mother as well as more controllable through the victim's mother. Allowing this evidence is consistent with Pennsylvania law permitting the joinder of similar cases involving sexual offenses. See e.g., Commonwealth v. Golphin, 161 A.3d 1009 (Pa.Super. 2017), appeal denied, 170 A.3d 1052 (Pa. 2017) (permitting another child's out-of-court statements regarding assaultive conduct as showing a common scheme of abusing children under defendant's care); Commonwealth v. Aikens, 990 A.2d 1181 (Pa.Super. 2010), appeal denied, 4 A.3d 157 (Pa. 2010) (allowing evidence of a defendant's prior sexual abuse of a daughter in a

---

[73 Ches. Co. Rep. **Commonwealth v. Reynolds**

---

case involving a different biological daughter where both victims were of similar age and contact was initiated at defendant's apartment despite the prior victim not being raped because she stopped him from disrobing her); Commonwealth v. O'Brien, 836 A.2d 966 (Pa.Super. 2004), appeal denied 845 A.2d 817 (Pa. 2004) (allowing evidence of prior sexual assaults of children in prosecution of sexual assault of a minor as meeting common scheme, plan, or design exception in that all charges were of sexual assault of young boys with similar characteristics and crimes were not remote in time); Commonwealth v. Smith, 47 A.3d 862 (Pa.Super. 2012) (permitting two alleged rapes to be tried jointly upon a finding that both victims were of similar age, had a close relationship to defendant, were told similar stories by defendant, and happened within a two month period); Commonwealth v. Lively, 231 A.3d 1003 (Pa.Super. 2020) (permitting consolidated trial with two minor victims of rape, unlawful contact, etc. due to the evidence tending to show common design or plan in action as well as the probative value of the evidence outweighing any prejudicial effect). Accordingly, the Commonwealth may introduce evidence regarding the prior victim.

Third, the Commonwealth argues that evidence of the 2013 investigation is relevant and necessary to evaluate the credibility, bias, or motive of the witnesses. Again, the Commonwealth cites to Federal Rules not adopted by Pennsylvania – F.R.E. 413(a), 414(a), and 415(a). However, as correctly noted by the Commonwealth, much of the reasoning for wanting to introduce that evidence may be for impeachment pursuant to Pa.R.E. 607 or 613. As discussed further above, this Court will withhold ruling categorically until testimony and evidence develop at trial. The Commonwealth may not mention or ask questions explicitly about the 2013 investigation; however, if a witness gives a statement inconsistent with prior statements the Commonwealth may be able to impeach. The defense may be able to request a limiting instruction pursuant to Pa. SSJI (Crim) 4.08A unless admitted pursuant to Pa.R.E. 803.1 as substantive evidence.

Fourth, the Commonwealth seeks to admit evidence of Defendant's continued sexual abuse of the victim in Delaware. At oral argument, Defendant conceded this point and that such evidence is admissible.

Fifth, the Commonwealth reiterates its argument that evidence of the Defendant's sexual contact with victim 2 is admissible to demonstrate a common plan or scheme. This is addressed fully as part of the second issue raised by the Commonwealth and addressed by this court and the evidence is admissible.

#### **4. Defendant's Motion in Limine filed January 29, 2024**

On January 29, 2024, Defendant filed a Motion in Limine regarding: (1) a recorded statement by and between Christine Witherspoon Reynolds (Defendant's wife) and Linda Rash; (2) a recorded Statement between Defendant and Gregory Avakian; (3) a recorded conversations between Ava Halpin and Defendant's wife; and (4) reference to Defendant's alleged suicide attempt, previous child pornography conviction, and violation of probation/parole.



For the first and third issues raised involving recordings between Defendant's wife and third parties, this court is unaware of the specifics of the statements within and, accordingly, must withhold ruling until such time as the Commonwealth attempts to introduce any such recording or statement. The court's analysis regarding the general rules of evidence in Section 1 above is incorporated here.

For the second issue concerning an alleged recording between Defendant and Mr. Avakian, it appears that the Commonwealth cannot locate the recording and thus it cannot be used by the Commonwealth. If the recording is located, the parties may renew their proffer and/or objection to such evidence.

For the last issue, as discussed above, the Commonwealth does not seek to introduce evidence of the prior child pornography conviction or violation of probation/parole. However, Defendant's possession of the underwear in connection with CSAM may be admitted as discussed further above. Evidence of Defendant's alleged suicide attempt may be admissible regarding Defendant's state of mind/consciousness of guilt; however, this court reserves ruling until time of trial and to do a further weighing of the prejudicial vs. probative value pursuant to Pa.R.E. 403.



TABLE OF CONTENTS  
LEGAL NOTICES

Orphans' Court Audit List **(1st Publication of 2)**. . . . . 2

Change of Name Notice . . . . . 3

Corporation Notice . . . . . 4

Dissolution Notice . . . . . 4

Estate Notice **1st Publication**. . . . . 4

Estate Notice **2nd Publication**. . . . . 6

Estate Notice **3rd Publication**. . . . . 8

Nonprofit Corporation Notice. . . . . 10

Notice 2024-10877-RC. . . . . 10

Chester County Court of Common Pleas

Orphans' Court Division

CALL OF THE AUDIT LIST

THE HONORABLE NICOLE R. FORZATO COURTROOM 11

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 04, 2025 09:00 AM

ROLLING GREEN MEMORIAL PARK PERPETUAL CARE1505-1659

CALL OF THE AUDIT LIST

FIFTH AND INTERIM ACCOUNTING

NINA B. STRYKER

REGIONS BANK, TRUSTEE

ORSINI ARDMORE15-24-2510

CALL OF THE AUDIT LIST

FIRST AND FINAL ACCOUNTING

ROBERTA A. BARSOTTI

ISABELLA ORSINI, TRUSTEE

GEORGE H. RUARK1599-0925

CALL OF THE AUDIT LIST

FIRST AND FINAL ACCOUNT

KENDRA D. MCGUIRE

INVESTORS TRUST COMPANY  
N/K/A TRUIST BANK, EXECUTOR

NOTICES

*Please note: All legal notices must be submitted in typewritten form and are published exactly as submitted by the advertiser unless otherwise specified. Neither the Law Reporter nor the printer will assume any responsibility to edit, make spelling corrections, eliminate errors in grammar or make any changes in content. The use of the word "solicitor" in the advertisements is taken verbatim from the advertiser's copy and the Law Reporter makes no representation or warranty as to whether the individual or organization listed as solicitor is an attorney or otherwise licensed to practice law. The Law Reporter makes no endorsement of any advertiser in this publication nor is any guarantee given to quality of services offered.*

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CIVIL ACTION

LAW NO. 2024-11715-NC

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the name change petition of Augustine Chea Saydee was filed in the above-named court and will be heard on Friday, June 20, 2025 at 2:00:00 PM, in Courtroom 4 at the Chester County Justice Center, 201 West Market Street, West Chester, Pennsylvania.  
Date of filing the Petition: Friday, December 27, 2024  
Name to be changed from: Augustine Chea Saydee to: J. Duweh Augustine Nah Sr  
Any person interested may appear and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the said petitioner should not be granted.

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CIVIL ACTION

LAW NO. 2025-00396-NC

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the name change petition of Barbara August Walker was filed in the above-named court and will be heard on Tuesday, August 12, 2025 at 3:00:00 PM, in Courtroom 17 at the Chester County Justice Center, 201 West Market Street, West Chester, Pennsylvania.  
Date of filing the Petition: Friday, May 2, 2025  
Name to be changed from: Barbara August Walker to: August Walker  
Any person interested may appear and show cause,

if any they have, why the prayer of the said petitioner should not be granted.

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CIVIL ACTION

LAW NO. 2025-02811-NC

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the name change petition of David Armand Arias was filed in the above-named court and will be heard on Friday, July 18, 2025 at 2:00:00 PM, in Courtroom 11 at the Chester County Justice Center, 201 West Market Street, West Chester, Pennsylvania.  
Date of filing the Petition: Friday, April 4, 2025  
Name to be changed from: David Armand Arias to: David Chechersky Arena  
Any person interested may appear and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the said petitioner should not be granted.

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CIVIL ACTION

LAW NO. 2025-03674-NC

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the name change petition of Derek Binh Thai Dao was filed in the above-named court and will be heard on Tuesday, August 12, 2025 at 3:00:00 PM, in Courtroom 17 at the Chester County Justice Center, 201 West Market Street, West Chester, Pennsylvania.  
Date of filing the Petition: Wednesday, April 30, 2025  
Name to be changed from: Derek Binh Thai Dao to: Binh Thai Dao  
Any person interested may appear and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the said petitioner should not be granted.

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CIVIL ACTION

LAW NO. 2025-03883-NC

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the name change petition of Nicole Morano on behalf of minor child Caleb McCool was filed in the above-named court and will be heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2025 at

3:00:00 PM, in Courtroom 17 at the Chester County Justice Center, 201 West Market Street, West Chester, Pennsylvania.

Date of filing the Petition: Tuesday, May 6, 2025

Name to be changed from: Caleb McCool to: Caleb Morano- McCool

Any person interested may appear and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the said petitioner should not be granted.

ES INC. is currently in the process of voluntarily dissolving.

Fromhold Adams & Jun  
795 East Lancaster Avenue  
Suite 260  
Villanova, PA 19085

---

### CORPORATION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT Articles of Incorporation were filed with and approved by the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on Wednesday, May 7, 2025, effective Wednesday, May 7, 2025 for Joylynn, Inc. in accordance with the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988. The purpose or purposes for which it was organized are: To own and manage real estate and related activities.

JAMIE V. OTTAVIANO, Esquire  
Picardi Philips & Ottaviano  
1129 East High Street, P. O. Box 776  
Pottstown, PA 19464-0776

---

### CORPORATION NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that Articles of Incorporation for a business corporation were filed for **Q5 Strategy, Inc.** with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The registered office address is 54 Sagewood Dr., Malvern, PA 19355-2234 in Chester County. This corporation is incorporated under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988, as amended.

---

### DISSOLUTION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that The Downingtown-Brandywine Group, Ltd., a Pennsylvania Corporation with an address at 1016 Chester Springs Road, Phoenixville, PA 19460 intends to file Articles of Dissolution with the Pennsylvania Department of State and that the Board of Directors is now engaged in winding up and settling the affairs of the corporation so that its corporate existence may be terminated under the provision of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988, as amended.

---

### DISSOLUTION NOTICE

Pursuant to the requirements of section 1975 of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988, notice is hereby given that POLETT ENTERPRIS-

---

### ESTATE NOTICES

*Letters Testamentary or of Administration having been granted in the following Estates, all persons having claims or demands against the estate of the said decedents are requested to make known the same and all persons indebted to the said decedents are requested to make payment without delay to the respective executors, administrators, or counsel.*

#### 1st Publication

**BENNETT**, Barbara R, a/k/a Barbara R Bassett and Barbara R. Rittenhouse, late of Malvern. Cindee Leigh Dove, 25 Landmark Drive, Malvern Pa 19355, care of CARRIE WOODY, Esquire, 110 West Front Street, Media, PA 19063, Executrix. CARRIE WOODY, Esquire, Woody Law Offices, PC, 110 West Front Street, Media, PA 19063, atty.

**BLAKE**, John P., late of Tredyffrin Township. Tracy Blake DeVlieger, 1275 Drummers Ln., Ste. 210, Wayne, PA 19087-1571, care of TRACY BLAKE DeVLIEGER, Esquire, 1275 Drummers Ln., Ste. 210, Wayne, PA 19087-1571, Executrix. TRACY BLAKE DeVLIEGER, Esquire, Gadsden Schneider & Woodward LLP, 1275 Drummers Ln., Ste. 210, Wayne, PA 19087-1571, atty.

**BOMBERGER, JR.**, John D., a/k/a John David Bomberger, Jr., late of Birmingham Township. Wendy L. Bomberger, care of ANYLISE C. CROUTH-AMEL, Esquire, 120 Gay Street, P.O. Box 289, Phoenixville, PA 19460, Executrix. ANYLISE C. CROUTHAMEL, Esquire, Unruh, Turner, Burke & Frees, P.C., 120 Gay Street, P.O. Box 289, Phoenixville, PA 19460, atty.

**BOYER**, Thomas Roland, a/k/a Thomas R. Boyer, Jr. and Thomas R. Boyer, late of West Whiteland Township. William C. Boyer, Sr., care of MARK S. DANЕК, Esquire, 100 Four Falls Corporate Center, Ste. 1-210, West Conshohocken, PA 19428, Administrator CTA. MARK S. DANЕК, Esquire, Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP, 100 Four Falls Corporate Center, Ste. 1-210, West Conshohocken, PA 19428, atty.

**BROWN**, Maxine Jeannine, late of West

Whiteland. William B. Phillips, Sr., 301 Kent Circle, Downingtown, PA 19335 and Amy A. Phillips, 301 Kent Circle, Downingtown, PA 19335, care of WILLIAM T. KEEN, Esquire, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, Executors. WILLIAM T. KEEN, Esquire, Keen Keen & Good, LLC, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, atty.

**CHANNELL**, Peggy Elaine, a/k/a Peggy E. Channell, late of London Grove Township. Amy L. Hunter, 332 Mourning Dove Dr., Newark, DE 19711, care of KRISTEN R. MATTHEWS, Esquire, 14 E. Welsh Pool Rd., Exton, PA 19341, Executrix. KRISTEN R. MATTHEWS, Esquire, Kristen Matthews Law, 14 E. Welsh Pool Rd., Exton, PA 19341, atty.

**CONNOR-GARAND**, Kathleen F., late of East Bradford Township. Sean P. Wajert, care of RONALD J. GORDON, Esquire, Noble Plaza, 801 Old York Rd., Ste. 313, Jenkintown, PA 19046, Executor. RONALD J. GORDON, Esquire, Ronald J. Gordon, P.C., Noble Plaza, 801 Old York Rd., Ste. 313, Jenkintown, PA 19046, atty.

**CROFTS**, Michael O, a/k/a Michael Crofts, late of Uwchlan Township. Maureen Crofts, 105 South Village Avenue, Exton, PA 19341, care of DEIRDRE A. AGNEW, Esquire, 1450 East Boot Road, Building 400A, West Chester, PA 19380, Executrix. DEIRDRE A. AGNEW, Esquire, Law Offices of Deirdre A. Agnew, 1450 East Boot Road, Building 400A, West Chester, PA 19380, atty.

**D'AMBROSIO**, Anthony L., late of East Goshen Township. Denise Legenstein, care of ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355-1419, Executrix. ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, Wisler Pearlstone, LLP, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355-1419, atty.

**DALY**, Maartje Johanna, late of West Whiteland Township. Paul R. Daly, care of DOUGLAS L. KAUNE, Esquire, 120 Gay Street, P.O. Box 289, Phoenixville, PA 19460, Executor. DOUGLAS L. KAUNE, Esquire, Unruh, Turner, Burke & Frees, P.C., 120 Gay Street, P.O. Box 289, Phoenixville, PA 19460, atty.

**DUNLEVY**, Bernard Matthew, a/k/a Bernard M. Dunlevy and B. Matthew Dunlevy, late of East Marlboro Township. Nicholas B. Dunlevy, care of CAROLINA R. HEINLE, Esquire, 724 Yorklyn Rd., Ste. 100, Hockessin, DE 19707, Administrator CTA. CAROLINA R. HEINLE, Esquire, MacElree Harvey, LTD., 724 Yorklyn Rd., Ste. 100, Hockessin, DE 19707, atty.

**ESPOSITO**, Shirley A., a/k/a Shirley Ann Es-

posito, late of East Pikeland Township. Daniel Franz, 832 Chase Lane, Chester Springs, PA 19425, care of SUZANNE BENDER, Esquire, 216 Bridge Street, Phoenixville, PA 19460, Administrator. SUZANNE BENDER, Esquire, 216 Bridge Street, Phoenixville, PA 19460, atty.

**GALLAGHER**, Patricia C., late of Westtown Township. Nickolas Lodato, care of PHILIP G. CURTIN, Esquire, 1231 Lancaster Ave., Berwyn, PA 19312, Executor. PHILIP G. CURTIN, Esquire, Philips, Curtin & DiGiacomo, 1231 Lancaster Ave., Berwyn, PA 19312, atty.

**KOBLE**, Dorothea B., a/k/a Dorothea B. Sykes, late of Downingtown. Hope R. Moldenhauer, care of BARRY S. RABIN, Esquire, 797 E. Lancaster Avenue Suite 13, Downingtown, PA 19335, Personal Representative. BARRY S. RABIN, Esquire, The Law Firm of Barry S. Rabin, 797 E. Lancaster Avenue Suite 13, Downingtown, PA 19335, atty.

**MADDEN**, Thomas S., a/k/a Thomas Madden, late of Willistown Township. Anthony D. Madden, care of IAN W. PELTZMAN, Esquire, 716 N. Bethlehem Pike, Ste. 303, Lower Gwynedd, PA 19002, Administrator DBN-CTA. IAN W. PELTZMAN, Esquire, Law Office of Andrew B. Peltzman, 716 N. Bethlehem Pike, Ste. 303, Lower Gwynedd, PA 19002, atty.

**MALLALIEU**, Kathryn D., late of New Garden Township. Donna Stack, care of JENNIFER ABRACHT, Esquire, 610 Millers Hill, P.O. Box 96, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Executor. JENNIFER ABRACHT, Esquire, Perna & Abracht, LLC, 610 Millers Hill, P.O. Box 96, Kennett Square, PA 19348, atty.

**MOLL**, Dorene E, late of Downingtown. Maureen A. Moll, care of KEVIN S. FRANKEL, Esquire, 150 N. Radnor Chester Rd., Suite F200, Radnor, PA 19087, Executrix. KEVIN S. FRANKEL, Esquire, Fiffik Law Group, 150 N. Radnor Chester Rd., Suite F200, Radnor, PA 19087, atty.

**REITER**, Elaine, late of Honey Brook. Kathleen Hardy, 107 Sunrise Drive, Pottstown, PA 19465, care of JAMES S. TUPITZA, Esquire, 212 W Gay Street, West Chester, PA 19380, Executrix. JAMES S. TUPITZA, Esquire, Tupitza & Associates, 212 W Gay Street, West Chester, PA 19380, atty.

**RIEG**, Florence, late of Schuylkill Township. John B. Rieg, 1333 Nathan Hae Drive, Phoenixville PA 19460, care of SUZANNE BENDER, Esquire, 216 Bridge Street, Phoenixville PA 19460, Executor. SUZANNE BENDER, Esquire, 216 Bridge Street,

Phoenixville PA 19460, atty.

**SALATINO**, Judy, a/k/a Judy A. Salatino, late of Londonderry Township. Camille Schaller, care of DANIEL R. COLEMAN, Esquire, 300 W. State St., Ste. 300, Media, PA 19063, Executrix. DANIEL R. COLEMAN, Esquire, Eckell, Sparks, Levy, Auerbach, Monte, Sloane, Matthews & Auslander, P.C., 300 W. State St., Ste. 300, Media, PA 19063, atty.

**STUCHELL**, Robert Wade, a/k/a Robert W. Stuchell and Robert Stuchell, late of Tredyffrin Township. Lisa Kahan, care of CAROL R. LIVINGOOD, Esquire, 130 W. Lancaster Ave., Wayne, PA 19087-0191, Executrix. CAROL R. LIVINGOOD, Esquire, Timoney Knox LLP, 130 W. Lancaster Ave., Wayne, PA 19087-0191, atty.

**TOMKINS**, Maria, a/k/a Maria B Tomkins, late of Chesterbrook. David Newman, 111 Dillons Lane, Mullica Hill, NJ 08062, and Roseann Newman, 111 Dillons Lane, Mullica Hill, NJ 08062, Executor.

**VILCHECK**, Anna, a/k/a Anna A. Vilcheck, late of West Chester. Karen A. Vilcheck, 629 Copeland School Rd, West Chester, PA 19380, Executrix.

**WAGNER**, Stephen K, late of West Chester. Jennifer H Wagner, 395 S Vine St, Denver, CO 80209, Executor.

**WHITE**, Richard G., late of Willistown Township. Mary Anne DiMarco, care of ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355-1419, Executrix. ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, Wisler Pearlstine, LLP, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355-1419, atty.

**YOCOM**, Carol Elizabeth Clay, a/k/a Lisa Yocom and Carol C. Yocom, late of North Coventry Township. Kimberly Ann Yocom, care of JOSEPH A. BELLINGHERI, Esquire, 17 W. Miner St., West Chester, PA 19382, Executrix. JOSEPH A. BELLINGHERI, Esquire, MacElree Harvey, LTD., 17 W. Miner St., West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

## 2nd Publication

**BAYLES**, Carol J., late of Caln Township. Steven E. Bayles, care of ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355, Executor. ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, Wisler Pearlstine, LLP, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355, atty.

**BELL**, Jane Maier, late of Westtown Township. Michael Bell, 732 Brighton Circle, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Executor.

**BERNDT**, Helen G., late of Kennett Township.

Joe C. Berndt, care of CAROLINA R. HEINLE, Esquire, 724 Yorklyn Rd., Ste. 100, Hockessin, DE 19707, Executor. CAROLINA R. HEINLE, Esquire, MacElree Harvey, LTD., 724 Yorklyn Rd., Ste. 100, Hockessin, DE 19707, atty.

**BESWICK**, Margaret Marie, a/k/a Margaret Beswick, late of West Goshen Township. Wayne Beswick, care of APRIL L. CHARLESTON, Esquire, 60 W. Boot Rd., Ste. 201, West Chester, PA 19380, Executor. APRIL L. CHARLESTON, Esquire, The Charleston Firm, 60 W. Boot Rd., Ste. 201, West Chester, PA 19380, atty.

**BOWMAN**, Jean Clarice, a/k/a Jean C. Bowman, late of Charlestown Township. Thomas J. Collins, care of HANNAH E. TRAVAGLINI, Esquire, 30 S. 17th St., Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196, Executor. HANNAH E. TRAVAGLINI, Esquire, Duane Morris LLP, 30 S. 17th St., Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196, atty.

**BRACELAND**, William Donald, late of West Chester Borough. Rosemary C. Braceland, care of ANTHONY MORRIS, Esquire, 118 W. Market Street, Suite 300, West Chester, Pennsylvania 19382-2928, Executor. ANTHONY MORRIS, Esquire, Buckley Brion McGuire & Morris LLP, 118 W. Market Street, Suite 300, West Chester, Pennsylvania 19382-2928, atty.

**BRAY**, Doris Jane, a/k/a Steinmetz, late of Downingtown. Laura Harting, 301 Brookwood Drive, Downingtown, PA 19335, and Catherine Donohue, 5339 Lake Drive, East Petersburg, PA 17520, Executrices.

**CIPOLLINI**, John M, a/k/a John Cipollini, late of Caln Township. Gina C. Driscoll, 1329 Dunsinane Drive, West Chester, PA 19380, care of ROSANA I. CHIPLE, Esquire, 158 W. Gay St, Ste 204, West Chester, PA 19380, Executrix. ROSANA I. CHIPLE, Esquire, Fink and Buchanan Law Offices, LLC, 158 W. Gay St, Ste 204, West Chester, PA 19380, atty.

**DENMAN**, Robert A, late of East Caln Township. Jessica C. Knowles, care of RICK MORTON, Esquire, 999 West Chester Pike, Suite 201, West Chester, PA 19382, Executrix. RICK MORTON, Esquire, Ryan Morton & Imms LLC, 999 West Chester Pike, Suite 201, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**FEDYK**, Iwanna H, late of Kennett Square. Julia F Szyszka, 463 Banewood Cir, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Executrix.

**FREY**, Helen Anne, a/k/a Helen A. Frey, late of Willistown Township. Stephanie Frey Robinson and Veronica Frey Fenerty, care of CHRISTOPHER M.

BROWN, Esquire, 1240 West Chester Pike, Ste. 210, West Chester, PA 19382, Executrices. CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN, Esquire, Law Offices of Christopher M. Brown, PLLC, 1240 West Chester Pike, Ste. 210, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**GRAHAM**, Lisa Marie, late of Tredyffrin Township. John R. Scott, care of EDWARD N. FLAIL, JR., Esquire, 10 Harrow Circle, Wayne, PA 19087, Administrator. EDWARD N. FLAIL, JR., Esquire, 10 Harrow Circle, Wayne, PA 19087, atty.

**HARTZELL**, George Richard, a/k/a G. Richard Hartzell, late of East Goshen Township. Nancy H. McIntyre and Richard M. Hartzell, care of GUY F. MATTHEWS, Esquire, 300 W. State St., Ste. 300, Media, PA 19063, Executors. GUY F. MATTHEWS, Esquire, Eckell, Sparks, Levy, Auerbach, Monte, Sloane, Matthews & Auslander, P.C., 300 W. State St., Ste. 300, Media, PA 19063, atty.

**HORVATH**, Judith P., late of East Goshen Township. Justina King, care of SARAH M. FORD, Esquire, 585 Skippack Pike, Ste. 100, Blue Bell, PA 19422, Executrix. SARAH M. FORD, Esquire, Ford and Buckman, PC, 585 Skippack Pike, Ste. 100, Blue Bell, PA 19422, atty.

**KILBURN**, Joan G., late of Penn Township. Jose L. Galvez, III, care of CAROLINA R. HEINLE, Esquire, 724 Yorklyn Rd., Ste. 100, Hockessin, DE 19707, Executor. CAROLINA R. HEINLE, Esquire, MacElree Harvey, LTD., 724 Yorklyn Rd., Ste. 100, Hockessin, DE 19707, atty.

**KRATZ**, Michael R., late of Uwchlan Township. Robert J. Kratz, care of ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355, Executor. ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, Wisler Pearlstine, LLP, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355, atty.

**LUCINE**, Mary Jane, a/k/a Mary J. Lucine, late of Pennsbury Township. Elizabeth Jane Trostle, care of NICOLE B. LABLETTA, Esquire, 16 Industrial Blvd., Ste. 211, Paoli, PA 19301, Executrix. NICOLE B. LABLETTA, Esquire, Ruggiero Law Offices LLC, 16 Industrial Blvd., Ste. 211, Paoli, PA 19301, atty.

**McNAMARA**, Diane, late of Lincoln University. Dylan P. Hastings and Melissa Hastings, care of MICHAEL R. PERNA, Esquire, 610 Millers Hill, P.O. Box 96, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Co-Executors. MICHAEL R. PERNA, Esquire, Perna & Abracht, LLC, 610 Millers Hill, P.O. Box 96, Kennett Square, PA 19348, atty.

**MISLICK**, Kurt David, late of Downingtown, Uwchlan Township. Susan M. Mislick, 703 Dover

Court Place, Downingtown, PA 19335, Administrator.

**OVERHOLSER**, Renee V., late of Pennsbury Township. Charles E. Overholser, Margaret O. Fox and George M. Overholser, care of L. PETER TEMPLE, Esquire, P.O. Box 384, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Co-Executors. L. PETER TEMPLE, Esquire, Larmore Scarlett, LLP, P.O. Box 384, Kennett Square, PA 19348, atty.

**PAGAN-MATOS**, Vicente, late of West Chester Borough. Josepha Pagan, care of KRISTEN L. BEHRENS, Esquire, 1650 Market St., Ste. 1200, Philadelphia, PA 19103, Administratrix. KRISTEN L. BEHRENS, Esquire, Dilworth Paxson LLP, 1650 Market St., Ste. 1200, Philadelphia, PA 19103, atty.

**POST**, Marjorie D., late of City of Landenberg. L. Peter Temple, care of L. PETER TEMPLE, Esquire, P.O. Box 384, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Executor. L. PETER TEMPLE, Esquire, Larmore Scarlett LLP, P.O. Box 384, Kennett Square, PA 19348, atty.

**RASER**, Annie M., a/k/a Annie Marie Raser, late of East Nottingham Township. David Raser, care of WINIFRED MORAN SEBASTIAN, Esquire, PO Box 381, Oxford, PA 19363, Administrator. WINIFRED MORAN SEBASTIAN, Esquire, PO Box 381, Oxford, PA 19363, atty.

**RUCH**, Roger Dean, late of West Chester. Jason S. Ruch, care of TRACEY A. SHREVE, Esquire, 123 North Fifth Street, Allentown, PA 18102, Executor. TRACEY A. SHREVE, Esquire, The Roth Law Firm, 123 North Fifth Street, Allentown, PA 18102, atty.

**SCOTT**, David T., a/k/a Miranda Duffy, late of Malvern Borough. Joshua Scott, 1331 Phoenixville Pike, West Chester, PA 19380 and Courtney Coffman, 101 Pine Drive, Phoenixville, PA 19460, care of GREGORY A. BARONI, Esquire, 13 E. Central Ave., First Floor, Paoli, PA 19301, Executors. GREGORY A. BARONI, Esquire, 13 E. Central Ave., First Floor, Paoli, PA 19301, atty.

**SHIPMAN**, Bert, late of Uwchlan Township. Emily Tarkington and Lisa Hendricks, care of ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355, Executrices. ANDREW H. DOHAN, Esquire, Wisler Pearlstine, LLP, 45 Liberty Blvd., Ste. 230, Malvern, PA 19355, atty.

**SIVERTSEN**, Herbert Paul, a/k/a H. Paul Sivertsen and Herbert P. Sivertsen, late of Malvern, East Whiteland Township. Lauren Sivertsen, care of VINCENT CAROSELLA, JR., Esquire, 882 S. Matlack St, Suite 101, West Chester, PA 19382, Executrix.



VINCENT CAROSELLA, JR., Esquire, Carosella & Associates, P.C., 882 S. Matlack St, Suite 101, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**SLAYTON**, Darryl L, a/k/a Darryl Leonard Slayton, late of West Whiteland Township. Donna E. Slayton, care of RICK MORTON, Esquire, 999 West Chester Pike, Suite 201, West Chester, PA 19382, Executrix. RICK MORTON, Esquire, Ryan Morton & Imms LLC, 999 West Chester Pike, Suite 201, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**SPIECE**, Joan E., late of Spring City. Marie Casey, 598 Main Street, Red Hill, PA 18076, care of CHRISTOPHER MULLANEY, Esquire, 598 Main Street, Red Hill, PA 18076, Executrix. CHRISTOPHER MULLANEY, Esquire, Mullaney Law Offices, 598 Main Street, Red Hill, PA 18076, atty.

### 3rd Publication

**ALLEN**, Walter Bradley, late of East Marlborough Township. John Bradley Allen, care of JOSEPH A. BELLINGHERI, Esquire, 17 W. Miner St., West Chester, PA 19382, Executor. JOSEPH A. BELLINGHERI, Esquire, MacElree Harvey, LTD., 17 W. Miner St., West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**BELL**, Betty P, late of Easttown Township. Timothy S Bell, 317 Virginia Ave, Collingswood, NJ, 08108, Executor.

**BLANDO**, Dean Edward, late of Coatesville. Erin Keough, 157 Rainbow Rd., Coatesville, PA 19320, Administrator.

**COLMENAR**, Marcela, late of Downingtown. Anne Guntz, 503 Crestwood Lane, Downingtown, PA, 19335, Executor.

**DABBACK**, Ruth Ann, a/k/a Ruthann Dabback, late of Phoenixville Borough. John D. Funk, care of WILLIAM B. COOPER, III, Esquire, P.O. Box 673, Exton, PA 19341-0673, Executor. WILLIAM B. COOPER, III, Esquire, Fox Rothschild LLP, P.O. Box 673, Exton, PA 19341-0673, atty.

**DOBRA**, Michael J., late of West Goshen Township. Lee A. Murray, 1131 Nottingham Drive, West Chester, PA 19380, care of WILLIAM T. KEEN, Esquire, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, Executor. WILLIAM T. KEEN, Esquire, Keen Keen & Good, LLC, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, atty.

**DOUMIT**, Jamal M., late of City of Coatesville. Ghada Doumit, 1305 E. Lincoln Highway, Coatesville, PA 19320, care of GORDON W. GOOD, Esquire, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372,

Executor. GORDON W. GOOD, Esquire, Keen Keen & Good, LLC, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, atty.

**EARLE**, Roberta Dian, a/k/a/ Roberta Earle, late of Tredyffrin Township. Stephen D. Potts, Strafford Office Bldg. #2, 200 Eagle Rd., Ste. 106, Wayne, PA 19087-3115, care of STEPHEN D. POTTS, Esquire, Strafford Office Bldg. #2, 200 Eagle Rd., Ste. 106, Wayne, PA 19087-3115, Executor. STEPHEN D. POTTS, Esquire, Herr, Potts & Potts, LLC, Strafford Office Bldg. #2, 200 Eagle Rd., Ste. 106, Wayne, PA 19087-3115, atty.

**GETTINGS**, Thomas A., a/k/a Thomas Austin Gettings, late of Borough of West Chester. Margaret A. Gettings, 206 N. Penn Street, West Chester, PA 19380, care of FRANK W. HAYES, Esquire, 31 South High Street, West Chester, PA 19382, Executrix. FRANK W. HAYES, Esquire, Hayes & Romero, 31 South High Street, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**GIBBONS**, Nancy C., a/k/a Ann C. Gibbons, late of Malvern Borough. Ann Marie Gibbons Davis and Mary Lourdes Gibbons, care of EMILY C. WATKINS, Esquire, 126 East King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602, Executors. EMILY C. WATKINS, Esquire, Barley Snyder LLP, 126 East King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602, atty.

**GRANT**, Dianne, a/k/a Diann Grant and Dianne Myers Grant, late of City of Coatesville. Seneca Lambert, 130 Glenrose Road, Coatesville, PA 19320, care of GORDON W. GOOD, Esquire, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, Executor. GORDON W. GOOD, Esquire, Keen Keen & Good, LLC, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, atty.

**HANDY**, Wayne Jackson, late of Devon, Tredyffrin Township. Meredith Brunel, 295 Forest Hills Circle, Devon, PA 19333, Executrix.

**HARLAN**, Bruce T., a/k/a Bruce Theodore Harlan, late of West Caln Township. Melanie Harlan, 151 Telegraph Rd., Coatesville, PA 19320, care of DENNIS C. VONDRAN, JR., Esquire, 24 E. Market St., P.O. Box 565, West Chester, PA 19381-0565, Executrix. DENNIS C. VONDRAN, JR., Esquire, Lamb McErlane, PC, 24 E. Market St., P.O. Box 565, West Chester, PA 19381-0565, atty.

**HEEBNER**, Susan C., late of City of Landenberg. Amy Heebner Davis, care of DONALD B. LYNN, JR., Esquire, P.O. Box 384, Kennett Square, PA 19348, Executrix. DONALD B. LYNN, JR., Esquire, Larmore Scarlett LLP, P.O. Box 384, Kennett Square, PA 19348, atty.

**HOCZOK**, Linda Sue, late of West Chester Bor-



ough. Sandra Kinderman, care of W. MARSHALL PEARSON, Esquire, 311 Exton Commons, Exton, PA 19341-2450, Executor. W. MARSHALL PEARSON, Esquire, 311 Exton Commons, Exton, PA 19341-2450, atty.

**JONES**, Joy A., late of Downingtown Borough. Linda Munzenmayer, care of VINCENT CAROSELLA, JR., Esquire, 882 S Matlack Street, Suite 101, West Chester, PA 19382, Executrix. VINCENT CAROSELLA, JR., Esquire, Carosella & Associates, P.C., 882 S Matlack Street, Suite 101, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**KEEFER**, Esther S., late of Uwchlan Township. James D. Savage and Deborah L. Croft, care of EMILY C. WATKINS, Esquire, 126 East King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602, Executors. EMILY C. WATKINS, Esquire, Barley Snyder LLP, 126 East King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602, atty.

**KNOX**, John E., late of East Goshen Township. Charles E. Knox, care of ROBERT E. O'CONNOR, Esquire, 341 West State Street, Media, PA 19063, Executor. ROBERT E. O'CONNOR, Esquire, 341 West State Street, Media, PA 19063, atty.

**KOZAK, SR.**, David A., late of West Whiteland Township. Kimberly Gouker, 204 Maplewood Dr., Phoenixville, PA 19460, care of ELIZABETH D. LUBKER, Esquire, 390 Waterloo Blvd., Ste. 210, Exton, PA 19341, Executrix. ELIZABETH D. LUBKER, Esquire, Lubker Ostien Law, LLC, 390 Waterloo Blvd., Ste. 210, Exton, PA 19341, atty.

**KUCH**, Brian D., late of West Brandywine Township. Michael Kuch, 248 Hill Rd., Honey Brook PA 19344, care of MAUREEN A. OSTIEN, Esquire, 390 Waterloo Blvd., Ste. 210, Exton, PA 19341, Executor. MAUREEN A. OSTIEN, Esquire, Lubker Ostien Law LLC, 390 Waterloo Blvd., Ste. 210, Exton, PA 19341, atty.

**McALARY**, Matthew J., late of East Goshen Township. Jennifer Lynne McAlary, care of NANCY W. PINE, Esquire, 104 S. Church St., West Chester, PA 19382, Administratrix. NANCY W. PINE, Esquire, Pine & Pine, LLP, 104 S. Church St., West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**McALEER**, Eileen Nora, late of West Goshen Township. Kathleen M. McAleer, care of CHRISTOPHER M. MURPHY, Esquire, 3305 Edgmont Ave., Brookhaven, PA 19015, Executrix. CHRISTOPHER M. MURPHY, Esquire, Breslin Murphy & Roberts, 3305 Edgmont Ave., Brookhaven, PA 19015, atty.

**NODLER**, Karen Elizabeth, a/k/a Karen E. Mac-turk Cook, late of Uwchlan Township. Dean M.

Nodler, 4402 Franklin Court, Chester Springs, PA 19425, Administrator.

**O'DONNELL**, Jean M., late of East Goshen Township. Donna O'Donnell DiFlavis, care of CARRIE A. S. KENNEDY, Esquire, 171 W. Lancaster Ave., Paoli, PA 19301, Executrix. CARRIE A. S. KENNEDY, Esquire, Connor, Weber & Oberlies, 171 W. Lancaster Ave., Paoli, PA 19301, atty.

**PEFFLE**, Robert S., late of Phoenixville Borough. Allison R. Peffle, 520 Ringold St., Phoenixville, PA 19460-4350, care of ALBERT R. RIVIEZZO, Esquire, P.O. Box 673, Exton, PA 19341-0673, Administratrix. ALBERT R. RIVIEZZO, Esquire, Fox Rothschild LLP, P.O. Box 673, Exton, PA 19341-0673, atty.

**POWALSKI**, Rosemarie Veronica, a/k/a Rosemarie V. Powalski and Rosemarie Powalski, late of Pennsbury Township. Gregory D. Powalski, care of P. KRISTEN BENNETT, Esquire, 3711 Kennett Pike, Ste. 100, Wilmington, DE 19807, Executor. P. KRISTEN BENNETT, Esquire, Gawthrop Greenwood, PC, 3711 Kennett Pike, Ste. 100, Wilmington, DE 19807, atty.

**PROCTOR**, Henry James, a/k/a Jim Proctor, late of East Nottingham. Dana P Simpson, PO Box 59, Oxford, PA 19390, care of GARY HEIM, Esquire, 2000 Linglestown Rd, Ste 202, Harrisburg, PA 17110, Executrix. GARY HEIM, Esquire, Hazen Law Group LLC, 2000 Linglestown Rd, Ste 202, Harrisburg, PA 17110, atty.

**RUDIBAUGH**, John Wayne, a/k/a John W. Rudibaugh, late of Birmingham Township. Doris I. Rudibaugh, care of STEPHEN J. OLSEN, Esquire, 17 E. Gay St., Ste. 100, West Chester, PA 19380, Executrix. STEPHEN J. OLSEN, Esquire, Gawthrop Greenwood, PC, 17 E. Gay St., Ste. 100, West Chester, PA 19380, atty.

**SCHULTZ**, Susan L., a/k/a Susan Lindenberg and Susan Schwer, late of Exton. Jessica Lindenberg, 322 Wharton Drive, Newark, DE 19711, Executrix.

**SCOTT**, Leona M., a/k/a Leona May Scott, late of East Coventry Township. Debra L. Werner and Lenard Michael Sygnet, care of MICHELLE M. FORSELL, Esquire, 570 Main Street, Pennsburg, PA 18073, Co-Administrators. MICHELLE M. FORSELL, Esquire, Crosson & Richetti, LLC, 570 Main Street, Pennsburg, PA 18073, atty.

**SGAVICCHIO**, Margaret Carmella, a/k/a Margaret C. Sgavicchio, late of West Chester Borough. John J. Sgavicchio, Jr., 206 3rd Avenue, Murray Manor, Wilmington, DE 19808, care of GORDON

W. GOOD, Esquire, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, Executor. GORDON W. GOOD, Esquire, Keen Keen & Good, LLC, 3460 Lincoln Highway, Thorndale, PA 19372, atty.

**WERKHEISER**, George Franklin, late of East Goshen Township. Robert Edward Werkheiser, care of LISA COMBER HALL, Esquire, 27 S Darlington Street, West Chester, PA 19382, Executor. LISA COMBER HALL, Esquire, Hall Law Offices, PC, 27 S Darlington Street, West Chester, PA 19382, atty.

**WILSON**, Carolyn W., late of East Brandywine Township. Diane Salvino & Donna Kelly, 209 Pinkerton Rd., Coatesville, PA 19320, care of CYNTHIA L. DENGLE, Esquire, 484 Norristown Rd., Ste. 124, Blue Bell, PA 19422, Executrices. CYNTHIA L. DENGLE, Esquire, Murphy & Dengler, 124, Blue Bell, PA 19422, atty.

**WOODWARD**, Michael Joseph, a/k/a Michael Woodward, late of Easttown Twp.. Kathleen Woodward, care of JOHN R. LUNDY, Esquire, 450 N. Narberth Ave., Suite 200, Narberth, PA 19072, Executrix. JOHN R. LUNDY, Esquire, Lundy Beldecos & Milby, PC, 450 N. Narberth Ave., Suite 200, Narberth, PA 19072, atty.

**NONPROFIT CORPORATION NOTICE**

*NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that an application was made to the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, for the purpose of obtaining a charter of a Nonprofit Corporation which was organized under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Nonprofit Corporation Law of 1988.*

The name of the corporation is Millstone Meadows Community Association, Inc..  
Articles of Incorporation were filed on Thursday, May 1, 2025.

**NOTICE**

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF  
CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CIVIL DIVISION**

**NO: 2024-10877-RC**

**US BANK TRUST NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,  
NOT IN ITS INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY BUT  
SOLELY AS OWNER TRUSTEE FOR VRMTG**

**ASSET TRUST vs. AMYIA MCCARTHY,**

**NOTICE**

**TO THE DEFENDANTS:**

You are hereby notified US Bank Trust National Association, Not In Its Individual Capacity But Solely As Owner Trustee For VRMTG Asset Trust, has filed a Complaint in Mortgage Foreclosure with regard to 403 Saginaw Road, Lincoln University, PA 19352, endorsed with a Notice to Defend, against you at No. 2024-10877-RC in the Civil Division of the Court of Common Pleas of Chester County, Pennsylvania, wherein plaintiff seeks to foreclose on the mortgage encumbering said property, which foreclosure would lead to a public sale by the Chester County Sheriff.

If you wish to defend, you must enter a written appearance personally or by attorney and file your defenses or objections in writing with the court. You are warned that if you fail to do so the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you without further notice for the relief requested by the plaintiff. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you.

YOU SHOULD TAKE THIS PAPER TO YOUR LAWYER AT ONCE. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A LAWYER, GO TO OR TELEPHONE THE OFFICE SET FORTH BELOW. THIS OFFICE CAN PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT HIRING A LAWYER.

IF YOU CANNOT AFFORD TO HIRE A LAWYER, THIS OFFICE MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT AGENCIES THAT MAY OFFER LEGAL SERVICES TO ELIGIBLE PERSONS AT A REDUCED FEE OR NO FEE.

Chester County Lawyer Referral Service  
Chester County Bar Association  
15 W. Gay Street, 2nd Floor  
West Chester, PA 19381-3191  
(610) 429-1500

PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY:  
STEPHEN M. HLADIK, ESQUIRE  
HLADIK, ONORATO & FEDERMAN, LLP  
298 WISSAHICKON AVENUE  
NORTH WALES, PA 19454, (215) 855-9521