

# Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 63

January 14, 2022

No. 37, pp. 88-97

## IN THIS ISSUE

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA VS.  
WESLEY LEE CHANCE, JR.

# Invest with Experience.

The right financial partner will help you plan for the future and manage investments with you and your family's best interests first and foremost. No need to look further...you've found the right partner at ACNB Bank.

Securities and Insurance Products are: NOT FDIC INSURED - MAY LOSE VALUE - NOT BANK GUARANTEED - NOT A DEPOSIT - NOT INSURED BY ANY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTITY



ADAMS COUNTY LEGAL JOURNAL (USPS 542-600)

Designated for the Publication of Court and other Legal Notices. Published weekly by Adams County Bar Association, Edward G. Puhl, Esq., Editor and Business Manager.

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

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

All rights reserved.

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 Littlestown, PA 17340, between the hours of 1:00 and 2:00 pm on January 15, 2022 to elect directors and to transact any other business properly presented.

Attest: Scott A. Hawk Secretary

12/24, 12/31, 1/7, & 1/14

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
CASE NO. D-21-634467-D
DEPT. G
SUMMONS

EVELIO OCAMPO ACEVES, Plaintiff

vs.

MARTINA ROMERO, Defendant

NOTICE! YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. THE COURT MAY DECIDE AGAINST YOU WITHOUT YOUR BEING HEARD UNLESS YOU RESPOND IN WRITING WITHIN 21 DAYS. READ THE INFORMATION BELOW VERY CAREFULLY.

To the Defendant named above:

The Plaintiff has filed a civil complaint or petition against you. Read the document (or get a copy at the court listed above) to find out the specific relief requested. The subject of this case is: (checkbox check one)

- Divorce
Annulment
Legal Separation
Custody, Paternity, Visitation, and/or Child Support
Other:

If you want to defend this lawsuit, you must do all of the following within 21 days after this summons is served on you (not counting the day of service):

- 1. File a formal written answer to the complaint or petition with the Clerk of Court (whose address is listed below).
2. Pay the required filing fee to the court, or request a fee waiver by filing an Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis.

3. Serve a copy of your answer on the Plaintiff whose name and address is shown below.

If you do not respond, Plaintiff can request a default against you. The court can then enter a judgment against you for the relief demanded in the complaint or petition.

By: /s/Pam Woolery
Date: 9/16/2021

Family Courts and Services Center
601 North Pecos Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
Regional Justice Center
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

Issued on Behalf of Plaintiff:
Evelio Ocampo Aceves
263 Gray Granite Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89123

12/24, 12/31, 1/7, & 1/14

NOTICE BY THE ADAMS COUNTY CLERK OF COURTS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to all heirs, legatees and other persons concerned that the following account with statements of proposed distribution filed therewith have been filed in the Office of Adams County Clerk of Courts and will be presented to the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County-Orphans' Court, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, for confirmation of accounts entering decrees of distribution on 01/21/2022 at 8:30 a.m.

CONNELLY —Orphans' Court Action Number OC-145-2019. First and Final Account of Mark Allen Connelly, Administrator of the Estate of MARK VINCENT CONNELLY, late of Adams County, Pennsylvania.

ZELLER—Orphans' Court Action Number OC-130-2021. First and Final Account of Paul Zeller, Executor of the Estate of VANDELIA B ZELLER, late of Adams County, Pennsylvania.

Kelly A. Lawver
Clerk of Courts

1/7 & 1/14

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation - Nonprofit were filed with the Department of State, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on November 30, 2021. The name of the corporation is CONEWAGO VALLEY JUNIOR BASEBALL. The purpose of the corporation is to organize and supervise the playing of baseball under specialized rules and regulations. The corporation has been incorporated under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Nonprofit Corporation Law of 1988, as amended.

Jennifer M. Stetter, Esq.
Barley Snyder

1/14

DISSOLUTION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT WHITE DEER MAILING SERVICE, INC., a Pennsylvania corporation, with a current address at 540 Bull Valley Road, Aspers, PA 17304, formerly located at 295 N. 4th Street, McSherrystown, PA 17344, is engaged in winding up the affairs of the corporation under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988, as amended, and will be filing Articles of Dissolution with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania so as to end its existence.

Matthew L. Guthrie, Esq.
Barley Snyder
Solicitors

1/14

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA VS.  
WESLEY LEE CHANCE, JR.

1. The issues before the Court are (1) whether there was probable cause for Officer Gilberto to effectuate a motor vehicle stop of Defendant's vehicle; (2) whether there was probable cause to arrest Defendant; and (3) whether the stop of Defendant's vehicle outside Littlestown Borough violated the Municipal Police Jurisdiction Act.

2. Here, Officer Gilberto had probable cause to stop Defendant's vehicle. As Officer Gilberto testified, the Audi "had very dark window tint around the windows as it drove past" such that Officer Gilberto "could not see inside the vehicle." This was a clear violation of Section 4524(e)(1); as Officer Gilberto recognized, the excessive tinting was "an equipment violation."

3. During the traffic stop, Officer Gilberto noticed numerous indications of intoxication that, in the totality of the circumstances, warranted the belief that Defendant "ha[d] committed or [w]as committing a crime" by driving under the influence of alcohol and/or a controlled substance.

4. Although "hot pursuit does not require a fender-smashing Hollywood style chase scene," it does "require a chase." Such a chase must be immediate, continuous and uninterrupted," but it need not be instantaneous with the officer's observation of the crime.

5. Because Officer Gilberto was in hot pursuit of Defendant for a Vehicle Code violation that he first observed in Littlestown Borough, he did not violate the MPJA by stopping Defendant's vehicle outside the Borough.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,  
PENNSYLVANIA, CP-01-CR-774-2021, COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA VS. WESLEY LEE CHANCE, JR.

Robert A. Bain, Esquire, Attorney for Commonwealth  
Scott A. Harper, Esquire Attorney for Defendant  
Wagner, J., December 28, 2021

OPINION ON DEFENDANT'S OMNIBUS  
PRETRIAL MOTION

Presently before this Court is Defendant Wesley Lee Chance, Jr.'s Omnibus Pretrial Motion, Motion to Suppress, filed August 6, 2021. A hearing was held on November 9, 2021 and December 6, 2021. The issues before the Court are (1) whether there was probable cause for Officer Gilberto to effectuate a motor vehicle stop of Defendant's vehicle; (2) whether there was probable cause to arrest Defendant; and (3) whether the stop of Defendant's vehicle outside Littlestown Borough violated the Municipal Police Jurisdiction Act. For reasons set forth herein, Defendant's Motion to Suppress is denied.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Officer Anthony Gilberto (“Officer Gilberto”) is employed with the Littlestown Borough Police Department. Officer Gilberto has been employed as a police officer in Littlestown Borough for ten years.
2. Officer Gilberto has undergone DUI training and is certified in the Standardized Field Sobriety Test (“SFST”) and the Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement test (“ARIDE”).
3. Officer Gilberto has performed SFST and ARIDE tests on hundreds of individuals suspected of DUI. Officer Gilberto has weekly contact with individuals suspected of driving under the influence of alcohol and/or controlled substances.
4. On March 19, 2021, at approximately 10:17 p.m., Officer Gilberto was on duty in Littlestown Borough, Adams County, Pennsylvania, in full uniform. Officer Gilberto was parked on North Queen Street, just north of Marvin Street in Littlestown Borough.
5. Officer Gilberto observed a black Audi sedan traveling north on North Queen Street at an estimated speed of 45 miles per hour. The speed limit throughout Littlestown Borough is 25 miles per hour.
6. Officer Gilberto attempted to use an AccuTrak speed timing device to determine the speed of the black Audi sedan, but he was not able to successfully obtain an accurate speed.
7. As the black Audi sedan passed Officer Gilberto’s location, Officer Gilberto observed the side windows had a very dark tint, and he could not see inside the vehicle. Based on Officer Gilberto’s training, he recognized this as an equipment violation of the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code.
8. Officer Gilberto made a U-turn onto North Queen Street and traveled north on North Queen Street in an attempt to catch the black Audi sedan.
9. Officer Gilberto made contact with the black Audi sedan in the 500 block of North Queen Street at the Littlestown Borough line, just as the road becomes Baltimore Pike. At the

Littlestown Borough line, Officer Gilberto observed the black Audi sedan drift into the oncoming traffic lane, straddling the double yellow lines for several seconds.

10. When Officer Gilberto made contact with the black Audi sedan at the Littlestown Borough line, he did not utilize his emergency lights because it was not safe to stop the vehicle, given the road conditions.
11. Officer Gilberto activated his emergency lights and stopped the black Audi sedan in the 5000 block area of Baltimore Pike, outside the Borough of Littlestown. Officer Gilberto identified Defendant Wesley Lee Chance, Jr. (“Defendant”) as the driver of the black Audi sedan.
12. Officer Gilberto requested Defendant’s driver’s license, registration, and insurance information for the vehicle. Defendant had difficulty locating these documents. Defendant advised Officer Gilberto that his driver’s license was suspended for a prior DUI.
13. Officer Gilberto had Defendant exit the vehicle and noticed an odor of alcohol coming from Defendant’s breath. Given Defendant’s suspended driver’s license for DUI and the odor of alcohol on Defendant’s breath, Officer Gilberto had Defendant perform the horizontal gaze nystagmus (HGN) test as part of the SFST. Officer Gilberto observed clues that led him to believe Defendant was under the influence of alcohol and/or a controlled substance and incapable of safe driving.
14. Defendant denied drinking alcohol but did admit to smoking marijuana several hours earlier.
15. Defendant provided a breath sample on a certified preliminary breath test device (“PBT”) and registered a reading of .10 breath alcohol content.
16. Based on the totality of the circumstances, Officer Gilberto believed Defendant was under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, which rendered him incapable of safe driving.
17. Officer Gilberto placed Defendant under arrest.
18. Officer Gilberto utilized a tint meter, which determined that only 18% of light was able to travel through the window, and

not 70% as required by state regulations. This confirmed Officer Gilberto's observation that Defendant's windows were in violation of the statutory regulations concerning the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code.

19. This Court found Officer Gilberto's testimony credible.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Officer Gilberto had probable cause to stop Defendant's vehicle for a violation of the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code given the dark tint on Defendant's windows.
2. Officer Gilberto had probable cause to arrest Defendant for a suspected violation of driving under the influence of alcohol and/or a controlled substance and for driving under suspension, DUI related.
3. Officer Gilberto's stop of Defendant's vehicle outside Littlestown Borough did not violate the Municipal Police Jurisdiction Act, ("MPJA") 42 Pa. C.S. § 8953.

### LEGAL STANDARD

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. Ruy**, 892 A.2d 802, 807 (Pa. 2006). Moreover, "it is the sole province of the suppression court to weigh the credibility of the witnesses. Further, the suppression court judge is entitled to believe all, part or none of the evidence presented." **Commonwealth v. Benton**, 655 A.2d 1030, 1032 (Pa. Super. 1995) (internal citations omitted).

A police officer must have either reasonable suspicion or probable cause to perform a traffic stop of a motor vehicle. **Commonwealth v. Salter**, 121 A.3d 987, 993 (Pa. Super. 2015). As the Superior Court of Pennsylvania has explained,

when considering whether reasonable suspicion or probable cause is required constitutionally to make a vehicle stop, the nature of the violation has to be considered. If it is not necessary to stop the vehicle to establish that a violation of the Vehicle Code has occurred, an officer must possess probable cause to stop the vehicle. Where a violation is suspected, but a stop is necessary to further

investigate whether a violation has occurred, an officer need only possess reasonable suspicion to make the stop.

**Id.** Thus,

[a] vehicle stop based solely on offenses not ‘investigable’ cannot be justified by a mere reasonable suspicion, because the purposes of a **Terry** stop do not exist—maintaining the status quo while investigating is inapplicable where there is nothing further to investigate. An officer must have probable cause to make a constitutional vehicle stop for such offenses.

**Commonwealth v. Landis**, 89 A.3d 694, 703 (Pa. Super. 2014) (footnote omitted).

Reasonable suspicion exists if the police officer reasonably believes “that the individual is engaging in criminal conduct.”

**Commonwealth v. Ulman**, 902 A.2d 514, 518 (Pa. Super. 2006).

However, probable cause requires a greater quantum of suspicion: “Probable cause exists where the facts and circumstances within the knowledge of the officer are based on reasonably trustworthy information and are sufficient to warrant a man of reasonable caution in the belief that the suspect ‘has committed or is committing a crime.’”

**Commonwealth v. Joseph**, 34 A.3d 855, 863 (Pa. Super. 2011) (quoting **Commonwealth v. Thompson**, 985 A.2d 928, 931 (Pa. 2009)).

When a non-investigable vehicle offense has occurred, an officer must “articulate specific facts possessed by him at the time of the questioned stop, *which would provide probable cause to believe that the vehicle or the driver was in violation of some provision of the [Vehicle] Code.*” **Commonwealth v. Feczko**, 10 A.3d 1285, 1291 (Pa. Super. 2010) (emphasis in original). Probable cause is evaluated based on the totality of the circumstances. **Id.**

## DISCUSSION

The facts of the case and the applicable law require the Court to deny Defendant’s motion. Officer Gilberto clearly had probable cause to conduct a traffic stop of Defendant’s vehicle and to arrest Defendant on suspicion of DUI. In addition, Officer Gilberto’s stop of Defendant’s vehicle was proper under the MPJA. The reasons for this determination are elaborated herein.

First, Officer Gilberto had probable cause to conduct a traffic stop of Defendant’s vehicle because he observed excessive window tint on the side windows of Defendant’s black Audi sedan. Under Section 4524(e)(1) of the Vehicle Code, “[n]o person shall drive any motor vehicle with any sun screening device or other material which does not permit a person to see or view the inside of the vehicle through the windshield, side wing or side window of the vehicle.” 75 Pa.C.S. § 4524(e)(1). The quantum of suspicion necessary for a police officer to stop a vehicle for a suspected “window-tint violation under section 4524(e)(1)” varies according to the nature of the officer’s observation of the window tint. **Commonwealth v. Prizzia**, 260 A.3d 263, 269 n.2 (Pa. Super. 2021). If the “window-tint violation was immediately apparent to the officer, and no further investigatory purpose was served by the traffic stop,” the traffic stop must be supported by probable cause. **Id.** By contrast, “if the specific facts of the case demonstrate that an investigatory purpose was served by the stop,” reasonable suspicion may be the applicable standard. **Id.**

“[T]o possess probable cause that a vehicle is in violation of section 4524(e)(1), an officer must only observe that the tint on the vehicle’s windows is so dark that it prohibits the officer from seeing inside the car.” **Id.** at 270; see also **Commonwealth v. Harris**, 176 A.3d 1009, 1019–20 (Pa. Super. 2017); **Commonwealth v. Scales**, No. 283 MDA 2021, 2021 WL 5027403, at \*4 (Pa. Super. Oct. 29, 2021). Although Section 4524(e)(2) provides exceptions to the rule established by Section 4524(e)(1), “an officer who observes a window-tint violation under section 4524(e)(1) has no burden to confirm that an (e)(2) exception does *not* apply before he or she has probable cause to stop the vehicle.” **Prizzia**, 260 A.3d at 270 (emphasis in original).

Here, Officer Gilberto had probable cause to stop Defendant’s vehicle. As Officer Gilberto testified, the Audi “had very dark window tint around the windows as it drove past” such that Officer Gilberto “could not see inside the vehicle.” This was a clear violation of Section 4524(e)(1); as Officer Gilberto recognized, the excessive tinting was “an equipment violation.” Because the Court favorably assessed Officer Gilberto’s credibility, it has no trouble concluding that Officer Gilberto had probable cause to conduct a traffic stop of Defendant’s vehicle.



Second, Officer Gilberto had probable cause to arrest Defendant on suspicion of driving under the influence of alcohol and/or a controlled substance and of driving under suspension, DUI related. During the traffic stop, Officer Gilberto noticed numerous indications of intoxication that, in the totality of the circumstances, warranted the belief that Defendant “ha[d] committed or [wa]s committing a crime,” **Joseph**, 34 A.3d at 863, by driving under the influence of alcohol and/or a controlled substance. When questioned by Officer Gilberto, Defendant had difficulty locating his own driver’s license, registration and insurance information. Moreover, Defendant admitted to smoking marijuana several hours before the stop and had a noticeable odor of alcohol on his breath. In addition, Defendant performed poorly on the HGN test and the PBT, which indicated .10 breath alcohol content. In view of Officer Gilberto’s significant training and experience in DUI investigations, the Court concludes Officer Gilberto had probable cause to arrest Defendant on suspicion of DUI. Moreover, Officer Gilberto had probable cause to arrest Defendant on suspicion of driving under suspension because Defendant admitted that his driver’s license was suspended for a prior DUI.

Finally, Officer Gilberto’s stop of Defendant’s vehicle outside Littlestown Borough did not violate the MPJA. If a police officer violates the MPJA, the exclusionary rule must be applied. See **Commonwealth v. Hlubin**, 208 A.3d 1032, 1049–51 (Pa. 2019). Here, application of the exclusionary rule is unwarranted because Officer Gilberto complied with the MPJA.

In addition to provisions inapplicable to the instant matter, the MPJA provides that:

Any duly employed municipal police officer who is within this Commonwealth, but beyond the territorial limits of his primary jurisdiction, shall have the power and authority to enforce the laws of this Commonwealth . . . as if enforcing those laws . . . within the territorial limits of his primary jurisdiction[:]

. . .

Where the officer is in hot pursuit of any person for any offense which was committed, or which he has

probable cause to believe was committed, within his primary jurisdiction and for which offense the officer continues in fresh pursuit of the person after the commission of the offense.

42 Pa.C.S. § 8953(a)(2). Although “hot pursuit does not require a fender-smashing Hollywood style chase scene,” it does “require a chase.” **Commonwealth v. McPeak**, 708 A.2d 1263, 1266 (Pa. Super. 1998) (internal quotation marks omitted). Such a chase must be “immediate, continuous, and uninterrupted,” but it need not be instantaneous with an officer’s observation of the crime. **Id.** at 1265–66. Moreover, hot pursuit must be supported by “probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed within [the pursuing officer’s] primary jurisdiction.” **Commonwealth v. McCandless**, 648 A.2d 309, 311 (Pa. 1994).

Caselaw amply illustrates the application of the MPJA in difficult cases. In **Commonwealth v. McCandless**, for example, a police officer on patrol in one municipality “observed a station wagon that appeared to be traveling much faster than other vehicles that had passed by earlier that night on the same street”; thus, the police officer followed the station wagon to ascertain “whether it was speeding.” **Id.** at 310. The officer hurried to catch up with the vehicle, which had by then entered another municipality, and clocked its speed. **Id.** After the officer had completed two-thirds of the measuring process, the vehicle reentered the municipality where it first was observed. **Id.** There, the officer conducted a traffic stop and ultimately arrested the defendant for exceeding the speed limit and DUI. **Id.** The trial court granted the defendant’s motion to suppress, and the Superior Court reversed. **Id.** at 311.

Reviewing this fact pattern, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania found that the traffic stop was improper under the MPJA. The court found that the officer’s observation was “too indefinite to supply probable cause” because the officer could not estimate the vehicle’s speed and had not observed any erratic driving. **Id.** at 311. Rather, the officer had testified that he had only reasonable suspicion of a violation and had pursued the defendant to confirm his suspicion that the defendant was speeding. **Id.** Because the officer had not had probable cause to pursue the defendant into a neighboring township, the Supreme Court reversed the Superior Court. **Id.**

By contrast, in **Commonwealth v. McGrady**, the Superior Court found that a police officer's pursuit did not violate the MPJA. **Commonwealth v. McGrady**, 685 A.2d 1008 (Pa. Super. 1996). In that case, a municipal police officer observed the defendant's vehicle driving slowly and crossing into the lane for oncoming traffic. **Id.** at 1008–09. The officer decided to cite the defendant and followed his vehicle; however, due to safety conditions, the officer was unable to effectuate a traffic stop until the defendant had left the officer's municipality. **Id.** at 1009. The officer arrested the defendant after noticing indicators of intoxication and conducting field sobriety tests, which the defendant failed. **Id.** The defendant successfully moved to suppress due to an alleged MPJA violation, and the Commonwealth appealed. **Id.**

On appeal, the Superior Court found that the officer had probable cause to stop the defendant's vehicle because he observed the defendant commit the offense of careless driving by "driving in the middle of the road." **Id.** at 1010. The court therefore declined to find that the officer had violated the MPJA, reasoning that "the officer could have stopped [the defendant] on the spot and issued a citation" and only declined to do so due to safety concerns. **Id.** at 1010–11. In so holding, the court explicitly distinguished this case from **McCandless** because the arresting officer in **McGrady** had "more than just . . . [a] hunch that a traffic violation occurred." **Id.** at 1011.

Suppression is inappropriate because the instant matter is similar to **McGrady** rather than **McCandless**. Like the police officer in **McGrady**, Officer Gilberto was on patrol within his own jurisdiction when he observed a Vehicle Code violation for which he immediately could have stopped Defendant's vehicle. As established above, Officer Gilberto had probable cause to conduct a traffic stop of Defendant's vehicle due to his observation of the vehicle's excessively tinted side windows. Officer Gilberto quickly commenced hot pursuit of Defendant by turning his police vehicle around and following Defendant's vehicle. However, by the time Officer Gilberto caught up with Defendant, Defendant's vehicle was at the Littlestown Borough line, where traffic conditions made it unsafe for Officer Gilberto to conduct a traffic stop. Thus, like the police officer in **McGrady**, Officer Gilberto conducted the traffic stop outside of his jurisdiction due to safety concerns, not because he lacked probable

cause to conduct the stop when he observed Defendant in Littlestown Borough. Because Officer Gilberto was in hot pursuit of Defendant for a Vehicle Code violation that he first observed in Littlestown Borough, he did not violate the MPJA by stopping Defendant's vehicle outside of the Borough. Accordingly, Defendant's final argument in favor of suppression fails.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, the attached Order denying Defendant's Omnibus Pretrial Motion is entered.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 28th day of December, 2021, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, Defendant's Omnibus Pretrial Motion is hereby denied.

**ESTATE NOTICES**

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

**FIRST PUBLICATION**

**ESTATE OF KATHRYN L. COPP, DEC'D**  
Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Joan M. Copp and Rebecca A. Strayer, c/o Richard R. Reilly, Esq., 54 N. Duke Street, York, PA 17401-1210

Attorney: Richard R. Reilly, Esq., 54 N. Duke Street, York, PA 17401-1210

**ESTATE OF MARY L. CROUSE, DEC'D**  
Late of Franklin Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Catherine L. Swartz, 7500 Molly Pitcher Highway, Lot 26, Shippensburg, PA 17257; Donald P. Crouse, 1200 Siloam Road, Chambersburg, PA 17201

Attorney: Tracy J. Ross, Esq., Keller, Keller, Beck And Ross, LLC, 1035 Wayne Avenue, Chambersburg, PA 17201

**ESTATE OF MARION D. CZAR a/k/a MARIION SHONK CZAR, DEC'D**

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: David M. Czar, 128 Seminary Avenue, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF BERNETTA G. HELWIG a/k/a BERNETTA HELWIG, DEC'D**

Late of Mount Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Larry E. Helwig, 9 Spring Trail, Fairfield, PA 17320

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

**ESTATE OF WILLIAM DAVID HOFFMAN, DEC'D**

Late of Hamilton Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Scott Douglas Hoffman, c/o John C. Zepp, III, Esq., P.O. Box 204, 8438 Carlisle Pike, York Springs, PA 17372

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

**ESTATE OF JANICE K. SPEAKMAN, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Susan L. Dow, c/o D. Keith Brown, Esq., Stuckert & Yates, P.O. Box 70, Newtown, PA 18940

Attorney: D. Keith Brown, Esq., Stuckert & Yates, P.O. Box 70, Newtown, PA 18940

**ESTATE OF ELLEN J. STULTZ a/k/a ELLEN JENNIE STULTZ, DEC'D**

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

Executrix: Dorothy E. Moul, 375 Heritage Drive, Gettysburg, PA 17325

**SECOND PUBLICATION**

**ESTATE OF HALLIE P. CARPENTER, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Littlestown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Janet M. Krom, 25 Fox Tail Drive, Hanover, PA 17331

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

**ESTATE OF ROBERT W. KLUNK, DEC'D**

Late of the Borough of Littlestown, Adams County, Pennsylvania

David R. Klunk, 534 East King Street, Littlestown, PA 17340; Mary R. Harner, 981 Biglerville Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

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

**ESTATE OF CYNTHIA A. LAWRENCE, DEC'D**

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Jefferson J. Cook, c/o Rachel L. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Rachel L. Gates, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 250 York Street, Hanover, PA 17331

**THIRD PUBLICATION**

**ESTATE OF MARY P. ANGEL, DEC'D**

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Michael R. Angel and Andrew M. Angel, c/o Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 1201 West Elm Avenue, Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 1201 West Elm Avenue, Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

**ESTATE OF JOANNE M. BATE, DEC'D**

Late of Hamilton Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Luke V. Bate, 43 Creek Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

**ESTATE OF WANDA PAULA BLEVINS a/k/a WANDA P. BLEVINS, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executors: Shelly L. Spangler, 1713 Hilltop Drive, York PA 17406; Katie L. Matz, 3500 Colonial Road, Dover PA 17315

Attorney: Brian J. Hinkle, Esq., Mette, Evans & Woodside, 3401 N. Front Street, Harrisburg PA 17110

**ESTATE OF ROY N. CRAMER, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix Gay E. Weigand, c/o Wm. D. Schrack III, Esq., Benn Law Firm, 124 West Harrisburg Street, Dillsburg, PA 17019-1268

Attorney: Wm. D. Schrack III, Esq., Benn Law Firm, 124 West Harrisburg Street, Dillsburg, PA 17019-1268

**ESTATE OF ROBERT F. CROUSE a/k/a ROBERT FRANCIS CROUSE a/k/a BOB F. CROUSE, DEC'D**

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Jolene M. Hoke, c/o Scott A. Ruth, Esq., 123 Broadway, Hanover, PA 17331

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

**ESTATE OF SHIRLEY J. GLASS a/k/a SHIRLEY JEAN GLASS, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Jerome L. Glass, 1565 Storms Store Road, New Oxford, PA 17350; Michele J. Auchey, 1851 Baltimore Pike, Hanover, PA 17331; Joseph L. Glass, 505 Berlin Road, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

**ESTATE OF MIRIAM B. HARRISON a/k/a MIRIAM BLANCHE HARRISON, DEC'D**

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Bonnie B. Harrison, c/o Jennifer M. Stetter, Esq., Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Jennifer M. Stetter, Esq., Barley Snyder, LLP, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

**THIRD PUBLICATION CONTINUED**

ESTATE OF ANTHONY J. STAMER a/k/a ANTHONY JOHN STAMER, DEC'D

Late of Berwick Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Rosemary G. Stamer, c/o Joy L. Kolodzi, Esq., Elder Law Firm of Robert Clofine, 340 Pine Grove Commons, York, PA 17403

Attorney: Joy L. Kolodzi, Esq., Elder Law Firm of Robert Clofine, 340 Pine Grove Commons, York, PA 17403

ESTATE OF MYRON C. WARREN a/k/a MYRON CHARLES WARREN, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of New Oxford, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Wendy E. Diviney, 216 Carlisle Street, New Oxford, PA 17350

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

ESTATE OF DODD A. WILLIAMS, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Laurie L. Williams, c/o Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 1201 West Elm Avenue, Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC, 1201 West Elm Avenue, Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF WAYNE W. WOERNER, DEC'D

Late of Hamiltonban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Ruth E. Woerner, 1140 Carrolls Tract Road, Orrtanna, PA 17353

Attorney: Robert L. McQuaide, Esq., Barley Snyder, Suite 101, 123 Baltimore Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325



# What are your clients' favorite things?

Chances are, your clients care deeply about certain organizations and causes. Help them bring their dreams to fruition with free philanthropic planning tools and ongoing support from the Adams County Community Foundation.

- Expertise in all areas of gift planning
- Free, confidential consultations
- Respect for your client relationships
- Facilitation of charitable giving in Adams County and beyond

To find out more, contact Ralph M. Serpe:  
717-337-0060 / [rserpe@adamscountycf.org](mailto:rserpe@adamscountycf.org)



25 South 4th Street  
Gettysburg, PA 17325  
[www.adamscountycf.org](http://www.adamscountycf.org)



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