



SINCE 1792

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION

Lancaster Law Review

The Official Legal Periodical of Lancaster County

Vol. 95

LANCASTER, PA NOVEMBER 26, 2021

No. 48

CASE REPORTED

Commonwealth v. Grooms — No. 0188-2020 — Ashworth, P.J. — July 26, 2021 — §1925 Opinion — Criminal — Motion in Limine — Statutory Sexual Assault — Reference to Sexual Assault Complainant as “Victim” — Authentication of Digital Evidence — Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11) — Jury Instruction — Missing Evidence Instruction — No error in denying motion to prohibit reference to statutory sexual assault complainant as “victim” in front of jury when complainant is, by statutory definition, a victim by virtue of age; Screenshot of Facebook page taken by defendant’s father eight months after relevant time period inadmissible where defendant cannot produce sufficient evidence to authenticate proffered evidence under new provision in the rules of evidence, Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11); For statutory sexual offenses, Commonwealth must produce evidence of the defendant’s and victim’s actual ages; Where defendant claims mistake of age as defense, defendant carries burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence; “Missing evidence” jury instruction properly denied where evidence claimed missing was equally attainable by defendant and Commonwealth th.....261

LEGAL NEWS

LEGAL NOTICES

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Calendar of Events.....4 | Articles of Dissolution.....33 |
| Continuing Legal Education | Articles of Incorporation.....33 |
| Calendar.....5 | Change of Name Notice.....34 |
| Job Board.....6 | Fictitious Name Notices.....34 |
| Membership Week 2021.....9 | Estate and Trust Notices.....24 |
| News from the Third Circuit.....10 | Orphans’ Court Division |
| | Auditing Notice.....35 |
| | Suits Entered.....35 |

LANCASTER LAW REVIEW

(USPS 304-080)

The Official Legal Periodical of Lancaster County –
Reporting the Decisions of the Courts of Lancaster County

OWNED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION

2021

2021 LBA CONTACTS, SECTION & COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Lancaster Bar Association

28 East Orange Street

Lancaster, PA 17602

www.lancasterbar.org

Phone: 717-393-0737

Fax: 717-393-0221

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION - STAFF

Executive Director

Lisa Driendl-Miller

lisa@lancasterbar.org

Lawyer Referral Service Coordinator

Cambrie Miller

cambrie@lancasterbar.org

**Managing Editor of the Lancaster
Law Review & Bookkeeper**

Kaitlyn Shoffstall

kaitlyn@lancasterbar.org

**Continuing Legal Education &
Membership Coordinator**

Emma Goodwin

emma@lancasterbar.org

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION - BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President.....David Freedman

Past President.....Eric Athey

President-Elect.....Angela Ward

Vice President.....Robert Cronin

Secretary.....Bernard Ilkhanoff

Treasurer..... Luke Weber

Foundation President.....Terry Warco

Chair, Long Range & Strategic Plan.....Eric Rothermel

Chair, Young Lawyers.....Lance Greene

Chair, Lancaster Law Review.....Aaron Zeamer

Director at Large.....Gregory Latimer

Director at Large.....Jennifer Zuidema

Director at Large.....Kiandra Steffy

Director at Large.....Melissa Montgomery

2021 LBA CONTACTS, SECTION & COMMITTEE CHAIRS

SECTION CHAIRS

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Child Dependency Law..... | David Natan |
| Civil Litigation..... | Jaime Jackson |
| Corporate Business & Bankruptcy Law..... | Brett Jackson |
| Criminal Law..... | Daniel Bardo |
| Employment & Labor Law..... | Caitlin Donahue |
| Estate Planning & Probate Law..... | Lindsay Schoeneberger |
| Family Law..... | Teresa Marino |
| In-House & Corporation Counsel..... | Avery Dice |
| Municipal, Zoning & Environmental Law..... | Reilly Noetzel |
| Professionalism/Ethics..... | Bryan Black |
| Real Estate Law..... | Rick Hecker |
| Solo/Small Firm Practice..... | Paula Silverstein |
| Workers' Compensation/Administrative Law..... | Ryan Murphy |
| Young Lawyers..... | Lance Greene |

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Alternative Dispute Resolution..... | Dan Brookhart |
| Diversity..... | Kiandra Steffy |
| Fee Arbitration..... | William Benner, Jr. |
| Judiciary..... | Jeffrey Ouellet |
| Lawyer Referral..... | Eric Winkle |
| Nominating Committee..... | Andrea Farney |
| WIP..... | Claudia Shank |

LANCASTER LAW FOUNDATION - BOARD OF DIRECTORS

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| President..... | Terry Warco |
| Vice President..... | Lindsay O'Neil |
| Secretary..... | John H. May |
| Treasurer..... | Jeffrey Ouellet |
| Director..... | Angela Rieck |
| Director..... | Bernadette Hohenadel |
| Director..... | Julia Vanasse |
| Director..... | Scott Mitchell |
| Director..... | Melvin Newcomer |
| Director..... | Amanda Kowalski |
| Director..... | Nichole Baer |
| Director..... | Grant Schonour |
| Director..... | Shaun Murphy |
| Director..... | Leslie Cradic |

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION
CALENDAR OF EVENTS

December Events

December 6-10, 2021

Membership Week

December 9, 2021

LBA Holiday Party
Yorgos Restaurant & Lounge

Mediation and ADR Solutions

provided by **The Honorable Thomas I. Vanaskie (Ret.)**



- 24 years on the Federal bench (Third Circuit Court of Appeals and Middle District of Pennsylvania)
- Unmatched credentials and experience makes him uniquely qualified to assist parties resolve disputes with guidance that is informed, impartial, fair and objective
- Available to resolve disputes in business and commercial, class action and mass tort, employment, ERISA, insurance, antitrust, securities, intellectual property, civil rights and personal injury cases
- Serves as a Special Master in complex litigation and is highly experienced in the area of e-discovery and privilege review

Stevens & Lee

215.568.7560 • tiv@stevenslee.com

Lancaster Law Review – 2021 Holiday Early Deadline Schedule

Submissions must be received by the dates and times below in order to publish in the follow issues:

November 26 Publication – must be received by Wednesday, November 17 at 12:00pm (noon)

December 24 Publication – must be received by Wednesday, December 15 at 4:00pm

There will **not** be an early deadline for the December 31 Publication.

**LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION
CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION CALENDAR**

December 9, 2021

Municipal Bonds: Basics Plus Recent Developments

Time: 12:00pm-1:00pm

Location: In-person at the Lancaster Bar Association and Virtual on Zoom

Speakers: David Unkovic, Esq., and Erica Wible, Esq.

1.0 Substantive Credit

Description: This course will focus first on the nuts and bolts of the process for the issuance of municipal bonds by municipalities, authorities, and school districts. Then it will explore recent developments, including the effect of low interest rates, increased use of taxable bonds, new post-closing disclosure responsibilities, pending legislation, and the emergence of green and social bond designations. Throughout the presentation, attention will be paid to the role of the issuer's solicitor in the bond process.

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION
JOB BOARD

AVAILABLE ATTORNEY POSITIONS—

Conflict Counsel - The Berks County Court of Common Pleas is accepting applications for an attorney to serve as Conflict Counsel in the Criminal Court. Applicants must have criminal law experience. Preference to Rule 801 qualified applicants. Send resume to: Judge M. Theresa Johnson, Berks County Courthouse, 8th Floor, 633 Court Street, Reading, PA 19601.

Associate Position - Casualty Litigation Department - 1-2 years' experience
Post & Schell's Casualty Litigation Department is currently seeking an attorney with 1-2 years' of litigation experience, preferably civil but criminal is also a plus, for the Firm's Lancaster Office. Top-notch academic background as well as excellent written and oral advocacy skills required. Must be licensed to practice in Pennsylvania. Competitive salary and full benefits.

To Apply: Resumes, with cover letter, should be sent by regular mail or electronically (preferred) to:

Hiring Partner
Post & Schell, P.C
Four Penn Center
1600 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Philadelphia, PA 19103
jobs@postschell.com

Estates & Trusts Associate - Brubaker Connaughton Goss & Lucarelli LLC, a growing entrepreneurial law firm in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, has an immediate opening for an associate with 1 to 6 plus years' experience in its prominent estates and trusts practice. This partnership track position will involve complex estate planning, drafting, and estate and trust administration. Excellent verbal and written communication skills required. Ability to work collaboratively is necessary. Lancaster, Pennsylvania was recently rated No. 1 in the US News Best Places to Retire Rankings. Candidates must possess a desire to become integrated into a dynamic community and participate in the continued growth of this exceptional practice area. Strong academic record required. Compensation begins at \$100,000 for 1 to 3 years' experience, \$130,000 for 4 to 6 years' experience, and \$160,000 for 6 plus years' experience. Bonus opportunities available. Interested candidates should submit their resume, law school transcript, writing sample, and list of references at www.bit.ly/ETA-02

Transactional Associate - Brubaker Connaughton Goss & Lucarelli LLC, a growing entrepreneurial law firm in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, has an immediate opening for a transactional associate with 1 to 6 plus years' experience. Areas of practice for this partnership track position include: mergers

& acquisitions; complex financing transactions for lenders and borrowers; and commercial real estate transactions. Excellent verbal and written communication skills required. A strong desire to learn and the ability to work collaboratively is necessary as is the willingness to become integrated into a dynamic business community. Strong academic record required. Compensation begins at \$100,000 for 1 to 3 years' experience, \$130,000 for 4 to 6 years' experience and \$160,000 for 6 plus years' experience. Bonus opportunities available. Interested candidates submit their resume, law school transcript, writing sample, and list of references at www.bit.ly/TA-02

Civil Litigation Associate - Brubaker Connaughton Goss & Lucarelli LLC, a growing entrepreneurial law firm in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, has an immediate opening for a civil litigation associate with 1 to 6 plus years' experience. Areas of litigation practice include: commercial, premises liability, personal injury, employment, and other general litigation matters. Excellent verbal, written communication skills, and social intelligence required. Ability to work collaboratively and handle client work independently in a fast-paced environment is necessary. Strong academic record required. Compensation begins at \$100,000 for 1 to 3 years' experience, \$130,000 for 4 to 6 years' experience, and \$160,000 for 6 plus years' experience. Bonus opportunities available. Interested candidates should submit their resume, law school transcript, writing sample, and references at www.bit.ly/CLA-02

Municipal and Land Use Law Attorney - Growing Central Pennsylvania law firm is looking for a motivated attorney to join our Municipal and Land Use Law practice group. Experience and strong interest in land use, litigation and regulatory matters a plus. This position will support an existing municipal practice representing Boroughs, Townships, Authorities and Zoning Hearing Boards as well as a rapidly growing regional solar energy land use practice. The ideal candidate will ideally have 2-5 years' experience in any of these practice areas. This position requires strong academic credentials, excellent written and verbal communications skills, excellent organizational skills, the ability to work independently as well as be part of a team and a high level of integrity and professional accountability. Attendance at some evening meetings will be necessary. Salary: DOE. Benefits available: health insurance; dental insurance; retirement plan; and paid time off. Please submit resumes and references confidentially to: lawposition8735@gmail.com

Beacon Law is hiring! - We are looking for a qualified attorney to work in a family friendly environment in Northern York County. Preference for at least 3+ years of experience in family law, criminal law, or wills and estates. Will consider resumes with experience that fits well with a general practice firm. Salary negotiable based on experience. Please forward a resume and cover letter to Alina Dusharm: adusharm@thebeaconlaw.com

Estate Administration Paralegal Position - Gibbel Kraybill & Hess was founded on a shared commitment to provide excellent legal services to our clients. Our attorneys and experienced staff work collaboratively to assist clients in a wide variety of legal matters. We are committed to serving everyone in our community, regardless of social or economic status.

GKH is currently seeking an Estate Administration Paralegal to work with attorneys in our 2933 Lititz Pike office. The ideal candidate will have excellent self-management and inter-personal skills as well as the ability to work on an estate from start to finish. Experience with Lackner estate administration software is preferred but not required. We offer a comprehensive benefit package and a collegial work setting. Email cover letter with salary requirements and resume with references to gkhlaw@gkh.com.

Responsibilities:

- Data entry, answering phones, scheduling client appointments, scanning, copying, and filing
- Prepare probate and administration documents including Petitions for Probate, statutory Notices, PA Inheritance Tax Returns and Federal Estate Tax Returns
- Maintain financial records for use in Accounting and preparation of tax returns
- Handle communications with beneficiaries and executors
- Track income tax deadlines

Skills:

- Strong communication and customer service skills
- Ability to work under deadlines
- Proficiency with MS Outlook, MS Word and MS Excel
- Strong work ethic and the ability to work independently and as part of a team
- Positive and professional demeanor

Education: Bachelor's degree or Paralegal certificate (Preferred but not required)

Job Type: Full-time

Benefits:

- Retirement Plan
- Health insurance
- Dental insurance
- Vision insurance
- Paid time off
- Life insurance
- Disability insurance



News from the Third Circuit

PHILADELPHIA - - The United States Court of Appeals will soon have a new chief judge.

Effective December 4, Judge Michael A. Chagares will take the reins from outgoing Chief Judge D. Brooks Smith who has served in the post since 2016. Judge Chagares has been a Third Circuit judge since 2006. His roots in the Third Circuit reach back to 1987 when he began a judicial clerkship with the late Judge Morton Greenberg.

“Mike Chagares brings to his new post a deep reservoir of good will,” said Judge Smith about his successor. “He is well-liked by all - - both by his colleagues and court staff. On a court with a collegial tradition like ours, that affection and respect is a priceless personal asset.”

Before arriving on the Third Circuit bench, Judge Chagares was chief of the Civil Division for the U.S.

Attorney’s Office for the District of New Jersey. He also has experience in the private practice of law, and has for many years, been an adjunct professor at Seton Hall University School of Law. Judge Chagares was a member of the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules of the U.S. Judicial Conference, and ended his service on the committee in the position of chair.

The Third Circuit is comprised of the federal courts within Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Judge Chagares becomes the first New Jersey judge to serve as Third Circuit Chief since the late John J. Gibbons, who retired from the post in 1990.

For further information, contact: Joel McHugh, Deputy Circuit Executive, at joel_mchugh@ca3.uscourts.gov.

November 26, 2021

 Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County

Criminal

Commonwealth v. Grooms

Motion in Limine — Statutory Sexual Assault — Reference to Sexual Assault Complainant as “Victim” — Authentication of Digital Evidence — Pa.R.E.901(b)(11) — Jury Instruction — Missing Evidence Instruction

No error in denying motion to prohibit reference to statutory sexual assault complainant as “victim” in front of jury when complainant is, by statutory definition, a victim by virtue of age; Screenshot of Facebook page taken by defendant’s father eight months after relevant time period inadmissible where defendant cannot produce sufficient evidence to authenticate proffered evidence under new provision in the rules of evidence, Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11); For statutory sexual offenses, Commonwealth must produce evidence of the defendant’s and victim’s actual ages; Where defendant claims mistake of age as defense, defendant carries burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence; “Missing evidence” jury instruction properly denied where evidence claimed missing was equally attainable by defendant and Commonwealth.

Opinion. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Jyptian T. Grooms. No. 0188-2020.

Andrew J. Gonzalez, Esquire for Commonwealth
 MaryJean Glick, Esquire for Defendant

OPINION SUR PA.R.A.P. 1925(a) BY ASHWORTH, P.J., July 26, 2021. Defendant Jyptian T. Grooms has filed a direct appeal to the Superior Court of Pennsylvania from the judgment of sentence imposed on March 31, 2021. This Opinion is written pursuant to Rule 1925(a) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure, and for the following reasons, the Court requests the appeal be denied.

I. BACKGROUND

Jyptian T. Grooms (“Grooms”) stands convicted of sexual crimes arising out of his course of conduct with a fourteen-year-old girl (E.P.), whom Grooms met through the social media website, Facebook. The factual and procedural history can be summarized as follows:

Grooms, a 21-year-old man, first contacted E.P. online by sending her a Facebook “friend request” on March 26, 2019. E.P. accepted the request, and the two began exchanging messages through Facebook Messenger. (Notes of Testimony (N.T.), Vol. I at 120; Commonwealth’s Exhibit 1).¹ After Grooms and E.P. got acquainted with each other via text on the first day, they discussed their relative ages for the first time on the second day of texting, March 27, 2019. E.P. clearly stated that she was fifteen years old.² (Id. at 121; Vol. II at 244, 247-248). On

¹ During the jury trial, the Commonwealth entered transcripts of the exchanged messages obtained from Facebook via search warrant. For organizational purposes, the Commonwealth entered these messages into evidence through both a single exhibit (containing the entire transcript of the messages) and as various individual exhibits (containing smaller groupings of related messages). See Commonwealth Exhibits 1-20; N.T., Vol I at 119, 121, 123, 129, 150, 153, 155, 166, 168, 171, 174, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 187, 188, 197; Vol. II at 202, 283.

² Although E.P. represented in the relevant messages that she was fifteen years old, she was actually only fourteen years old at the time. Her date of birth is June 14, 2004. (N.T., Vol I at 117). E.P. admitted she used an inaccurate birthday to open her Facebook account initially, but testified that she did not believe

March 30, 2019, Grooms and E.P. discussed meeting in person and subsequently did have a brief in-person meeting where there was no sexual contact. (Id., Vol. I at 123-24). Beginning on March 31, 2019, however, the messages between the two turned sexually explicit, with Grooms stating in detail how he would perform both oral and vaginal sex on E.P. when they met in person again. E.P. also sent sexually explicit messages to Grooms. (N.T., Vol. I at 124, 157-165). On April 2, 2019, Grooms clearly reaffirmed via text message that he knew E.P. was 15 years old. (N.T., Vol. I at 176). Two days later, April 4, 2019, Grooms went to E.P.'s home where he and E.P. engaged in both oral and vaginal sex, as planned.³ (N.T., Vol. I. at 125-126, 182-186).

About ten days after this sexual encounter, E.P. suspected that she was pregnant. (N.T., Vol. I at 126-127). Soon thereafter, E.P.'s mother learned of E.P.'s sexual contact with the 21-year-old Grooms and the suspected pregnancy, after which she filed an incident report with the police. (Id. at 128; N.T., Vol. II at 253). As a result of the incident report, Detective Ryan Hockley of the Special Investigations/Special Victims Unit of the Lancaster City Police, began an investigation during which he obtained a search warrant for Grooms' Facebook page, which yielded a total of 2,500 printed pages. (N.T., Vol II at 263-64; Commonwealth Exhibit Nos. 23, 24). Detective Hockley also filed a search warrant for E.P.'s Facebook page, but did not receive any results due to an error with the link he provided in the warrant. (N.T., Vol. II at 263-64). After reviewing the Facebook documents from the Grooms search warrant results, Detective Hockley went to Grooms' residence on November 25, 2019; Grooms voluntarily accompanied the detective to the police station, where he waived his Miranda rights and spoke with the detective in a recorded interview. (Id. at 269-271; Commonwealth Exhibits 26, 27).

Grooms was arrested on November 25, 2019, and charged with statutory sexual assault (defendant 4-8 years older than victim),⁴ corruption of minors (defendant aged 18 or above),⁵ unlawful contact with a minor (for purposes of committing statutory sexual assault),⁶ and involuntary deviate sexual intercourse (IDSI)(victim under the age of 16 years; defendant four or more years older than victim).⁷ Grooms waived his preliminary hearing on January 7, 2020, and on February 23, 2020, the Commonwealth filed Information 188-2020, which included counts for all the previously listed offenses except for the IDSI charge. Shortly thereafter, a Judicial Emergency was declared in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and this matter was continued. On September 28,

any birthdate showed publicly on her Facebook page in the time from of March, 2019 - April, 2019. (N.T., Vol. I at 130-131, 236-237).

3 Whether or not E.P. granted actual consent to the sexual contact was irrelevant to the charges at issue; the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's statutes reflect that a child under the age of 16 is not legally capable of granting consent to any sexual contact. See 18 Pa. C.S.A. §3122.1(a)(1).

4 Specifically, that Grooms "did penetrate the vagina of [E.P.], with his penis, when the victim was under the age of 16" in violation of 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 3122.1(a)(1).

5 Specifically, that Grooms "did engage in a course of conduct that corrupted or tended to corrupt the morals of a minor, [E.P.]" in violation of 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 6301(a)(1)(iii).

6 18 Pa. C.S.A. §6318(a)(1).

7 Specifically, that Grooms "did insert his tongue into the vagina of [E.P.]" in violation of 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 3123(a)(7). The IDSI charge was initially withdrawn by agreement of counsel after Grooms waived his preliminary hearing; however, the Commonwealth amended in September to add this charge back in.

2020, an Amended Information was filed, which added back the IDSI charge. Upon the resumption of criminal trials, this matter was scheduled for a jury trial on November 30, 2020.

On November 26, 2020, defense counsel electronically filed a multi-pronged Motion in Limine, and on November 27, 2020, a Friday, a Motion to Continue the trial that was set to begin on November 30, 2020, the following Monday.⁸ The relevant issue raised in the Motion in Limine was that the Commonwealth should be precluded from using the word “victim” in reference to E.P. in order to avoid prejudice to Grooms. The morning of trial, the Court denied both the continuance and the motion to preclude use of the term “victim”. (N.T., Vol I at 24-25). On December 1, 2020, Grooms filed a written request for points of charge, which included Pennsylvania Standard Jury Instruction 3.21B (Crim). See Requested Points for Charge at ¶ 5(h). After argument in Chambers at the charging conference, the Court declined to instruct the jury on this point of charge.⁹ (N.T., Vol. II at 305-308).

At the conclusion of the two-day trial, and despite deliberating at length, the jury was unable to reach a unanimous verdict on every count of the Amended Information. Ultimately, the jury returned the following verdict on December 2, 2020: a verdict of guilty on the corruption of minors charge, finding specifically that Grooms engaged in a course of conduct for purposes of committing sexual offenses against E.P.; a verdict of guilty on the charge of unlawful contact with a minor, finding that Grooms’ unlawful contact with E.P. was specifically for the purpose of engaging in the statutory sexual assault of E.P. and for the purpose of involuntary deviate sexual intercourse with a child over 12 and under 16 years of age; and no verdict on either the statutory sexual assault or the IDSI charges. Following the verdict, sentencing was deferred pending a pre-sentence investigation (PSI). A further Order was entered on December 7, 2020, directing Grooms to undergo an evaluation by the Sexual Offenders Assessment Board (SOAB), to determine whether he qualified as a sexually violent predator (SVP) under the Sexual Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA II), 42 Pa. C.S. §§9799.10-9799.75, due to his predicate offenses.

After the Court received the PSI on February 22, 2021, and the Notification of Registration from the SOAB,¹⁰ Grooms stood for sentencing on March 31, 2021. The Court sentenced Grooms to 1-5 years’ incarceration for corruption of minors, with a concurrent sentence of 5-10

⁸ November 26, 2020, was Thanksgiving Day. The Lancaster Court of Common Pleas Courthouse was closed for the holiday on both Thursday, November 26, 2020 (the date on which counsel electronically filed the motion in limine), and Friday, November 27, 2020 (the date on which counsel electronically filed the motion for continuance). Grooms’ jury trial, having already been necessarily postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, was scheduled to begin on Monday, November 30, 2020, after the holiday. A jury had been called. As a result of defense counsel’s tactics, the Commonwealth had no opportunity to file any written response to either motion; indeed, the undersigned was not even aware on the morning of trial that the motions had been filed. Defense counsel could offer no explanation for why the matters contained in the defendant’s motion in limine could and should not have been brought to the Court’s attention well in advance of the day of trial. Nonetheless, after denying the continuance, the Court did entertain argument in Chambers from both parties on the Motion in Limine.

⁹ Defense counsel preserved this issue for appeal by raising it again on the record at sidebar after the Court charged the jury. (N.T., Vol. II at 415). See Pa. R.Crim.P. 647(c); see also, *Commonwealth v. Parker*, 104 A.3d 17 (Pa. Super. 2014)(to preserve issue of jury instruction denial, defendant must make/renew objection on the record at close of court’s actual charging of jury).

¹⁰ The SOAB found Grooms qualified as a Tier II sexual offender under SORNA II, but not as an SVP. (N.T., Sentencing, at 49-50).

years' incarceration for unlawful contact with a minor, for an aggregate sentence of 5-10 years' incarceration. (N.T., Sentencing, at 47-48). Restitution in the amount of \$844.00 was also imposed. (Id. at 48). Grooms was Recidivism Risk Reductive Incentive (RRRI) ineligible and his ineligibility was not waived by the Commonwealth. (Id.; see also Sentencing Order). Grooms was advised at sentencing of his 25 year registration obligations pursuant to SORNA II, supra, as a Tier II sexual offender. (Id. at 49-51; see also Sentencing Order).

Grooms filed a timely post-sentence motion on April 9, 2021,¹¹ to which the Commonwealth responded on April 14, 2021. By Order entered April 27, 2021, Groom's post-sentence motion was denied.¹² On May 27, 2021, Grooms filed a timely Notice of Appeal to the Superior Court of Pennsylvania.¹³ Pursuant to this Court's directive, Grooms filed a statement of matters complained of on appeal, in which he raises the following issues: (1) "[t]he trial court erred in permitting the prosecutor to refer to E.P. as the 'victim' . . . This description of E.P. was prejudicial to Mr. Grooms throughout the trial; (2) "[t]he trial court erred in refusing to permit defense counsel to admit into evidence, and to show to the jury, E.P.'s facebook [sic] page which showed that in December, 2019, she was identifying her date of birth as June 14, 1999. Furthermore, Mr. Grooms testified that when he became friends with E.P., he saw on her facebook [sic] page that her date of birth was June 14, 1999"; and (3) [t]he trial court erred in refusing to give defense counsel's requested jury instruction number 3.21B, with regard to the Commonwealth's failure to produce E.P.'s facebook [sic] page which would have shown E.P.'s claim about her date of birth close to the time of the offense." (See Concise Statement at ¶¶ 1-3).

II. DISCUSSION

A. Referencing E.P. as "Victim"

Grooms' initial argument on appeal relates to the Court's denial of his motion to preclude the Commonwealth from referring to E.P. as a "victim" during the course of the trial. Grooms asserts that whether E.P. was actually a "victim" is a question of fact for the jury to decide, and that any reference to E.P. as a "victim" by the Commonwealth caused prejudice against Grooms throughout the trial.

A trial court's ruling on a motion in limine is reviewed for abuse of discretion. *Commonwealth v. Owens*, 929 A.2d 1187, 1190 (Pa. Su-11 Grooms' post-sentence motion alleged that the Court abused its discretion by imposing a sentence that was unreasonable, not individualized, and which did not afford proper weight to some fifteen alleged mitigating factors.

¹² As set forth in the Order of April 27, 2021, the Court considered all relevant sentencing factors before sentencing Grooms to a reasonable and appropriate term of incarceration (aggregate of 5 to 10 years) well within the standard sentencing guidelines range for Grooms. Grooms' unsupported allegations, based on irrelevant factors, failed to create a substantial question as to whether the Court abused its sentencing discretion. *Commonwealth v. Mouzon*, 812 A.2d 617, 627 (Pa. 2002); see also *Commonwealth v. Maneval*, 688 A.2d 1198, 1200 (Pa. Super. 1997) (sentence within sentencing guidelines generally considered reasonable). Further, the request by Grooms in his post-sentence motion — "that he be resentenced to time-served or probation" — was patently unreasonable considering the crimes for which he had been found guilty as well as the applicable standard sentencing guidelines range (48-66 months +/- 12 months). Moreover, throughout the trial process and continuing into the post-sentence motion, Grooms consistently tried to minimize his culpability by casting aspersions on E.P., alleging that she was "dishonest" about her age, that she was responsible for taking conversations with him in a "dirty direction", and that E.P.'s absence from the sentencing hearing somehow showed Grooms' crimes had little lasting impact on her. These factors were and are wholly irrelevant to the degree of Grooms' culpability and the penalty he must pay.

¹³ After trial and sentencing, Grooms' counsel terminated her position with the Office of the Public Defender, and Attorney MaryJean Glick, Esquire of that same office entered her appearance on Grooms' behalf for purposes of this appeal.

per. 2007), appeal denied, 596 Pa. 705, 940 A.2d 364 (2007). This Court's research uncovers only one Pennsylvania case to address the propriety of referring to a complainant in a sexual assault case as a "victim" before a jury. *Commonwealth v. Williams*, 439 A.2d 765, 768 (Pa. Super. 1982). In *Williams*, the Superior Court found no error with a trial court's reference to an adult rape complainant as the "victim" during its instructions to the jury, finding that use of the term in no way expressed the judge's opinion as to the defendant's guilt. *Id.* Citing the trial court's opinion with approval, the *Williams* Court noted that

our Superior Court [has] made numerous references to the complainant in a rape case as the 'victim' where consent was very much at issue. Our courts have ruled that the use of more aggravating terminology constituted harmless error. For example, use of the word 'murder' instead of 'killing'; reference to the defendant on a single occasion as 'prisoner' instead of the 'defendant' or 'accused'; and references to co-defendants as 'habitual criminals' where the record established numerous prior arrests, were insufficient to sway the jurors' minds to a position of prejudice against the defendant.

Id. at 768-69 (quotations and citations omitted).¹⁴

In the case, *Grooms* never challenged or presented evidence tending to challenge that sexual contact occurred with E.P.. Nor did he present evidence to contradict the fact that he was 21 years and E.P. 14 years old at the time of the sexual contact. Pennsylvania's elected legislature has long codified its belief that a child the age of 14 is not legally capable of granting consent to sexual contact. See 18 Pa. C.S.A. §3.122.1, et al. When an individual has sexual contact with a 14-year-old individual in Pennsylvania, that individual is deemed a perpetrator by statute and the 14-year-old child is deemed a victim. *Id.* There was, therefore, no question of fact as to whether E.P. was a "victim" for purposes of the crimes for which *Grooms* stood trial, and reference to E.P. as a victim could not have caused undue prejudice to *Grooms*. If the defendant suffered any prejudice from reference to E.P. throughout the trial as a victim, such prejudice would have been *de minimus* at most. As such, the Court did not abuse its discretion by denying *Grooms*' motion in limine on this issue.

B. Admission of E.P.'s Facebook Page

Next, *Grooms* complains that the Court erroneously refused "to permit defense counsel to admit into evidence, and to show the jury, E.P.'s facebook [sic] page which showed that in December of 2019, she was identifying her date of birth as June 14, 1999. Furthermore, Mr. Grooms testified that when he became friends with E.P., he saw on her

¹⁴ In a recent case out of Montgomery County, a defendant unsuccessfully attempted to preclude the use of the term "victim" in an adult sexual assault case. The Montgomery County trial court denied the defendant's motion in limine without opinion, and the parties chose not to appeal that ruling; however, a review of the underlying briefs filed by the parties reveals the defendant relied entirely on extra-jurisdictional authority to support its proposition that reference to the sexual assault complainant in that case as a "victim" would cause undue prejudice to the defendant. See *Commonwealth v. Cosby, Jr.*, 2017 WL 2653376 (defendant's brief in support of motion in limine to preclude use of the term "victim"); 2017 WL 2653382 (Commonwealth's response to motion in limine). Of course, such extra-jurisdictional case law is in no way binding on this Court. See *Commonwealth v. Allen*, 48 A.3d 1283, 1287 n.10 (Pa. Super. 2012).

facebook [sic] page that her date of birth was June 14, 1999.” Statement of Errors at ¶2. Grooms sought permission pre-trial, orally and off-the-record, to enter a screenshot taken by Grooms’ father (father) in December, 2019 (screenshot), some eight months after the relevant time period. Grooms hoped to show the jury this screenshot in support of his defense that when he met E.P., he made a reasonable mistake as to her age in March/April, 2019. Grooms planned to authenticate the screenshot through the father’s testimony. The Court denied admission of the screenshot, though this denial was also made both orally and off the record. For the record, then, the Court allowed limited argument on this issue when, during a Chambers conference held at the close of the Commonwealth’s evidence, defense counsel repeated her objection to the Court’s prior ruling. (N.T., Vol II at 219). Defense counsel argued that even though Grooms’ father had been rendered unavailable to testify on that particular day,¹⁵ the screenshot could and should be fully admissible if or when Grooms himself testified that the birthdate depicted in the screenshot was the same birthdate he saw on E.P.’s Facebook page in March/April, 2019 (Id. at 221). The Commonwealth responded that the Court properly denied admission of the screenshot on the grounds of relevancy and authenticity. (Id. at 221-222).

A trial court’s ruling on issues of evidence is reviewed for abuse of discretion. “Rulings on admissibility are committed to the common pleas court’s discretion and will only be reversed on appeal where there is an abuse of discretion. *Commonwealth v. Rogers*, --- Pa.--- , 250 A.3d 1209, 1215 (2021). An abuse of discretion occurs when the law is overridden or misapplied, or the judgment exercised was either manifestly unreasonable or the product of partiality, prejudice, bias, or ill will. *Id.*” *Commonwealth v. Orr*, --- A.3d.--- , (Table) 2021 WL269649 (Pa. Super. July 1, 2021).

In the instant case, the reasons the Court initially denied admission of the screenshot are not stated in the record. The propriety of the Court’s denial, however, turns on whether the Court properly found that Grooms would be unable to produce sufficient evidence to authenticate the screenshot.

¹⁵ On the day Grooms was to present his defense, his father was unavailable as a witness. Although Grooms has raised no appellate issue relating to the circumstances of his father’s unavailability, the Court must at least note here the unique circumstances attendant thereto. On November 30, 2020, the day before Grooms was to present his defense, his sister, with whom both he and his father lived, had exhibited symptoms of COVID-19 and was tested for the virus that night at the hospital. (N.T., Vol. II at 213). The next morning, December 1, 2020, Grooms’ counsel sought a continuance of the trial on the basis that Grooms was considered a close contact of a potentially COVID-19 positive individual and should quarantine pending the results of his sister’s COVID-19 test. Grooms had posted bail on January 2, 2020, and was living with his parents and his sister at the time of trial.

In denying the continuance, the Court considered multiple factors, including but not limited to: the length of time this matter had been pending, the time already invested by both the jury and the Court in the trial, the fact that Grooms displayed no symptoms of COVID-19, the existing COVID-19 mitigation measures already in place and in practice at the courthouse and in the courtroom, and the additional safety precautions (in the form of masking, shielding, and creating greater distancing between Grooms and other individuals) that could be undertaken to adequately mitigate against the possibility of virus transmission, should his sister’s pending COVID test return positive (which, thankfully, it did not).

The Court did not, however, view the circumstances surrounding the presence of Grooms’ father in the same light. As acknowledged by counsel, the only potentially relevant fact to which Grooms’ father could have testified was the fact that he took a screenshot of E.P.’s Facebook page in December, 2019. He could provide no further testimony regarding either the authenticity or the relevance of the screenshot. See Section II.B, *supra*. Since the Court had previously denied admission of the screenshot, the absence of Grooms’ father was immaterial to any relevant issue. Moreover, had Grooms expressed at any time the need to have the father testify, the Court would have accommodated the father giving testimony remotely through use of Advanced Communications Technology. Grooms had already made such arrangements for another of its witnesses, who was also quarantined at home at the time of trial. (N.T., Vol II at 217-18).

The subject of authentication of digital evidence is a developing area of the law. Just weeks prior to the beginning of Grooms' trial, on October 1, 2020, a new provision to Rule 901 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Evidence took effect. The new provision, section 901(b)(11), attempts to address uncertainty surrounding the requirements for authenticating digital evidence. In pertinent part, Rule 901 provides:

Rule 901. Authenticating or identifying evidence

(a) In General. Unless stipulated, to satisfy the requirement of authenticating or identifying an item of evidence, the proponent must produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is.

(b) Examples. The following are examples only—not a complete list—of evidence that satisfies the requirement:

(11) Digital Evidence. To connect digital evidence with a person or entity:

(A) direct evidence such as testimony of a person with personal knowledge; or

(B) circumstantial evidence such as:

(i) identifying content; or

(ii) proof of ownership, possession, control, or access to a device or account at the relevant time when corroborated by circumstances indicating authorship.

Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11) has no counterpart in the Federal Rules of Evidence. "Digital evidence," as used in this rule, is intended to include a communication, statement, or image existing in an electronic medium. This includes emails, text messages, social media postings, and images. The rule illustrates the manner in which digital evidence may be attributed to the author.

The proponent of digital evidence is not required to prove that no one else could be the author. Rather, the proponent must produce sufficient evidence to support a finding that a particular person or entity was the author. See Pa.R.E.901(a).

Direct evidence under Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11)(A) may also include an admission by a party-opponent.

Circumstantial evidence of identifying content under Pa.R.E. 901 (b)(11)(B)(i) may include self-identification or other distinctive characteristics, including a display of knowledge only possessed by the author. Circumstantial evidence of content may be sufficient to connect the digital

evidence to its author.

Circumstantial evidence of ownership, possession, control, or access to a device or account alone is insufficient for authentication of authorship of digital evidence under Pa.R. E. 901 (b)(11)(B)(ii). See, e.g. *Commonwealth v. Mangel*, 181 A.3d 1154, 1163 (Pa. Super. 2018) (social media account bearing defendant's name, hometown, and high school was insufficient to authenticate the online and mobile device chat messages as having been authored by defendant). However, this evidence is probative in combination with other evidence of the author's identity.

Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11) and cmt. (effective October 1, 2020).

Only three appellate cases have directly addressed the application of the new Rule 901 provision and its comments. Each of those opinions address the authentication of text messages in a context where proof of authorship is problematic, and none engages in analysis that would be useful in the instant case. See *Commonwealth v. Harper*, 241 A.3d 447 (Table), 2021 WL 777697 (Pa. Super. March 21, 2021); *Commonwealth v. Kline*, 245 A.3d 494 (Table), 2021 WL 212296 (Pa. Super. January 01, 2021); *Commonwealth v. Stump*, 245 A.3d 1096 (Table), 2020 WL 7658402 (Pa. Super. December 23, 2020). However, another recent opinion is instructive to the instant case even though it, too, concerns the issue of authorship and does not directly apply the new provision of Rule 901. See *Commonwealth v. Orr*, --- A.3d.---, (Table), 2021 WL269649 (Pa. Super. July 1, 2021).

In *Orr*, the defendant challenged the trial court's admission of text messages allegedly sent by the defendant to the victim, arguing that the Commonwealth failed to authenticate the text messages because it presented insufficient evidence that the defendant did, in fact, author and send the relevant texts. In its opinion, the *Orr* Court engaged in a detailed analysis of Pennsylvania jurisprudence on the subject of whether proof of authorship of a text message is relevant to the issue of authentication, beginning with the case of *Commonwealth v. Koch*, 39 A.3d 996 (Pa. Super 2011), affirmed by equally divided court, 630 Pa. 374, 106 A.3d 705 (2014)(holding digital evidence subject to same authentication requirements as non-digital evidence). Based on its review of *Koch* and its progeny, the *Orr* court surmised that "the authentication of text messages turns upon the depth of direct and circumstantial evidence of authorship marshaled by the proponent of the text messages." *Orr* at *9. The Court divided a list of cases decided under *Koch* into two categories: where evidence of authorship was found insufficient for authentication¹⁶ and where the evidence was found sufficient.¹⁷ Important to this case, the *Orr* Court stated in a footnote that the new rule of evidence, provision 901(b)(11), "appears consistent with *Koch* and its

16 *Commonwealth v. Mangel*, *supra*; *Commonwealth v. Mosley*, 114 A.3d 1072 (Pa. Super 2015); and *Commonwealth v. Koch*, *supra*.

17 *Commonwealth v. Bry'Drick Wright*, --- A.3d ---, n.4, 2021 WL 2345903, n.4 (Pa. Super., Jun. 9, 2021); *Commonwealth v. Talley*, 236 A.3d 42 (Pa. Super. 2020); and *Commonwealth v. Murray*, 174 A.3d 1147 (Pa. Super. 2017).

progeny” since the new explanatory comments to Rule 901 reference *Commonwealth v. Mangel*, 181 A.3d 1154 (Pa. Super. 2018). *Id.* at *9 n.3.

Based on the dicta in *Orr*, this Court finds it appropriate to utilize case law decided before the effective date of Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11) in the analysis of the instant case as long as those cases were decided in under *Koch*. Here, the Court was not presented with a case involving screenshots of text messages that could be authenticated either by the sender or recipient of the messages, as in *Commonwealth v. Talley*, 236 A.3d 42 (Pa. Super. 2020). Rather, the issue in the instant case is more akin to that in *Commonwealth v. Mangel*, *supra*, where the Superior Court upheld a trial court’s refusal, on authenticity grounds, to admit undated screenshots taken of the defendant’s alleged Facebook page. In *Mangel*, the defendant neither claimed ownership of the account pictured in the screenshots proffered by the Commonwealth nor authorship of the content/posts pictured therein. *Id.* at 1164. The *Mangel* Court found that even with circumstantial evidence linking the defendant to the Facebook account in the proffered screenshots (the defendant’s name, hometown, and school district, among other indicia, were reflected in the screenshots), the evidence was still insufficient to authenticate the online and mobile device chat messages as having been authored by defendant. *Id.*

In the case sub judice, Grooms faced similar problems with authentication of the screenshot. First, without the testimony of the individual who actually took the screenshot, Grooms would have been unable to provide the Court the most basic indicia of the screenshot’s authenticity. Yet, even if Grooms had requested a special accommodation for the unavailability of his father due to the unique COVID-19 circumstances, and the Court and jury had received the father’s testimony through an alternative medium, the father’s testimony would still be insufficient to prove authenticity of the screenshot. The only fact to which the father could legitimately testify was the fact that he himself took the proffered screenshot at a certain date and time. He could not offer any evidence that E.P. in fact owned the specific Facebook account depicted in the screenshot, or that E.P. authored the contents reflected therein. Under *Mangel*, *supra*, the father’s testimony alone would have been insufficient to authenticate the screenshot.

Furthermore, Grooms himself could not testify as to the authenticity of the screenshot, contrary to the apparent theory Grooms advanced in the Statement of Errors. The fact that Grooms testified “that when he became friends with E.P., he saw on her facebook [sic] page that her date of birth was June 14, 1999”, which is the date reflected on the alleged Facebook page depicted in the screenshot, has no bearing on the authenticity of the screenshot. Again, like his father, Grooms would have been incompetent to testify that the Facebook page depicted in the screenshot was in fact the genuine Facebook page owned, operated, and authored by E.P. Almost any teenager with a modicum of computer savvy can replicate and manipulate web pages to appear to be authentic screenshots of valid webpages and accounts. Therefore, neither Grooms

nor his father would have been able to provide the basic foundation necessary for authenticating the evidence he wished the Court to enter. Under Koch and its progeny, which validly co-exist with new Pa.R.E. 901(b)(11), the scant relevant facts to which either Grooms or his father could have testified regarding the screenshot would have been insufficient to establish the authenticity of the proffered evidence. The Court properly denied admission of the screenshot.

C. Denial of Proposed Jury Standard Instruction 3.21B

Lastly, Grooms complains the Court erroneously refused his requested point of charge, specifically, Pennsylvania Standard Jury Instruction 3.21B, which is commonly referred to as the “missing evidence” instruction.¹⁸ Grooms believes this Court erred when it failed to give the missing evidence instruction “with regard to the Commonwealth’s failure to produce E.P.’s facebook [sic] page which would have shown E.P.’s claim about her date of birth close to the time of the offense.” Statement of Errors at ¶3.

The standard for review of the denial of a jury instruction is well settled. An appellate court will reverse a trial court’s decision to deny a requested jury instruction only where the trial court abused its discretion or committed an error of law. Additionally, “[t]he Suggested Standard Jury Instructions themselves are not binding and do not alter the discretion afforded trial judges in crafting jury instructions; rather, as their title suggests, the instructions are guides only.” *Commonwealth v. Simpson*, 620 Pa. 60, 96 n.24, 66 A.3d 253, 274 n.24 (2013).

In this case, all that was required of the Commonwealth to prove the age element of its case was evidence of the defendant’s and victim’s actual ages. 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 3122.1(a)(1); 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 6301(a)(1)(ii); 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 6318(a)(1); and 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 3123(a)(7). The Commonwealth produced evidence that E.P.’s date of birth is June 14, 2004. (N.T., Vol. I at 117). Beyond this evidence, the Commonwealth was under no obligation to present evidence of what E.P. claimed her birthdate to be close to the time of the offense. Whether E.P. claimed to be 16, 19, or 29 is entirely irrelevant to the Commonwealth’s burden of proof. It was Grooms who claimed at trial that he made a reasonable mistake as to E.P.’s age. It was Grooms’ burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he made reasonable mistake of age. *Commonwealth v. Bohonyi*, 900 A.2d 877, 884 (Pa. Super. 2006). While the age E.P. held herself out to be might certainly bear on the reasonableness of his belief, that is evidence that Grooms, not the Commonwealth, would be

¹⁸ The requested instruction reads:

3.21B (Crim) FAILURE TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OTHER TANGIBLE EVIDENCE AT TRIAL

1. There is a question about what weight, if any, you should give to the failure of [a party] [the Commonwealth] [the defendant] to produce an item of potential evidence at this trial [identify document or tangible item].

2. If three factors are present, and there is no satisfactory explanation for a party’s failure to produce an item, the jury is allowed to draw a common-sense inference that the item would have been evidence unfavorable to that party. The three necessary factors are:

First, the item is available to that party and not to the other;

Second, it appears the item contains or shows special information material to the issue; and

Third, the item would not be merely cumulative evidence.

3. Therefore, if you find these three factors present and there is no satisfactory explanation for the [party’s] [Commonwealth’s] [defendant’s] failure to produce [the item], [specify item], at this trial, you may infer, if you choose to do so, that it would have been evidence unfavorable to [that party] [the Commonwealth] [the defendant]

Pa. SSJI (Crim) 3.21B.

responsible for proffering to the jury.¹⁹

Moreover, the evidence in question, E.P.'s Facebook page from around the time of the incidents, was not "missing" for purposes of the missing evidence instruction. First, E.P.'s Facebook page was equally attainable by either Grooms or the Commonwealth. Grooms' counsel was unable to offer any valid reason why she failed to utilize the judicial subpoena process to obtain the alleged "missing" evidence for the defense. (N.T., Vol II at 305-06). Second, Detective Hockley clearly testified for the Commonwealth that he did, in fact, attempt to obtain the evidence in question. Hockley served a valid search warrant on Facebook seeking both Grooms' and E.P.'s Facebook accounts (N.T., Vol II at 263-64); however, Facebook was only able to return documents responsive to the search warrant for Grooms' account, due to a technical error.²⁰ Evidence from Grooms' account sufficed to meet the Commonwealth's evidentiary needs in this case, which rendered documents specifically from E.P.'s account superfluous to the Commonwealth's burden. The Commonwealth was therefore under no obligation to pursue the matter further.

So long as evidence is equally available to both the Commonwealth and the defense, the Commonwealth is not required to produce at trial every piece of relevant evidence it has, if that evidence is not necessary to meet the burden of proof. Indeed, at least one appellate court has wisely acknowledged that

[a] missing evidence charge is not meant to be given when there is a generalized allegation that a party did not present some evidence that may bear on an issue in the case. Indeed, where evidence or a witness is available to both sides to present at trial, that one side does not present said evidence or witness does not render it "missing." Appellant's trial did not reveal any specific document, item, or witness that was only available to the Commonwealth and not to the defense. Thus, the missing evidence charge requested by Appellant was irrelevant to the issues presented at trial and inappropriate.

Commonwealth v. Wilson, 237 A.3d 442 (Table), 2020 WL 2315616 (Pa. Super. May 11, 2020). In this case, the alleged "missing evidence" of E.P.'s Facebook account was just as available to Grooms through subpoena as it was to the Commonwealth through search warrant. Grooms' failure to obtain the evidence for himself does not render the evidence "missing" for purposes of jury instructions. The Court, therefore, did not abuse its discretion or commit error by denying Grooms' request for

¹⁹ The Court does note that while mistake of age was a defense available to Grooms for the statutory sexual assault and IDSI charges (18 Pa.C.S.A. §§3122.1 and 3123, respectively), it was not available to him for the corruption of minors charge (18 Pa.C.S.A. §6301(d)). The plain meaning of the corruption of minors statute reflects on its face that mistake of age, no matter how reasonable, is not a defense when the concerned minor/victim is less than 16 years of age, as E.P. was in this case. See 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 6301(d).

²⁰ Detective Hockley testified that "first the search warrant that I filed for [E.P.'s] Facebook page, I received a response from Facebook stating that there had been an error in the link that I had listed in the item to be searched box on the search warrant. So I did not receive results for her Facebook page, but I did receive the results for Mr. Grooms' Facebook page, which consisted of a 2,500-page PDF document and also a certificate of authenticity from Facebook." (N.T., Vol II at 263-64)

suggested standard jury instruction 3.21(B)(Crim).

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, this Court respectfully requests that Appellant Jyptian Grooms' conviction and judgment of sentence be affirmed and his appeal dismissed.

Accordingly, I enter the following:

ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th day of July, 2021, the Court submits this Opinion pursuant to Rule 1925(a) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure.

BY THE COURT:
DAVID L. ASHWORTH
PRESIDENT JUDGE

ESTATE AND TRUST 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. Notice is also hereby given of the existence of the trusts of the deceased settlors set forth below for whom no personal representatives have been appointed within 90 days of death. All persons having claims or demands against said estates or trusts are requested to make known the same, and all persons indebted to said estates or trusts are requested to make payment, without delay, to the executors or administrators or trustees or to their attorneys named below.

FIRST PUBLICATION

Bolich, Karen L., dec'd.

Late of New Holland Boro.

Executrix: Crystal Tuno c/o Katherine L. McDonald, Esquire, Dethlefs-Pykosh Law Group, LLC, 2132 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011.

Attorney: Katherine L. McDonald, Esquire.

Breger, Judith M. a/k/a Judi Breger a/k/a Judith Marshall Breger, dec'd.

Late of Ephrata.

Executor: Joshua Breger and Matthew Breger c/o Gregory K. Goebert, Esquire, Goebert Law LLC, 101 Lindenwood Drive, Suite 225, Malvern, PA 19355.

Attorney: Gregory K. Goebert, Esquire.

Cesaro, Julius, dec'd.

Late of Mount Joy Borough.

Executrix: Kathleen M. Shepp

c/o James N. Clymer, Esquire, 408 West Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17603.

Attorney: Clymer Musser & Sarno, PC.

Deppen, Mabel M., dec'd.

Late of Elizabethtown Borough.

Executor: Eric J. Deppen c/o Randall K. Miller, Esq., 659 East Willow Street, Elizabethtown, PA 17022.

Attorney: Randall K. Miller.

DeVerter, Benjamin L. a/k/a Benjamin Leroy DeVerter, Sr., dec'd.

Late of East Lampeter Township.

Executor: Benjamin L. DeVerter, Jr. c/o George H. Eager, Esquire, 1347 Fruitville Pike, Lancaster, PA 17601.

Attorneys: Eager, Stengel, Quinn, Sofilka & Babic.

Dinsmore, Elizabeth R. a/k/a Elizabeth Dinsmore, dec'd.

Late of Donegal Township.

Co-Executors: Cris E. Dinsmore and Phil W. Dinsmore c/o Stock and Leader, 221 West Philadelphia Street, Suite 600, York, PA 17401-2991.

Attorney: Jody Anderson Leighty, Esquire; Stock and Leader.

Earhart, Christopher A., dec'd.

Late of East Cocalico Township.

Executrix: Rachel C. Elliott c/o James N. Clymer, Esquire, 408 West Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17603.

Attorney: Clymer Musser & Sarno, PC.

Ecenrode, Daniel E., dec'd.

Late of Ephrata Township.

Executrix: Karen L. Shreiner
c/o Edward P. Seeber, Esquire,
JSDC Law Offices, Suite C-400,
555 Gettysburg Pike, Mechan-
icsburg, PA 17055.

Attorney: Edward P. Seeber, Es-
quire.

Goshkey, Audrey A., dec'd.

Late of Warwick Township.

Executor: Timothy S. Gerhart
c/o Russell, Krafft & Gruber,
LLP, 101 North Pointe Blvd.,
Suite 202, Lancaster, PA 17601.

Attorney: Lindsay M. Schoene-
berger.

**Grant, Richard A., Jr. a/k/a
Richard A. Grant**, dec'd.

Late of Little Britain Township.

Administrator: Justin L. Grant
c/o Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP,
212 North Queen Street, Lan-
caster, PA 17603.

Attorney: Barbara Reist Dillon,
Esquire.

**Harter, Mary S. a/k/a Mary Eliz-
abeth Harter**, dec'd.

Late of West Hempfield Town-
ship.

Executor: Fulton Bank, N.A., 1
Penn Square, P.O. Box 7989,
Lancaster, PA 17604.

Attorney: Thomas L. Goodman,
Esquire.

Hill, Hanna M., dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Town-
ship.

Executor: Robin D. Stauffer
c/o Barley Snyder LLP, 126
East King Street, Lancaster, PA
17602.

Attorney: Randy R. Moyer; Bar-
ley Snyder LLP.

Huber, Anna M., dec'd.

Late of Earl Township.

Executors: Elvin H. Huber and
Mervin H. Huber c/o Kling
and Deibler, LLP, 131 W. Main
Street, New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorney: Linda Kling, Esquire;
Kling & Deibler, LLP.

Kreiser, Jean E., dec'd.

Late of Columbia Borough.

Executrix: Kathleen F. Hodgen
c/o Karl Kreiser, Esquire, 553
Locust Street, Columbia, PA
17512.

Attorney: Mountz & Kreiser.

**Krempels, Mary Agnes a/k/a
Mary A. Krempels**, dec'd.

Late of Lancaster Township.

Executor: Ronald K. Krempels
c/o Thomas A. Kauffman, Es-
quire, Kauffman & Billilmoria,
PLLC, 52 South Ninth Street,
Indiana, PA 15701.

Attorney: Thomas A. Kauffman,
Esquire.

Kurtz, Paul H., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.

Personal Representatives: Carol
A. Kline and Deborah K. Weaver,
Executrices, c/o John R. Gibbel,
Attorney, P.O. Box 5349, Lan-
caster, PA 17606.

Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill &
Hess LLP.

Leibrand, Phyllis F., dec'd.

Late of Ephrata Township.

Executor: John R. Nagle c/o
Kling and Deibler, LLP, 131 W.
Main Street, New Holland, PA
17557.

Attorney: Linda Kling, Esquire;
Kling & Deibler, LLP.

Longenecker, Geraldine F.,
dec'd.

Late of West Cocalico Township.
Co-Executors: Lorrie L. Dunn
and Jason L. Longenecker c/o
E. Richard Young, Jr., Esq.,
1248 W. Main Street, Ephrata,
PA 17522.

Attorney: E. Richard Young, Jr.,
Esquire.

Lutz, Alberta C., dec'd.

Late of West Cocalico Township.
Executors: Kathleen M. Lauder-
milch and Michael K. Lutz c/o
Robert E. Sisko, Esquire, 700
North Duke Street, P.O. Box
4686, Lancaster, PA 17604-
4686.

Attorneys: Morgan, Hallgren,
Crosswell & Kane, P.C.

Matthews, John G., dec'd.

Late of Ephrata Borough.
Executrix: Debra Ann Hornberg-
er c/o Anthony P. Schimaneck,
Esquire, 700 North Duke Street,
P.O. Box 4686, Lancaster, PA
17604-4686.

Attorneys: Morgan, Hallgren,
Crosswell & Kane, P.C.

Mohr, Harold A., Sr., dec'd.

Late of Conoy Township.
Executor: Jerry Mohr c/o Ran-
dall K. Miller, Esq., 659 East
Willow Street, Elizabethtown,
PA 17022.

Attorney: Randall K. Miller.

**Pfautz, Clyde R. a/k/a Clyde R.
Pfautz, Jr.**, dec'd.

Late of Denver Borough.
Executor: Ronald S. Pfautz c/o
Appel Yost & Zee LLP, 33 North
Duke Street, Lancaster, PA
17602.

Attorney: James K. Noel, IV.

Rodriguez-Santiago, Isabel, dec'd.

Late of Lancaster City.

Executors: Elizabeth Santiago
and Jose L. Santiago c/o James
N. Clymer, Esquire, 408 West
Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA
17603.

Attorney: Clymer Musser & Sar-
no, PC.

Schopf, Margaret Z., dec'd.

Late of Manor Township.

Executor: Eric J. Schopf c/o
Cody & Pfursich, 53 North Duke
Street, Suite 420, Lancaster, PA
17602.

Attorney: Stephen W. Cody.

Smith, Thomas R., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.

Executrix: Ashley Scherry c/o
Law Office of Shawn Pierson,
105 East Oregon Road, Lititz,
PA 17543.

Attorney: Shawn M. Pierson Es-
quire.

Sherr, Carol Y., dec'd.

Late of East Hempfield Town-
ship.

Executor: LuAnn Johns and
Kimberly Sherr c/o Cody &
Pfursich, 53 North Duke Street,
Suite 420, Lancaster, PA 17602.

Attorney: Stephen W. Cody.

Stephenson, Betty Jo, dec'd.

Late of West Hempfield Town-
ship.

Executor: Michael J. Stephe-
nson c/o Cody & Pfursich, 53
North Duke Street, Suite 420,
Lancaster, PA 17602.

Attorney: Stephen W. Cody.

Weaver, Mary M., dec'd.

Late of Upper Leacock Township.

Executor: Amy Shea and Jan E. Weaver c/o Cody & Pfursich, 53 North Duke Street, Suite 420, Lancaster, PA 17602.

Attorney: Stephen W. Cody.

Zook, Elsie B., dec'd.

Late of Salisbury Township.

Co-Executors: Mose Stoltzfus and Alvin S. Zook c/o Nicholas T. Gard, Esquire, 121 E. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorneys: Smoker Gard Associates LLP.

SECOND PUBLICATION

Armstrong, Lavon M., dec'd.

Late of Lancaster Township.

Executor: Glenn L. Armstrong c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.

Attorney: Young and Young.

Bates, Donna, dec'd.

Late of East Petersburg Borough.

Executrix: Carol A. Adams c/o James N. Clymer, Esquire, 408 West Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17603.

Attorney: Clymer Musser & Sarno, PC.

Bernas, Irene R., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.

Executor: Philip P. Bernas c/o Angela M. Ward, Esquire, Going & Plank, 140 E. King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.

Attorney: Angela M. Ward, Esquire; Going & Plank.

Boston, Glenna Joy, dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Township.

Personal Representative: Rebecca A. Boston, Administratrix, c/o Douglas A. Smith, Attorney, P.O. Box 5349, Lancaster, PA 17606.

Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill & Hess LLP.

Cummings, Patricia M., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.

Executrix: Kelly S. Shuffelbottom c/o Kevin Scott, Esquire, Barley Snyder LLP, 213 Market Street, 12th Floor, Harrisburg, PA 17101.

Attorneys: Barley Snyder LLP.

D'Angelo, Bernadette M., dec'd.

Late of East Hempfield Township.

Executrix: Kathleen A. Sobeck c/o Vance E. Antonacci, Esquire, McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC, 570 Lausch Lane, Suite 200, Lancaster, PA 17601.

Attorney: McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC.

Daubert, Sigrid A., dec'd.

Late of Penn Township.

Executor: Delphia G. Seese c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.

Attorney: Young and Young.

Duddy, Dorothy A., dec'd.

Late of New Holland Borough.

Executor: Fulton Bank, N.A. c/o Kling and Deibler, LLP, 131 W. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorney: Patrick A. Deibler, Esquire; Kling & Deibler, LLP.

Eshelman, Christine M., dec'd.

Late of the Borough of East Petersburg.

Personal Representative: Vincent R. Eshelman II, Executor, c/o Angelo J. Fiorentino, Attorney, P.O. Box 5349, Lancaster, PA 17606.

Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill & Hess LLP.

Etnyre, Daniel P., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.

Executrix: Jennifer E. Pradziad c/o Robert M. Slutsky, Esq., 600 W. Germantown Pike, #400, Plymouth Meeting, PA 19462.

Attorney: Robert M. Slutsky, Esquire; Slutsky Elder Law, 600 W. Germantown Pike, #400, Plymouth Meeting, PA 19462.

Evans, Ronald R., Jr., dec'd.

Late of Manor Township.

Executor: Timothy McAdoo c/o David P. Carson, 2547 Lititz Pike, Lancaster, PA 17601.

Attorney: David P. Carson.

Evans, Ronald R., Sr., dec'd.

Late of Manor Township.

Executor: Timothy McAdoo c/o David P. Carson, 2547 Lititz Pike, Lancaster, PA 17601.

Attorney: David P. Carson.

Fischer, Lucille M., dec'd.

Late of Millersville Borough.

Co-Administrators: Michael R. Glath and Steven G. Glath c/o O'Day Law Associates, 158 East Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.

Attorney: O'Day Law Associates.

Flynt, Roy A., Jr., dec'd.

Late of East Drumore Township. Executors: Beverly E. Hopkins and Lola E. Nichols c/o Paterson Law LLC, 2600 Willow Street Pike N, PMB 155, Willow Street, PA 17584.

Attorney: Kim Carter Paterson.

Free, Gloria A., dec'd.

Late of West Hempfield Township.

Executor: Eileen F. Little c/o 327 Locust Street, Columbia, PA 17512.

Attorney: Michael S. Grab, Esquire; Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP, 327 Locust Street, Columbia, PA 17512.

Gantz, Mary L., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Borough.

Executors: Paul G. Gantz, Joanne L. Pickel, and John F. Gantz, Jr. c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.

Attorney: Young and Young.

Gilgore, Alberta M. a/k/a Alberta Marie Gilgore, dec'd.

Late of Salisbury Township.

Executor: Charles W. Gilgore, Jr. c/o Kling and Deibler, LLP, 131 W. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorney: Linda Kling, Esquire; Kling & Deibler, LLP.

Hammer, Pearl M. a/k/a Pearl M. Nelson Hammer, dec'd.

Late of Lancaster City.

Executor: Todd L. Hammer c/o Russell, Krafft & Gruber, LLP, 101 North Pointe Blvd., Suite 202, Lancaster, PA 17601.

Attorney: Nichole M. Baer.

Harting, Philip H., dec'd.

Late of Adamstown Borough.
Co-Executors: Jeffrey P. Harting and David B. Harting c/o E. Richard Young, Jr., Esq., 1248 W. Main Street, Ephrata, PA 17522.
Attorney: E. Richard Young, Jr., Esquire.

Hess, Wanda H., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.
Personal Representative: Helen H. Nolt, Executrix, c/o John R. Gibbel, Attorney, P.O. Box 5349, Lancaster, PA 17606.
Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill & Hess LLP.

Hirschmann, Ozetta M., dec'd.

Late of Lancaster Township.
Executor: April S. Gammache c/o Dennis L. Plank, Esq., Going & Plank, 140 E. King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorney: Dennis L. Plank, Esquire.

Hoover, Erma V., dec'd.

Late of East Cocalico Township.
Executors: Mary Ann Witmer and Philip Mark Hoover c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.
Attorney: Young and Young.

Johnson, James E., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.
Executrix: Margie E. Johnson c/o Scott Alan Mitchell, Esq., Saxton & Stump, LLC, 280 Granite Run Drive, Suite 300, Lancaster, PA 17601.
Attorney: Saxton & Stump, LLC.

Leensvaart, Charles D., dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.
Executor: Amy B. Scott c/o Jeffrey C. Goss, Esquire, 480 New Holland Avenue, Suite 6205, Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorneys: Brubaker Connaughton Goss & Lucarelli LLC.

Lyons, Jon C., dec'd.

Late of Lancaster City.
Executor: Marlene S. Arnold c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.
Attorney: Young and Young.

McCall, Judy K., dec'd.

Late of East Hempfield Township.
Executor: Jodie L. Mowrer c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.
Attorney: Young and Young.

Metzler, Ivan D., dec'd.

Late of Strasburg Township.
Executor: Donald H. Metzler c/o Appel Yost & Zee LLP, 33 North Duke Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorney: Jeffrey P. Ouellet, Esquire.

Morgan, Harold C., dec'd.

Late of Lancaster County.
Executor: Carlos E. Morgan, 841 Groff Avenue, Elizabethtown, PA 17022.
Attorney: Chad J. Julius; 8150 Derry Street, Suite A, Harrisburg, PA 17111.

Mowrer, Robert R., Jr., dec'd.

Late of Lancaster Township.
Executors: Denise K. Shearer, Donna K. Mowrer, Robert R.

Mowrer, III, and Melanie E. Henry c/o Paterson Law LLC, 2600 Willow Street Pike N, PMB 155, Willow Street, PA 17584.

Attorney: Kim Carter Paterson.

Quinn, Patrick W., dec'd.

Late of Manor Township.

Executor: Colleen Quinn c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.

Attorney: Young and Young.

Rapp, Earl R., dec'd.

Late of W. Hempfield Township.

Executor: Shawn Rapp c/o 327 Locust Street, Columbia, PA 17512.

Attorney: John F. Markel; Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP, 327 Locust Street, Columbia, PA 17512.

Readerger, Fay P., dec'd.

Late of Maiden Creek Township.

Executor: Doreen F. Impink c/o May Herr & Grosh, LLP, 234 North Duke Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.

Attorney: Matthew A. Grosh.

Rinaldi, Lawrence W., dec'd.

Late of Ephrata Borough.

Executor: Dennis M. Hartranft, Jr., 151 E. Main Street, Ephrata, PA 17522.

Attorney: Dennis M. Hartranft, Jr., Esquire,

Rutt, Clarence H., Jr., dec'd.

Late of the Township of Manheim.

Personal Representative: Richard D. Rutt, Executor, c/o Marci S. Miller, Attorney, P.O. Box 5349, Lancaster, PA 17606.

Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill & Hess LLP.

Sauers, Margaret A., dec'd.

Late of Terre Hill.

Executor: John A. Lownes c/o Janis M. Smith, Esquire, 4203 West Lincoln Highway, Parkesburg, PA 19365.

Attorney: Janis M. Smith, Esquire.

Slaugh, Gregory Paul, dec'd.

Late of Pequea Township.

Administrator: Alexandra Slaugh, 314 Millstone Drive, Mountville, PA 17554.

Attorney: None.

THIRD PUBLICATION

Beiler, Jacob R., dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Township.

Executors: Martha Louise Riehl, John Norman Beiler, Freda Arnell Lapp, and David Jay Beiler c/o Nevin D. Beiler, Esq., 105 S. Hoover Ave., New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorney: Nevin D. Beiler, Esquire.

Beiler, John S., dec'd.

Late of Upper Leacock Township.

Co-Executors: Amos Beiler, Alvin Beiler, and Christian Beiler c/o Nicholas T. Gard, Esquire, 121 E. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorney: Smoker Gard Associates, LLP.

Chipperfield, Russell R., Jr.
a/k/a Russell Chipperfield,
dec'd.

Late of Manheim Township.
Executor: Michael A. Chipperfield c/o Young and Young, 44 S. Main Street, P.O. Box 126, Manheim, PA 17545.
Attorney: Young and Young.

Cornelius, Edward S., dec'd.

Late of Marietta Borough.
Executor: Alma Cornelius c/o 327 Locust Street, Columbia, PA 17512.
Attorney: John F. Markel, Esquire; Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP, 327 Locust Street, Columbia, PA 17512.

Fitch, Nancy W. a/k/a Nancy Wilker Fitch a/k/a Nancy W. Shrimpton, dec'd.

Late of East Hempfield Township.
Executors: Jennifer A. Crothamel and Daniel M. Shrimpton c/o Barley Snyder LLP, 126 East King Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorney: Randy R. Moyer; Barley Snyder LLP.

Gochnauer, Ethel McGallicher, dec'd.

Late of West Hempfield Township.
Executor: N. Eugene Gochnauer c/o Alspach and Ryder LLC, 232 N. Duke St., Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorney: Alspach and Ryder LLC.

Goshert, Naomi W., dec'd.

Late of Ephrata Borough.
Co-Executors: June Stuber and Jane H. Pittman c/o E. Richard Young, Jr., Esq., 1248 W. Main Street, Ephrata, PA 17522.

Attorney: E. Richard Young, Jr., Esquire.

Gray, Charles F. a/k/a Charles Franklin Gray, dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Township.
Personal Representative: Elizabeth L. Gray c/o John W. Metzger, Esquire, 901 Rohrerstown Road, Lancaster, PA 17601.
Attorneys: Metzger and Spencer, LLP.

Graham, Doris C., dec'd.

Late of Mount Joy Township.
Executor: Orrstown Bank c/o Russell, Krafft & Gruber, LLP, 101 North Pointe Blvd., Suite 202, Lancaster, PA 17601.
Attorney: Lindsay M. Schoeneberger.

Grimm, Mary Jo, dec'd.

Late of Akron Borough.
Executor: Michael J. Grimm c/o Jeffrey C. Goss, Esquire, 480 New Holland Avenue, Suite 6205, Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorneys: Brubaker Connaughton Goss & Lucarelli LLC.

Holden, William J., Jr., dec'd.

Late of Manor Township.
Executor: Constance Pitz c/o May Herr & Grosh, LLP, 234 North Duke Street, Lancaster, PA 17602.
Attorney: Bradley A. Zuke.

Lauer, Barbara A. a/k/a Barbara Ann Lauer, dec'd.

Late of Lititz Borough.
Executrix: Deborah Trimble c/o Appel Yost & Zee LLP, 33 North Duke Street, Lancaster, PA

17602.
Attorney: Jeffrey P. Ouellet.

Laurento, Frank S., dec'd.

Late of Bart Township.
Administrator: Matthew J. Laurento c/o Kling and Deibler, LLP, 131 W. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.
Attorney: Linda Kling, Esquire; Kling & Deibler, LLP.

Levering, Laura T., dec'd.

Late of Providence Township.
Executrix: Diana Dee Levering DeFranco c/o Kristen L. Behrens, Esq., 457 Haddonfield Rd., Ste. 700, Cherry Hill, NJ 08002.
Attorney: Kristen L. Behrens, Esquire; Dilworth Paxson LLP, 457 Haddonfield Rd., Ste. 700, Cherry Hill, NJ 08002.

Martin, Martha S., dec'd.

Late of Caernarvon Township.
Executor: Raymond N. Martin c/o Kling and Deibler, LLP, 131 W. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.
Attorney: Linda Kling, Esquire; Kling & Deibler, LLP.

McCarty, Audrey P. a/k/a Audrey Paecht McCarty, dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Township.
Executor: William I. McCarty, Jr. c/o Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP, 212 North Queen Street, Lancaster, PA 17603.
Attorney: Barbara Reist Dillon.

McMichael, Miriam Brubaker a/k/a Miriam B. McMichael, dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Township.

Executors: Kenneth E. Brubaker and Ronda Brubaker-Brooks c/o Attorney J. Elvin Kraybill, P.O. Box 5349, Lancaster, PA 17606.

Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill & Hess LLP.

Moad, Ruth N., dec'd.

Late of the Township of Brecknock.

Executor: Carol J. Moad, 17 Fairway Drive, Denver, PA 17517.

Attorney: Robert R. Kreitz, Esquire; Kreitz Gallen-Schutt, 1210 Broadcasting Road, Suite 103, Wyomissing, PA 19610.

Nieczyporuk, M. Elizabeth a/k/a Mary Elizabeth Nieczyporuk, dec'd.

Late of West Lampeter Township.

Personal Representative: Laura E. Zielonko, Executrix, c/o Justin J. Bollinger, Attorney, P.O. Box 5349, Lancaster, PA 17606.

Attorneys: Gibbel Kraybill & Hess LLP.

Nolt, Edwin W., dec'd.

Late of West Earl Township.

Executors: Aaron M. Nolt and Edwin W. Nolt, Jr. c/o Good & Harris, LLP, 132 West Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.

Attorney: Good & Harris, LLP.

Pries, Denise a/k/a Denise Marie Pries a/k/a Denise M. Pries, dec'd.

Late of Lititz Borough.

Executrix: Kelly Schwartz c/o Nancy Mayer Hughes, Esquire, Barley Snyder LLP, 126 East King Street, Lancaster, PA

17602.
Attorneys: Barley Snyder LLP.

Rettew, Violet S., dec'd.
Late of Warwick Township.
Executor: Richard L. Henry c/o David R. Morrison & Assoc., 1850 William Penn Way, Suite 103, Lancaster, PA 17601.
Attorney: David R. Morrison & Assoc.

Rodriguez, Gumersindo, dec'd.
Late of Manheim Township.
Personal Representative: Benjamin Rodriguez c/o John W. Metzger, Esquire, 901 Rohrerstown Road, Lancaster, PA 17601.
Attorneys: Metzger and Spencer, LLP.

Schaeffer, George, Jr. a/k/a George Schaeffer, dec'd.
Late of Conestoga Township.
Executor: Dennis F. Schaeffer c/o Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP, 212 North Queen Street, Lancaster, PA 17603.
Attorney: Barbara Reist Dillon.

Schein, Delroy C., dec'd.
Late of the Borough of Elizabethtown.
Executor: Brent R. Schein c/o Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP, 222 S. Market Street, Suite 201, Elizabethtown, PA 17022.
Attorney: Kevin D. Dolan, Esquire.

Sowers, Carl W., dec'd.
Late of West Donegal Township.
Executor: Craig A. Sowers, 25 North Duke Street, Suite 202, York, PA 17401.
Attorney: Charles J. Long, Es-

quire.

Stoltzfus, Jonathan D., dec'd.
Late of East Drumore Township.
Executors: Amos W. Stoltzfus and Edwin L. Stoltzfus c/o Nevin D. Beiler, Esq., 105 S. Hoover Ave., New Holland, PA 17557.
Attorney: Nevin D. Beiler, Esquire.

Zook, Sara L., dec'd.
Late of Salisbury Township.
Executor: Aaron S. Zook c/o Nicholas T. Gard, Esquire, 121 E. Main Street, New Holland, PA 17557.
Attorneys: Smoker Gard Associates LLP.

ARTICLES OF DISSOLUTION

Please be advised that: LARRY J. WILCOX, CPA, P.C. a Pennsylvania professional corporation, at 1316 Clayton Road, Lancaster PA 17603, is in the process of winding up its affairs and dissolving.
Jeffrey P. Ouellet
APPEL, YOST & ZEE LLP
Attorneys

N-26

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

Notice is hereby given that a business corporation known as: Lupado Inc. has been incorporated under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988.
Barbara Reist Dillon, Esquire
Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP

N-26

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE

Court of Common Pleas
Lancaster County, Pennsylvania
Civil Action - Law

IN RE: CHANGE OF NAME OF
L.N.S., a minor, and C.M.S, a mi-
nor, by KAREN M. SLIVOVSKY,
parent and natural guardian

CI-21-00489 / CI-21-00491

CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that a
Hearing on the Change of Name
of L.N.S. and C.M.S. will be heard
on the 16th of December, 2021, at
2:00 p.m. in Courtroom No. 4 of
the Lancaster County Courthouse,
Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The Pe-
titions were filed with the Court of
Common Pleas of Lancaster Coun-
ty, Pennsylvania, on January 25,
2021.

Names to be changed from
L.N.S. to L.N.S. and from C.M.S.
to C.M.S.

Any persons interested may
show cause, if any, why the prayer
of Petitioner should not be grant-
ed.

By: /s/ Sandra Edwards Gray, Es-
quire

Pyfer Reese Straub Gray & Farhat,
PC

128 N. Lime Street
Lancaster, PA 17602
Attorney ID No. 39127

N-26

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
that a Petition has been filed in
the Court of Common Pleas of
Lancaster County, Pennsylva-
nia, seeking to change the name
of Elizabeth Alvarez to Elizabeth
Vargas Alvarez. A hearing on the

Petition will be held on December
7, 2021 at 3:20 p.m. in Courtroom
No. 4 at the Lancaster County
Courthouse, Lancaster County,
Lancaster, Pennsylvania, at which
time any persons interested may
attend and show cause, if any,
why the Petition should not be
granted.

Elizabeth Alvarez
Petitioner

N-26

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
that a Petition has been filed in
the Court of Common Pleas of
Lancaster County, Pennsylvania,
seeking to change the name of
Damian David Allman to Damian
Cassidy Kaine. A hearing on the
Petition will be held on Decem-
ber 7, 2021 at 3:00 o'clock PM in
Courtroom No. 4 at the Lancaster
County Courthouse, 50 N. Duke
Street, Lancaster, Pennsylvania,
at which time any persons inter-
ested may attend and show cause,
if any, why the Petition should not
be granted.

Damian D. Allman
Petitioner

N-26

FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE

Dora Z. Blank, of 5780 Old Phil-
adelphia Pike, Gap, Pennsylvania
17527, did file in the office of the
Secretary of the Commonwealth
of Pennsylvania, on October 22,
2021, registration of the name:

Blank's Quilts & Crafts
under which they intend to do
business at 5780 Old Philadelphia
Pike, Gap, Pennsylvania 17527,
pursuant to the provisions of the
Act of Assembly of December 16,
1982, Chapter 3, known as the
"Fictitious Name Act."

KLING & DEIBLER, LLP
Attorneys

N-26

**ORPHANS' COURT DIVISION
AUDITING NOTICES**

To All Claimants, Beneficiaries, Heirs and Next of Kin, and other persons interested: NOTICE IS GIVEN that the following accounts in decedents', incapacitated persons, minors', and trust estates have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the Orphans' Court division of the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County and will be presented to said Orphans' Court Division for Audit and confirmation therein to the parties legally entitled thereto on
December 7, 2021

at 9 o'clock a.m. in Courtroom No. 11 on the fourth floor of the Courthouse, 50 North Duke Street, Lancaster, PA

1. MYER, BARBARA A., a/k/a BARBARA ANN MYER, decd., 2019-2272. First and Final Account, Barbara M. Sherman, Executor, Michael J. Mongiovi, atty.
2. PLEGER, DAVID E., SR., decd., 2020-0012. First and Final Account, William C. Pleger, Executor, Barbara Reist Dillon, atty.
3. TCHEOU, JIMMY S., a/k/a JIMMY SHIU TCHEOU, decd., 2021-0456. Account, Pang J. S. Tcheou, Administrator, Richard G. Greiner, atty.

Anne L. Cooper

Clerk of the Orphans' Court Division of the Court of Common Pleas.

N-26; D-3

SUITS ENTERED

Defendant's name appears first in capitals, followed by plaintiff's name, number and plaintiff's or appellant's attorneys.

November 10, 2021
to November 17, 2021

ARMSTRONG RELOCATION COMPANY PENNSYLVANIA, LLC; Randy Kimble; 07989; Cave

BANOUB, RAMY F.; Robert Estill; 07856

BARNETT, EDWARD; Discover Bank; 07872; Santucci

BECHTOLD, POLLY; Citibank, N.A.; 07975; Axelrod

BEECHER CONCRETE, BEECHER, LEONARD; New Enterprises Stone & Lime Co.; 07970; Petersen

CAMPBELL, COLIN D.; JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.; 08042; Holzman

CHRISMAN, LINDA E.; Cavalry SPV I, LLC; 07944; Apothaker

CLAYTON, DEANNA; Cavalry SPV I, LLC; 07946; Apothaker

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BUREAU OF DRIVER LICENSING; Courtney Tianne Valle; 07937; Harter

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; Donal M. Newcomer; 07931; Yoder

COUNTRY BARN, LLC, BARNYARD KINGDOM; Andrew Clemens; 07883; McGrath

DELGADO, GIOVANNY ROSARIO, L.H. HUDZIK ENTERPRISES, INC.; Jennifer L. Arocha; 08022; Oberholtzer

DIVERIO, DAWN, DIVERIO, DONALD; Pinnacle Building & Design, Inc.; 07948; Asbell

DIXON, ROBERT, JR.; Cavalry SPV I, LLC; 07949; Apothaker

ENGLEHART, GEMASTIN, WILLIAMS, STEVEN; Marble Properties; 07910

ESCH, JOHN M.; PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; 08005; Manley

FORD, ANITA; Capital One Bank (USA), N.A.; 08013; Ratchford

FRITSCH, CORY, CORY L. FRITSCH CONTRACTING, LLC, FRITSCH CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC; HAJOCA Corporation; 07996; Wechsler

GRAHAM, BARBARA, GRAHAM, BARARA A.; Discover Bank; 07874; House

HIRSCHHORN, RICHELLE LEANN, HIRSCHHORN, LEE EVAN; Matrix Financial Services Corporation, LLC; 07917; Wooters

HOOVER, SUSAN; Craig W. Smith; 07890; Sarno

IN RE: CANDIDACY OF EMILY ZIMMERMAN FOR SCHOOL DIRECTOR IN WARWICK SCHOOL DISTRICT; 07849; Winter

IN RE: CANDIDACY OF JENNIFER WALKER FOR SCHOOL DIRECTOR IN MANHEIM CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT; 07851; Winter

JOHNSON, ANJULI J., JOHNSON, JEFFREY L., LAMPLIGHT LEARNING, LLC, LAMPLIGHT LEARNING EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT; Truist Bank; 07941; Dougherty

KHODAI, ASHLEY; First Financial Investment Fund I, LLC; 07852; Ratchford

MCEVOY, CRAIG A.; Capital One Bank (USA), N.A.; 07859; Ratchford

MEDINA, MELISSA, SANTIAGO, ANTHONY; Truist Bank; 07932; Dougherty

MERCER, CELIA A.; Bank of America, N.A.; 07986; Flink

MILLER, BARBARA E.; Citibank, N.A.; 07981; Axelrod

NAST, REBECCA J.; U.S. Bank National Association; 07863; Dhanda

POLLOCK, SAMUEL, POLLOCK, OLIVA; Albert Hartman; 07903; Hagelgans

ROADCAP, SHANE P.; Citibank, N.A.; 07974; Axelrod

SPOOKY NOOK SPORTS, INC.; Adam Lippe; 07879; Kennett

STATE AUTO INSURANCE COMPANIES, STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY, SUNSTATE CARRIERS, INC., COFIELD, JAMES H.; Jesse C. Farra; 07923; Farhat

STRONG ARM PAINTING, LLC, SWAREZ, EDDIE; LEGS Realty, LP; 07952; Wentzel

UMBLE, MICHELLE E.; U.S. Bank National Association; 07875; Santucci

USCIAK, MARK; U.S. Bank National Association; 07866; Dhanda

WESTACOTT, SIMON, LRA IMAGING AT PENN MEDICINE, KIRCHNER, EMILY, LG HEALTH PHYSICIANS FAMILY MEDICINE DOWNTOWN; Ricardo Rodriguez; 07876; Beasley

ZOOK, ISAAC L.; Capital One Bank (USA), N.A.; 07857; Ratchford

Please join us for a

Retirement Reception

HONORING

*Judge Howard F. Knisely
and
Judge Donald R. Totaro*

Thursday | December 16, 2021 | 4:30 - 6:30pm
Lancaster Bar Association, 28 E. Orange St., Lancaster

LANCASTER BAR ASSOCIATION
INVITES
LBA MEMBERS + THEIR STAFF



A N N U A L

HOLIDAY

PARTY

THURSDAY DECEMBER 9 | 4:30-6:30

YORGO'S RESTAURANT
66 NORTH QUEEN STREET, LANCASTER, PA
2ND & 3RD FLOORS + BUBBLE TENTS ON THE DECK

RSVP TO EMMA@LANCASTERBAR.ORG

POTOMAC.LEGAL

PA MD DC FED

David E. Kindermann, Esquire

313 West Liberty Street Suite 105 Lancaster, PA 17603

717-621-2699 | david@potomac.legal

The Lancaster Law Review (USPS 304080) is published weekly by the Lancaster Bar Association, 28 E. Orange St., Lancaster, PA 17602.

Advertisements and news items must be received before 12:00pm the preceding Friday. Deadlines are subject to change for holiday schedule. Subscription: \$87.00 per year in advance; single copies \$3.40. All legal notices must be submitted in typewritten form and are published exactly as submitted by the advertiser. Neither the Lancaster Law Review nor the printer will assume any responsibility to edit, make spelling corrections, eliminate errors in grammar or make any changes in content. The Lancaster Law Review makes no representation as to the quality of services offered by any advertiser in this publication.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Lancaster Law Review, 28 E. Orange St., Lancaster, PA 17602.

Submissions should be e-mailed to lawreview@lancasterbar.org or faxed to 717-393-0221. Please visit www.lancasterbar.org for more information and current legal advertisement rates.

Do You Recall...

A Better Time Than Now to Take Advantage
of PDF Compression Technology?



Capitol
Support Service

LARGE
2
small



FILE
COMPRESSION

CUTTING EDGE TECHNOLOGY

Electronic court filing systems are great, until
you are faced with transferring large files quickly
or have exceeded file size requirements.

Learn how Capitol can help you please the courts, reduce transfer time
and never miss a deadline due to expanded file sizes. We use the Best
Industry Leading Compression Technology.

CAPITOLSUPPORT.NET