



# Dauphin County Reporter ADVANCE SHEET

(USPS 810-200)

A weekly Journal containing the decisions rendered in the 12th  
Judicial District

No. 6127 Vol. 126

December 22, 2017

No: 130

---

---

Entered as Second Class Matter, February 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Harrisburg, PA., under the Act of Congress of March 31, 1879.

---

---

TERMS: Advertisements must be received before 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday of each week at the office of the Dauphin County Reporter, 213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101; Telephone: (717) 232-7536.

---

---

S.T.E. v. A.T.  
Bar Association Page

194  
Back Pages



The  
Dauphin County Reporter  
Edited and published  
by the  
Dauphin County Bar Association  
213 North Front Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
(717) 232-7536

ELIZABETH G. SIMCOX

Executive Director

KENDRA HEINBAUGH

Office Manager

BRIDGETTE L. HILBISH

CLE Coordinator/Reporter Designer

Printed by:

K-PRESS

P.O. Box 1626, York, PA 17405

---

---

THE DAUPHIN COUNTY REPORTER (USPS 810-200) is published weekly by the Dauphin County Bar Association, 213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101. Periodical postage paid at Harrisburg, PA. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE DAUPHIN COUNTY REPORTER, 213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101.

---

---

TERMS: Advertisements must be received before 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday of each week at the office of the Dauphin County Reporter, 213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101; Telephone: (717) 232-7536; Email: [Bridgette@dcba-pa.org](mailto:Bridgette@dcba-pa.org)

---

---



### Estate Notices

#### DECEDENTS ESTATES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that letters testamentary or of administration have been granted in the following estates. All persons indebted to the estate are required to make payment, and those having claims or demands to present the same without delay to the administrators or executors or their attorneys named below.

#### FIRST PUBLICATION

### Estate Notices

ESTATE OF SHERRY M. BOYER, late of Halifax Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Administrator: Earl W. Boyer, 414 Lehman Road, Halifax, PA 17032 or to his Attorney: Scott W. Morrison, Esquire, 6 West Main Street, P.O. Box 232, New Bloomfield, PA 17068. d22-j5

ESTATE OF GLADYS D. SHOOP, late of Penn Township, Perry County, Pennsylvania. Administrator: Shelby Shoop. Attorney: Melanie Walz Scaringi, Esquire, Scaringi & Scaringi, P.C., 2000 Linglestown Road, Suite 106, Harrisburg, PA 17110. d22-j5

ESTATE OF LAWRENCE TODD WELLER a/k/a LAWRENCE T. WELLER a/k/a TODD WELLER, (died: September 22, 2017), late of Upper Paxton Township. Administrator: Rebecca M. Fesig, 590 Robin Hill Circle, York, PA 17404. Attorney: Gilbert G. Malone, 42 South Duke Street, York, PA 17401. d22-j5

ESTATE OF JUNE E. WARFEL, (died: November 05, 2017), late of Upper Paxton Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Co-Executors: Doris M. Erdman, 123 Travitz Road, Millersburg, Pennsylvania; Robert L. Warfel, 944 Small Valley Road, Halifax, Pennsylvania. Attorney: Joseph D. Kerwin, Esquire, Kerwin & Kerwin, LLP, 4245 State Route 209, Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania 17023. d22-j5

ESTATE OF SUZANN C. WILLIAMS, late of Halifax Borough, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Executor: Jason D. Gutshall, 2370 Dewey Lane, Enola, PA 17025. Attorney: Earl Richard Etzweiler, Esquire, 105 N. Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101, (717) 234-5600. d22-j5

ESTATE OF DOROTHY M. HESS, late of Lower Paxton Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Executor: Gerald L. Hess, c/o Robert P. Kline, Esquire, Kline Law Office, P.O. Box 461, New Cumberland, PA 17070-0461. d22-j5

Summer

Grandmother shall be entitled to three nonconsecutive weeks (7-day periods) of partial custody with the subject children. The weeks shall take place in June, July and August with the parties agreeing upon the week for each month.

Telephone/Text/Email

The parties shall allow reasonable contact by telephone/text/email between the children and the non-custodial party when the children are in their respective custody.

---

**S.T.E. v. A.T.****Domestic Relations - Child Support - Upward Deviation**

Father appealed an order to pay a 15% upward deviation in his basic child support obligation due to his failure to exercise parental custodial responsibilities.

1. The amount of basic child support due under the Support Guidelines assumes that children spend 30% of their time with the obligor and that the obligor makes direct expenditures on their behalf during that time. Variable expenditures, such as food and entertainment that fluctuate based upon parenting time, were adjusted in the schedule to build in the assumption of 30% parenting time. *Upward deviation should be considered in cases in which the obligor has little or no contact with the children. Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-4 (Explanatory Comment 2010)* (emphasis added).
2. The Support Guidelines permit the imposition of an additional expense upon the obligor if the Court determines that the expense covered a reasonable need and its exclusion would render the support order inappropriate. *Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-6(d)*.

Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) Opinion. C.P., Dau. Co., No. 0630 DR 2009, PACSES 763110775

*Lisa Mary-Francis Hopkins*, for the Plaintiff

*Anthony T. McBeth*, for the Defendant

Turgeon, J., December 6, 2017

**OPINION**

Before the court is the appeal filed by Father from an order directing he pay child support. Father challenges this court's imposition upon him of an upward deviation of support because he has failed to exercise custody. He also challenges the court's decision to require he pay a portion of camp and trip expenses incurred by Mother on behalf of one of the parties' children. Finally, he objects to the court's direction that he include his eldest child on his health insurance policy, even though the inclusion would cost him nothing. This opinion is written in support of the child support order, pursuant to Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a).

**Background**

The parties, Mother S.T.E. and Father A.T., were married in December 1997 and separated in April 2009. They are the parents of three children, born in October 1998, July 2003 and October 2006.

Mother and Father divorced in November 2009 and the parties later reached an agreement in 2010 that they would share legal custody and that Mother would have primary physical custody and Father partial physical custody on alternating weekends.<sup>1</sup> The parties' separation involved a great deal of conflict that included Protection From Abuse proceedings.<sup>2</sup> At some point following entry of their custody agreement, Father stopped exercising custody and has not seen the children for numerous years. Mother filed a complaint seeking child support and spousal support / *alimony pendente lite* in April 2009 and a support order was entered. After the parties' divorce, it was changed to child support only and the amounts due amended a number of times over the ensuing years.

On August 24, 2016, Mother filed a petition seeking an increase to the then existing child support order requiring Father pay \$1,492 per month. Following a Domestic Relations Section (DRS) office conference, this court issued an order recommended by the conference officer dated December 14, 2016 (effective August 24, 2016), directing that Father pay \$1,603 monthly child support plus \$150 towards arrears. In calculating support, the conference officer assigned Mother a monthly net income of \$1,226 based upon an earning capacity of \$8 per hour for a forty-hour work week. Mother was not working at the time and had not worked during the parties' marriage. Father was assigned a monthly net income of \$6,254 reflecting his actual wages. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 4-6) A provision in the recommended order reflected the parties' stipulation that they pay costs of agreed upon extracurricular activities in proportion to their incomes. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 6)

Mother sought de novo review and a hearing was held before me on March 8, 2017. At that hearing, Mother argued that Father should also pay his proportionate share for the children's private and religious school tuition. She also argued he should pay his share of the middle child's annual summer camp costs and her overseas school-related trip scheduled for April 2017. Mother requested as well that Father be required to pay increased support due to his failure to exercise any custody for several years. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 6, 11)

Mother testified that all children take the overseas trip following 8<sup>th</sup> grade as part of their religious training. Mother paid \$2,293.21 for the trip on February 1, 2017 and provided an invoice to the court reflecting the cost, which was reduced due to her fundraising and a scholarship. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 8-9)<sup>3</sup> Upon the recommendation of the middle child's teacher, that child had attended summer camp for a number of years to help with her socialization and intends to do so in the future. The camp costs \$500 annually and Mother provided an invoice for the 2016 summer camp. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 10, 13)

---

<sup>1</sup> A.T. v. S.T.E., 2009 CV 5034 CU (Dauphin County).

<sup>2</sup> S.T.E. v. A.T., 2009 CV 4006 AB (Dauphin County).

<sup>3</sup> During both the March 8, 2017 and September 20, 2017 de novo hearings, the parties presented numerous exhibits, all of which I reviewed and were copied for my files and those of the Dauphin County DRS. However, none of the exhibits were formally admitted into evidence by the parties, nor attached to the hearing transcripts.

Regarding custody, Mother testified that Father has refused to see their children, noting he last saw the oldest child in 2010 and the younger two in 2014. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 12, 13) She presented a signed letter he sent to her in August 2014, the contents of which were recited at the hearing, as follows:

I [A.T.], no longer want any contact from [S.T.E.], either direct or indirect, by phone, text, or e-mail. Any further contact from this point will be considered harassment by Communications Pa. C.S. 18 Section 2709 and could be punishable up to 90 days in jail. The police will be notified and I will prosecute any violations to the full extent of the law.

(N.T. 3/8/17 at 12, 32-33) Father testified (via his attorney's offer of proof, adopted by Father) that Mother has prevented him from having contact with the children and that when there was contact in the past, she would interfere by making excessive phone calls. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 17) According to Father, the oldest child has told him she will never see him again. (*Id.*) Father presented a letter from May 2013, from his then-attorney to Mother's attorney, stating that Father has been attempting to resume physical custody but that Mother was refusing to allow him to do so. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 17-18) Father admitted, however, that he never sought to modify the existing custody order nor filed a contempt action against mother seeking to enforce his custodial rights. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 26-27) At the conclusion of the hearing, I took the matter under advisement.

While my decision was pending, Father filed a petition to modify March 17, 2017, on the ground that his income had decreased due to the loss of his job. I thereafter issued an order May 24, 2017 covering two time periods. The first part of the order directed that, effective August 24, 2016 (the date Mother filed her petition for modification), Father pay \$1,868 per month in child support plus \$100 per month on arrears. In calculating the support amount, I directed that Father's basic child support obligation include a 15% upward deviation due to him "failing to exercise his parental [custodial] responsibilities." The second time period commenced March 17, 2017 (the date Father filed his petition for modification) under which Father's child support obligation was reduced to \$1,083 per month, plus \$100 on arrears. This calculation factored in that Father was receiving unemployment compensation. The order also included a 15% upward deviation due to his failure to exercise custody and his proportional share for the \$500 annual camp costs for the middle child.<sup>4</sup> The order again included a provision directing the parties share the cost of agreed upon extracurricular activities in proportion to their incomes (excluding the \$500 camp cost already factored into the support order). I also ordered that \$1,146.61 be added to Father's arrears, which represented one-half of the cost of the overseas school-related trip taken by the middle child, which had been paid solely by Mother. The support order issued did not require Father to pay any portion of the two

---

<sup>4</sup> Under the May 24, 2007 order, effective August 24, 2016, Mother was assigned a monthly net income based upon her earning capacity of \$1,226 and Father's was based upon his wage income of \$6,254. Father's proportionate share of the basic child support owed under those incomes was \$1,633 per month. The figure was increased to include a 15% upward deviation of \$245 for failure to exercise custody. Father was also directed to pay \$35 per month which represented his proportional share of camp costs for one child paid by Mother. He was also given a \$45 monthly credit representing his payment of Mother's portion of the children's medical costs, for a total order of \$1,868 (\$1633 + \$245 + \$35 - \$45).

Under the order as effective March 17, 2017, Mother was assigned the same \$1,226 monthly net income (earning capacity) while Father was assigned a monthly net income of \$2,437 from unemployment compensation. Father's proportionate share of the basic child support owed under those incomes was \$917, to which I added the 15% upward deviation of \$138 per month and \$28 per month for his proportional share of camp costs paid by Mother, for a total order of \$1,083 (\$917 + \$138 + \$28).

younger children's religious school tuition. Notably, Father did not file an appeal from the May 24, 2017 order including from my decision to include a 15% upward deviation or that he pay a portion of the middle child's overseas trip and annual camp costs.

On May 25, 2017, Father filed a petition for modification seeking that the oldest child, then 18 years old, be removed from the order due to her anticipated emancipation the following month, when she would graduate from high school. Following a DRS office conference, I issued an order August 11, 2017, as recommended by the conference officer, which covered three time periods. The first, effective June 9, 2017, reduced Father's support obligation to \$946 per month to reflect the removal of the oldest child from the order. Effective July 8, 2017, the order increased to \$1,157 per month due to Father having obtained a job and an increased monthly net income. Effective August 1, 2017, the order was decreased slightly to \$1,093 to account for Father's payment of health care premiums for the children. Father's support obligation under all three time periods again included a 15% upward deviation to reflect his failure to exercise custody.<sup>5</sup> The order also included a provision that the parties share the cost of agreed upon extracurricular activities in proportion to incomes (less \$500 for camps already considered). (See N.T. 9/20 at 3-5)

Father filed a timely request for de novo review and a hearing was held before me September 20, 2017. At the hearing, Father argued that he should not be directed to pay a 15% upward deviation due to his failure to exercise custody because Mother has not allowed him to see the children and that he did not even know where they lived. Father provided the court with unmarked correspondence including a letter from his then-attorney to Mother's attorney (dated March 17, 2017), in which he indicated a desire to resume his alternating weekend periods of custody as soon as possible.<sup>6</sup> (See N.T. 9/20/17 at 5) Mother's attorney responded to Father's March 17, 2017 letter, stating Mother would not allow Father to see the children because his prior actions caused the children significant psychological problems, that he has "willfully, intentionally and deliberately been the direct root of the disassociation between himself and the children," and it would not be in their best interests to see him. Mother noted the history of abuse against her and the minor children and that she is reasonably in fear of her life from him. (N.T. 9/20/17 at 7, 8)

---

<sup>5</sup> Under the recommended order effective June 9, 2017, Mother was again assigned a \$1,226 monthly net income (earning capacity) while Father was again assigned a monthly net income of \$2,437 from unemployment compensation. The basic child support obligation for two children under the Support Guidelines was \$1,200, of which Father's proportionate share was \$798, to which the officer added a 15% upward deviation of \$120 per month and \$28 per month for his proportional share of camp costs paid by Mother, for a total order of \$946 (\$798 + \$120 + \$28).

Under the recommended order effective July 8, 2017, Mother was assigned her \$1,226 monthly net income while Father was assigned his new employment monthly net income of \$3,249. The basic child support obligation for two children under the Support Guidelines was \$1,349, of which Father's proportionate share was \$979, to which the officer added a 15% upward deviation of \$146 per month and \$30 per month for his proportional share of camp costs, for a total order of \$1,157 (\$979 + \$147 + \$30).

Under the recommended order effective August 1, 2017, Father's total support obligation of \$1,157 (calculated above as of July 8, 2017), was reduced by \$63 per month, to account for Mother's proportionate share of health insurance premiums Father had commenced paying to include the children on his employer-provided health insurance.

<sup>6</sup> This letter was dated shortly after the first de novo hearing in this matter, March 8, 2017, in which Mother sought the upward deviation due to Father's non-exercise of his custodial rights.

Near the conclusion of the hearing Mother's attorney inquired as to whether Father could add his emancipated eldest daughter (then still 18 years of age) to his employer provided family health insurance. As explained to the court, the eldest child suffers from serious mental health issues and had been receiving treatment with providers permitted under her prior insurance with Father. After that lapsed, she was able to obtain medical assistance but it did not cover her mental health providers and caused a loss of continuity with her treatment. (N.T. 9/20/17 at 9) Under Father's plan, she would be able to treat again with her mental health providers.

Father agreed that it would cost him nothing extra to add her to his health insurance policy but believed that he was unable to have his employer add her. I informed him that was not true since children are mandated by law as being eligible for health benefits until they are 26 years old. (N.T. 9/20/17 at 16-17). I assumed Father was amenable to this common sense solution to providing his eldest daughter with adequate health insurance, **at no additional cost to him**, and directed DRS add her to his policy to which Father did not articulate any objection. (N.T. 9/20/17 at 17) Following the hearing, I issued an order denying Father's claims on de novo review and directing he add the eldest child to his health insurance. Father thereafter filed an appeal to the Superior Court.

#### Legal Discussion

In his statement of errors raised on appeal, Father argues that this court erred by (1) imposing upon him a 15% upward deviation in child support due to his failure to exercise custody where Mother has secreted the whereabouts of the children from him for years and because he has lacked the financial resources to pursue a remedy; (2) continuing to require he pay his a portion of the middle child's overseas school trip as he was not consulted by Mother concerning the appropriateness and affordability of the trip; (3) requiring he pay his proportionate share of the \$500 annual summer camp cost when he was not consulted by Mother about this cost and also because Mother failed to provide any documentation evidencing this expenditure; and (4) requiring that he include the oldest child on his health insurance since she is emancipated and he has no legal obligation to provide her with such insurance.

#### *Upward Deviation Due to Failure to Exercise Custody*

Father argues the court erred by requiring he pay 15% extra to account for the fact he exercises no custody. He claims that no deviation was warranted because Mother secreted the whereabouts of the children from him for years and because he has lacked the financial resources to pursue a remedy by seeking relief in the custody action.

The amount of basic child support due under the Support Guidelines assumes that children spend 30% of their time with the obligor and that the obligor makes direct expenditures on their behalf during that time. See Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-1 (Explanatory Comment 2010, E. Shared Custody) An Explanatory Comment to Support Guidelines Rule 1910.16-4, grants this court discretion to make an upward deviation to basic child support in cases where the obligor parent spends considerably less than the assumed 30% custodial time factored into basic child support figures, as follows:

The basic support schedule incorporates an assumption that the children spend 30% of the time with the obligor and that the obligor makes direct expenditures on their behalf during that time. Variable expenditures, such as food and entertainment that fluctuate

based upon parenting time, were adjusted in the schedule to build in the assumption of 30% parenting time. **Upward deviation should be considered in cases in which the obligor has little or no contact with the children.** However, upward deviation may not be appropriate where an obligor has infrequent overnight contact with the child, but provides meals and entertainment during daytime contact. Fluctuating expenditures should be considered rather than the extent of overnight time. Downward deviation may be appropriate when the obligor incurs substantial fluctuating expenditures during parenting time, but has infrequent overnights with the children.

...

Pa.R.C.P. No. 1910.16-4 (Explanatory Comment 2010) (emphasis added). See, Morgan v. Morgan, 99 A.3d 554, 560 (Pa. Super. 2014) (noting that this Comment “only suggests that upward deviation be considered; it does not require it.”)<sup>7</sup>

Before reaching the merits of Father’s argument, I note that I previously included a 15% upward deviation in the May 24, 2017 child support order (issued following the March 8, 2017 de novo hearing), “for Father’s failure to exercise his parental responsibilities.” Father did not appeal from that order and thus has waived raising the issue, at least to the extent of his claims through the date of that order.

Assuming the issue has not been waived, however, the record shows Father is still failing to exercise custodial responsibilities. The evidence presented was that Father has not seen his two younger children for almost four years (since the early part of 2014). Father asserted that he recently tried to exercise custody but has been “thwarted” by Mother. In support, he presented correspondence between his then-attorney and Mother’s attorney from March 2017. Mother’s attorney cited a number of reasons for stating in her letter that Mother would not agree to resume custody after such a long period of time, reasons to which Mother credibly testified at the most recent hearing, including a past history of abuse, that Mother fears for her life if she were to resume any contact with Father, and that Father’s past actions have caused the children significant psychological problems. Since that time, Father has done nothing to pursue custody. I specifically advised him at the March 8, 2017 hearing that he should file a modification request or contempt petition if he wanted to see his children. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 27-28) In addition, despite his current attorney’s claims at the September 20, 2017 hearing that Father was then in the process of seeking custody by filing a petition for contempt when he got the funds together (N.T. 9/20/17 at 5), the record shows he has made no such filings since that hearing to date. The custody case docket in fact reflects no action in the custody matter since 2010. (See N.T. 9/20/17 at 6) Father’s argument on appeal suggesting he has not filed for custody because he lacks sufficient income lacks credibility. Based upon Father’s \$3,249 monthly net

---

<sup>7</sup> The Support Guidelines provide a direct remedy to an obligor parent who has custody a “substantial amount of time,” defined as 40% or more of overnights. See Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-4(c)(1). In such cases, the Rule grants that parent a rebuttable presumption the he or she “is entitled” to a reduction in the basic support obligation to reflect the extra time under a formula set forth in the Rule. *Id.* The Rules themselves grant no such presumption and formulaic remedy to the obligee parent in the reverse situation where the obligor parent spends considerably less than the assumed 30% custodial time. However, the Explanatory Comment quoted above notes that upward deviation *should* be considered in those cases. Pa.R.C.P. No. 1910.16-4 (Explanatory Comment 2010)

Newly proposed language by the Domestic Relations Procedural Rules Committee would explicitly provide within the text of Rule 1910.16-4 that a court “*shall* consider an upward deviation” of support where the obligor exercises insubstantial custodial time, defined as 10% or less custodial time. Proposed Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-4(c)(2) (emphasis added) (Recommendation 167; Proposed Amendment of Pa.R.C.P. No. 1910.16-4 (47 Pa.B. 5928, Sept. 23, 2017); <http://www.pabulletin.com/secure/data/vol47/47-38/1570.html>).



income, he can clearly afford to pay the \$150 fee to file a contempt petition. The evidence showed Father has not genuinely attempted to exercise custody and that his testimony to the contrary is not credible.

The basic child support amount due under the Support Guidelines assumes Father is making direct expenditures on the children's behalf when they are in his custody. Because Mother is paying for all such expenditures Father is otherwise presumed to be making during his custodial periods, she was entitled to a 15% upward deviation in the basic support amount, particularly since the record shows a need for such support wherein she has been assigned a minimum wage earning capacity, receives medical assistance and food stamps. (See N.T. 9/20/17 at 3-4)

*Additional Expenses: Cost of Child's Trip and Summer Camp*

The next two issues involve similar claims and I thus address them together. Father argues this court erred by requiring he pay a share of the middle child's overseas school trip and also by requiring he pay a proportionate share of the \$500 per year cost of the middle child's summer camp.

The overseas trip expense issue was fully and finally litigated and memorialized in my support order issued May 24, 2017, following the March 8, 2017 de novo hearing. At the hearing, Mother testified about the nature of the trip and its cost, and requested Father reimburse her a portion of the costs. My order directed he pay one-half of the cost, totaling \$1,146.61. Father did not appeal from that order and thus the issue was fully concluded and cannot be litigated again.

Even if Father properly raised the issue, however, the inclusion of this cost to Father was proper. "Additional expenses" such as the one at issue are a legitimate part of a child support order under Support Guidelines Rule 1910.16-6(d), which states:

**Rule 1910.16-6. Support Guidelines. Adjustments to the Basic Support Obligation. Allocation of Additional Expenses.**

The trier of fact may allocate between the parties the additional expenses identified in subdivisions (a) - (e). If under the facts of the case an order for basic support is not appropriate, the trier of fact may allocate between the parties the additional expenses.

...

**(d) Private School Tuition. Summer Camp. Other Needs.** The support schedule does not take into consideration expenditures for private school tuition or other needs of a child which are not specifically addressed by the guidelines. If the court determines that one or more such needs are reasonable, the expense thereof shall be allocated between the parties in proportion to their net incomes. The obligor's share may be added to his or her basic support obligation.

Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-6.<sup>8</sup> Under this Rule, if this court determines that an additional expense is used to pay for a reasonable need and further finds that the amount of basic child support is not appropriate without

---

<sup>8</sup> Subsection (d) was amended effective October 1, 2017, as follows:

**(d) Private School Tuition. Summer Camp. Other Needs.** Expenditures for needs outside the scope of typical child-rearing expenses, e.g., private school tuition, summer camps, have not been factored into the Basic Child Support Schedule.

inclusion of the additional expense, it can require that the obligor pay his or her share of the expense. Mother presented evidence that the overseas trip was a one-time cost and was a normal part of the child's school curricula. Furthermore, the original cost of the trip, of over \$4,000, was reduced in part due to Mother's fundraising and thus, the final cost of \$2,293.21 was reasonable. Because this expenditure was for a reasonable need, and its exclusion from the order would be inappropriate, Father was properly required to pay a portion of it.<sup>9</sup>

Father argues that he should not be required to pay any part of the trip's cost because he never agreed to it and Mother never consulted him about it including whether it was appropriate and affordable. As noted above, earlier versions of the support orders entered in this case recite that the parties reached some sort of stipulation that they pay costs of agreed upon extracurricular activities in proportion to their incomes. (N.T. 3/8/17 at 6) There was no evidence that Mother obtained Father's agreement or consulted with him before paying for the overseas trip. Nevertheless, to the extent there was a stipulation of some sort between the parties, that stipulation cannot be used to bargain away any child support rights, of which an "additional expense," such as the overseas trip here, is a legitimate part. See Huss v. Weaver, 134 A.3d 449, 454-55 (Pa. Super. 2016), *appeal denied*, 158 A.3d 1231 (Pa. 2016) ("[T]he right to child support ***belongs to the child***, and thus cannot be "bargained away" by the parents" and parental agreements to the contrary are invalid on public policy grounds) (bolding and italics in original, citation omitted)). Instead, this court is mandated to follow the Support Guidelines which permit the court to impose an additional expense upon the obligor if this court determines that the expense covered a reasonable need and its exclusion would render the support order inappropriate. Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-6(d).

Father similarly argues that I erred by requiring he pay his proportionate share of the \$500 annual camp cost when he was not consulted by Mother about this cost and also because Mother failed to provide any documentation evidencing this expenditure. This issue was initially raised at the March 8, 2017 de novo hearing wherein Mother sought that Father pay a portion of this expense. In my final order

---

(1) If a party incurs an expense for a need not factored into the Basic Child Support Schedule and the court determines the need and expense are reasonable, the court shall allocate the expense between the parties in proportion to the parties' monthly net incomes. The court may order that the obligor's share is added to his or her basic support obligation, paid directly to the service provider, or paid directly to the obligee.

(2) Documentation of the expenses allocated under (d)(1) shall be provided to the other party not later than March 31 of the year following the calendar year in which the invoice was received unless the service provider invoices the parties separately for their proportionate share of the expense. For purposes of subsequent enforcement, these expenses need not be submitted to the domestic relations section prior to March 31. Allocation of expenses for which documentation is not timely provided to the other party shall be within the discretion of the court.

Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-6 (as amended). Notably, the amended language has not substantively altered this subsection other than to explicitly require that the court find both the expense and the need reasonable, as opposed to just the need.

<sup>9</sup> I directed that Father pay 50% of the total cost of the trip, which was less than his proportionate share of the parties' combined incomes. Since the matter was not appealed by either party, his obligation remains in this lower amount.

following that hearing, issued May 24, 2017, I directed that the *annual* cost be included in Father's child support order to be paid in proportion to his income. (See footnote 4)

As with the claim above, Father's failure to appeal from my decision imposing he pay a proportionate share of the \$500 camp cost on an annual basis is a waiver by him to raising the issue now. To the extent not waived, the cost was clearly a proper inclusion into the child support under Rule 1910.16-6(d). Annual camp attendance is a reasonable need wherein Mother testified the child attended upon the recommendation of her teacher to help with socialization. Mother properly documented the cost in the prior hearing. Because this cost reflected a reasonable need, and its exclusion from the order would be inappropriate, Father was properly required to pay a portion of it. Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-6(d).

#### *Health Insurance*

Father's final argument is that this court erred by requiring he include the eldest child on his health insurance since she is emancipated and he has no legal obligation to provide her with such insurance. As I noted above, Father appeared amenable to the addition of his eldest child on his health insurance policy, given that *it would add no additional cost* to his health insurance expense, and I thus included it in the order. Father is correct that I cannot force him to provide insurance to his emancipated daughter. Nevertheless, it evidences a deep level of alienation with this child and most certainly with his other children and supports my finding that his testimony not credible that he genuinely wants to have contact with his children.

Accordingly, I issued the order of September 20, 2017, from which Father appeals.

---

## FIRST PUBLICATION

### Estate Notices

ESTATE OF NORA M. SCHMIDT, (died: July 10, 2016), late of Borough of Middletown, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Co-Executor: Benedict J. Brought, 841 Moores Mountain Road, Lewisberry, PA 13799; Co-Executor: Melissa Wells, 620 Georgian Place, Harrisburg, PA 17111. Attorney: John S. Davidson, Esquire, Yost & Davidson, 320 West Chocolate Avenue, P.O. Box 437, Hershey, PA 17033-0437. d22-j5

ESTATE OF MILDRED E. KENNEDY, (died: October 27, 2017), Late Of: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Executrix: Nina M. Intrieri, 6207 Blue Ridge Avenue, Harrisburg, PA 17112. Attorney: Susan E. Lederer, Esquire, 5011 Locust Lane, Harrisburg, PA 17109. d22-j5

## SECOND PUBLICATION

### Estate Notices

ESTATE OF WILLIE GREEN, of Susquehanna Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Personal Representatives/Administratrices: Kelly Green, 213 Francis L. Cadden Pkwy, Apt. # 104, Harrisburg, PA 17111 & Deloris A. Penn, 656 Madison Avenue, York, PA 17404 or to Attorney: ROBERT FREEDENBERG, ESQUIRE, SkarlatosZonarich LLC, 17 South 2nd Street, Floor 6, Harrisburg, PA 17101. d15-29

ESTATE OF DANIEL R. KALBACH, (died: August 21, 2017), late of City Of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Administrator: Richard C. Kalbach And Denise L. Kalbach, 1595 Williamsburg Way, Mechanicsburg, PA 17050. Attorney: Andrew H. Shaw, 2011 W. Trindle Road, Carlisle, PA 17013. d15-29

NOTICE OF TRUST ADMINISTRATION OF THE RICHARD D. GARBER LIVING TRUST dated June 21,2007, as amended (the "Trust"), following the death of Richard D. Garber, late of East Hanover Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania (died: October 29,2017). Successor Death Trustee: Christina L. Garber, c/o JSDC Law Offices, P.O. Box 650, Hershey, PA 17033 or to Attorney: Christa M. Aplin, Esquire, JSDC Law Offices, P.O. Box 650, Hershey, PA 17033, (717) 533-3280. d15-29

ESTATE OF RICHARD W. BAILEY, (died: November 17, 2017), late of Swatara Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Executrix: Susan E. Owens, 1855 Albemarle Beach Road, Roper, NC 27970. Attorney: Elizabeth H. Feather, Esquire, Caldwell & Kearns, P.C., 3631 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110, (717) 232-7661. d15-29

ESTATE OF ROBERT J. RUTH, (died: November 19, 2017), late of Lower Paxton Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Executrix: Michele Ruth. c/o William R. Church, Esq., Keefer Wood Allen & Rahal, LLP, P.O. Box 11963, Harrisburg, PA 17108-1963. d15-29

ESTATE OF LARRY A. FESSLER, late of the Borough of Pillow, County of Dauphin and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Co-Executors: Douglas L. Fessler, 435 Small Cut Road, Dalmatia, PA 17017; Lucretia A. Michael, 152 Witmer Farm Lane, Dalmatia, PA 17017; Joseph C. Michetti, Jr., Esquire, Law Offices Of Diehl, Dluce, Michetti & Michetti, 921 Market Street, Trevorton, Pa 17881. d15-29

## THIRD PUBLICATION

### Estate Notices

ESTATE OF ESTHER H. FORNEY, (died: November 14, 2017), late of Upper Paxton Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Co-Administrator: Jeffrey E. Forney, 610 Light Street, Millersburg, Pennsylvania 17061; Co-Administrator: Vaughn A. Forney, 620 Light Street, Millersburg, Pennsylvania 17061; Attorney: Terrence J. Kerwin, Esquire, Kerwin & Kerwin, LLP, 4245 State Route 209, Elizabethtown, PA 17023. d8-22

ESTATE OF AGNES M. BURNS, (died: August 4, 2017), late of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Administrator: Thomas F. Bums c/o David C. Miller, Jr., Esquire, 1846 Bonnie Blue Lane, Middletown, PA 17057, (717) 939-9806, email: [DavidCMillerJr@verizon.net](mailto:DavidCMillerJr@verizon.net). d8-22

ESTATE OF BETTY M. KREISER, (died: November 10, 2017), late of Lykens Borough, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Co-Executor: Delton T. Kreiser, Jr., 756 East Main Street, Lykens, PA 17048 or Co-Executor: Cynthia F. Motter, 2617 Alessandro Blvd., Harrisburg, PA 17110; Attorney: Gregory M. Kerwin, Esquire, 4245 State Route 209, Elizabethtown 17023. d8-22

ESTATE OF W. L. REXRODE a/k/a WILLARD L. REXRODE, (died: November 2, 2017), late of Conewago Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Executor: Mid Penn Bank, Attn: Kimberly Arthur-Tressler, V.P., 4431 N. Front St., Harrisburg, PA 17110 or to Attorney: Kendra A. Mohr, Esq., Pannebaker & Mohr, P.C., 4000 Vine St, Suite 101, Middletown, PA 17057. d8-22

**THIRD PUBLICATION**

Estate Notices

ESTATE OF ELLIS L. CONRAD, (died: September 17, 2017), late of Middletown Borough, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Administratrix: Sheree Fox, 227 East Main Street, Middletown, PA 17057. Attorney: Elizabeth H. Feather, Esquire, Caldwell & Kearns, P.C., 3631 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110, (717) 232-7661.

d8-22

ESTATE OF CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL HAWK, (died: November 17, 2017), late of Lower Paxton Township, Dauphin County, PA. Executrix: Sally A. Hawk, 104 North Johnson Street, Harrisburg, PA 17112. Attorney: Bruce G. Baron, Esquire, Capozzi Adler, P.C., 2933 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110-1250. d8-22

ESTATE OF HULDA EINHORN aka HULDA R. EINHORN, (died: October 15, 2017), late of Middletown Borough, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Executor: Gordon Alan Einhorn, c/o Hazen Law Group, 2000 Linglestown Road, Suite 202, Harrisburg, PA 17110 or to Estate of Hulda Einhorn, c/o Hazen Law Group, 2000 Linglestown Road, Suite 202, Harrisburg, PA 17110. d8-22

ESTATE OF MORTON ELLIS BAUMGARTEN a/k/a MORTON E. BAUMGARTEN, late of the City of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Administrator: Ronald D. Butler, 1007 Mumma Road, Suite 101, Lemoyne, PA 17043 or to Butler Law Firm, 1007 Mumma Road, Suite 101, Lemoyne, PA 17043. d8-22

ESTATE OF HARTMAN, MARTHA M. aka HARTMAN, MARTHA aka HARTMAN, MARTHA MAXWELL late of Lower Paxton Twp., PA. Executrix: Molly H. Goldsmith, c/o Ned Hark, Esq., Goldsmith Hark & Hornak, PC, 7716 Castor Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19152. Attorney: Goldsmith Hark & Hornak, PC, 7716 Castor Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19152. d8-22



**FIRST PUBLICATION**

Corporate Notices

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Foreign Registration Statement has been filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA on or about October 27, 2017, for a foreign corporation with a registered address in the state of Pennsylvania as follows: **Arts for Learning Connecticut Inc** c/o AAAgent Services, LLC

This corporation is incorporated under the Laws of Connecticut.

The address of its principal office is 3074 Whitney Avenue Building 2, 2nd Floor, Hamden, CT 06518.

The corporation has been qualified in Pennsylvania under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988, as amended. d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988 were filed by **ADVANCED CROWN TECHNOLOGY, INC.**, having its office at 4940 Linglestown Road, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 17110, with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and approved by said Department on the 30th day of November, 2017. The corporation shall have unlimited power to engage in and do any lawful act concerning any or all lawful business for which corporations may be incorporated under the Business Corporation Law. d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the Business Corporation Law of 1988, **Tempdady Inc.**, a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, intends to withdraw from doing business in Pennsylvania. The address of its principal office is 30 Newbury Street, 3rd Floor, Boston, MA 02116 and the name of its commercial registered office provider in Pennsylvania is CT Corporation System. d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the Business Corporation Law of 1988, **Carter & Burgess, Inc.**, a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Texas, intends to withdraw from doing business in Pennsylvania. The address of its principal office in its jurisdiction of incorporation is 350 N. St. Paul St., Suite 2900, Dallas, TX 75201 and the name of its commercial registered office provider in Pennsylvania is CT Corporation System. d22

**FIRST PUBLICATION**

**Corporate Notices**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Event Resource Professionals Inc.**, a foreign corporation formed under the laws of the State of New York, where its principal office is located at 557 W. Walnut St., Long Beach, NY 11561, has or will register to do business in Pennsylvania with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA, on December 1, 2017, under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988. The registered office in Pennsylvania shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located at c/o Business Filings Incorporated, Dauphin County.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State for **PhilaDel Inc.**, a corporation organized under the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State for **Rooted Leadership Solutions Inc.**, a corporation organized under the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State for **Green Ops, Inc.**, a profit corporation organized under the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP, Solicitors  
747 Constitution Drive, Ste. 100  
P.O. Box 673  
Exton, PA 19341-0673

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation have been filed with the Department of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on 12/14/2017 under the Domestic Business Corporation Law, for **US Squash Development Corporation**, and the name and county of the commercial registered office provider is c/o: Corporation Service Co., Dauphin County.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State for **MC Holdco, Inc.**, a profit corporation organized under the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP, Solicitors  
747 Constitution Drive, Ste. 100  
P.O. Box 673  
Exton, PA 19341-0673

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Vology, Inc.**, a foreign corporation formed under the laws of the State of Florida where its principal office is located at 15950 Bay Vista Drive, Clearwater, FL 33760, has or will register to do business in Pennsylvania with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA, on December 12, 2017, under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

The registered office in Pennsylvania shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located in Dauphin County.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Vology, Inc.**, a foreign corporation formed under the laws of the State of Florida where its principal office is located at 15950 Bay Vista Drive, Clearwater, FL 33760, has or will register to do business in Pennsylvania with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA, on December 12, 2017, under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

The registered office in Pennsylvania shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located in Dauphin County.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the Business Corporation Law of 1988, **Tybrin Corporation**, a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, intends to withdraw from doing business in Pennsylvania. The address of its principal office is 1030 Titan Court, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547 and the name of its commercial registered office provider in Pennsylvania is CT Corporation System.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Western Environmental Corp.**, a foreign corporation formed under the laws of the State of Ohio where its principal office is located at 6820 Roosevelt Ave., Franklin, OH 45005, has or will register to do business in Pennsylvania with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA, on December 1, 2017, under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

The registered office in Pennsylvania shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located in Dauphin County.

d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Porven LTD.**, a foreign corporation formed under the laws of the State of Delaware where its principal office is located at 153 Sevilla Ave, Coral Gables, FL 33134, has or will register to do business in Pennsylvania with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA, on December 6, 2017, under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988.

The registered office in Pennsylvania shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located in Dauphin County.

d22

**FIRST PUBLICATION**

Corporate Notices

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Chameleon Communications International, Inc.**, a foreign business corporation incorporated under the laws of New York, with its princ. office located at 488 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10022, has applied for a Statement of Registration to do business in Pennsylvania under the provisions of Chapter 4 of the Association Transactions Act. The commercial registered office provider in PA is c/o: Corporation Service Co., and shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located in Dauphin County. d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Foreign Registration Statement has been filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, PA on or about November 16, 2017, for a foreign corporation with a registered address in the state of Pennsylvania as follows: **Verdant Services, Inc.** c/o Registered Agent Solutions, Inc.

This corporation is incorporated under the laws of Texas.

The address of its principal office is 2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 780, Seattle, WA 98121.

The corporation has been qualified in Pennsylvania under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988, as amended. d22

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a nonprofit corporation known as **ONE MASTER FOUNDATION** was incorporated on December 6, 2017, under the provisions of the Nonprofit Corporation Law of 1988, as amended, exclusively for charitable and educational purposes as defined in Section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

BARLEY SNYDER  
Attorneys

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Foreign Registration Statement was filed with the PA Dept. of State on 11/08/2017 for **HeartFlow, Inc.**, a business corporation formed under the laws of the jurisdiction of DE with its principal office located at 1400 Seaport Blvd., Bldg. B, Redwood City, CA 94063, to do business in PA under the provisions of the Business Corporation Law of 1988. The registered office in PA shall be deemed for venue and official publication purposes to be located in Dauphin County. d22

**FIRST PUBLICATION**

Miscellaneous Notices

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
OF DAUPHIN COUNTY,  
PENNSYLVANIA

NO. 2013-CV-5701 MF

NOTICE OF SHERIFF'S SALE

**DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE FOR MORGAN STANLEY ABS CAPITAL I INC. TRUST 2005-HE7, MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2005-HE7, PLAINTIFF**  
**VS.**

**DANIEL M. VENEY, DEFENDANT**

NOTICE TO: DANIEL M. VENEY

NOTICE OF SHERIFF'S SALE  
OF REAL PROPERTY

Being Premises: 3010 HOFFMAN STREET,  
HARRISBURG, PA 17110

Being in HARRISBURG CITY, County of DAUPHIN, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 14-028-006-000-0000

Improvements consist of residential property.

Sold as the property of DANIEL M. VENEY

Your house (real estate) at 3010 HOFFMAN STREET, HARRISBURG, PA 17110 is scheduled to be sold at the Sheriff's Sale on 01/18/2018 at 10:00 AM at the DAUPHIN County Courthouse, 101 Market Street, Room 104, Harrisburg, PA 17107-2012 to enforce the Court Judgment of \$96,956.90 obtained by DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE FOR MORGAN STANLEY ABS CAPITAL I INC. TRUST 2005-HE7, MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2005-HE7 (the mortgagee) against the above premises.

PHELAN HALLINAN DIAMOND  
& JONES, LLP  
Attorney for Plaintiff

d22

**FIRST PUBLICATION**

Miscellaneous Notices

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
OF DAUPHIN COUNTY,  
PENNSYLVANIA**

**NO. 2017-CV-3757 MF**

**NOTICE OF SHERIFF'S SALE**

**SANTANDER BANK, N.A., PLAINTIFF  
VS.  
ROSCO D. SCHOCK AND  
APRIL L. LEISTER, DEFENDANT**

NOTICE TO: APRIL L. LEISTER

**NOTICE OF SHERIFF'S SALE  
OF REAL PROPERTY**

Being Premises: 121 PIKE STREET, MID-  
DLETOWN, PA 17057-1012

Being in MIDDLETOWN BOROUGH, County  
of DAUPHIN, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,  
40-009-036-000-0000

Improvements consist of residential property.

Sold as the property of ROSCO D. SCHOCK and  
APRIL L. LEISTER

Your house (real estate) at 121 PIKE STREET,  
MIDDLETOWN, PA 17057-1012 is scheduled to  
be sold at the Sheriff's Sale on 1/18/2018 at 10:00  
AM at the DAUPHIN County Courthouse, 101  
Market Street, Room 104, Harrisburg, PA 17107-  
2012 to enforce the Court Judgment of \$32,868.11  
obtained by, SANTANDER BANK, N.A. (the  
mortgagee) against the above premises.

PHELAN HALLINAN DIAMOND  
& JONES, LLP  
Attorney for Plaintiff

d22

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
OF DAUPHIN COUNTY,  
PENNSYLVANIA**

**NO. 2016-CV-5041 MF**

**NOTICE OF SHERIFF'S SALE**

**OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC,  
PLAINTIFF  
VS.**

**JOHN J. COLLINS, JR, DEFENDANT**

NOTICE TO: JOHN J. COLLINS, JR A/K/A  
JOHN J. COLLINS

**NOTICE OF SHERIFF'S SALE  
OF REAL PROPERTY**

Being Premises: 2324 ASPEN WAY, HARRIS-  
BURG, PA 17110-9692

Being in SUSQUEHANNA TOWNSHIP, County  
of DAUPHIN, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,  
62-071-058-000-0000

Improvements consist of residential property.

Sold as the property of JOHN J. COLLINS, JR

Your house (real estate) at 2324 ASPEN WAY,  
HARRISBURG, PA 17110-9692 is scheduled to  
be sold at the Sheriff's Sale on 1/18/2018 at 10:00  
AM at the DAUPHIN County Courthouse, 101  
Market Street, Room 104, Harrisburg, PA 17107-  
2012 to enforce the Court Judgment of  
\$247,363.56 obtained by OCWEN LOAN SER-  
VICING, LLC (the mortgagee) against the above  
premises.

PHELAN HALLINAN DIAMOND  
& JONES, LLP  
Attorney for Plaintiff

d22



**WE CARE  
ABOUT CHILDREN**

**DONATE NOW**

**See what inspires  
US...**

to fund a Family Law Attorney who can provide legal support to local Dauphin County families living under the poverty level. Visit us [here](#) for more information.



**FIRST PUBLICATION**

Name Change Notices

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
OF DAUPHIN COUNTY  
PENNSYLVANIA**

**Docket No. 2017-CV-07854-NC**

**PETITION FOR CHANGE OF NAME**

**NOTICE**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on December 6, 2017, the Petition of Atembeh Atabong & Adam Rakibu on behalf of minor child Davidson Lekezem Asongany was filed in the above named court, requesting a decree to change minor child's name from **Davidson Lekezem Asongany** to **Fadel Davidson Rakibu**.

The Court has fixed Monday, January 29, 2018, at 9:30a.m. in Courtroom No. 9, Second Floor, Dauphin County Courthouse, 101 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA as the time and place for the hearing on said Petition, when and where all persons interested may appear and show cause if any they have, why the prayer of the said Petition should not be granted. d22



Local Expertise,  
Global Reach

Commercial Real Estate Services, Worldwide.

**EXPERT SOLUTIONS FOR REAL ESTATE CHALLENGES**

- Industrial
- Land
- Retail
- Mangement
- Office
- Hospitality
- Consulting
- Testimony

**Central Pennsylvania's No. 1 Ranked  
Commercial Real Estate Firm**

\*Ranked by transaction volume CPBJ through 2015

1015 Mumma Drive  
Lemoyne, PA 17043  
+1 717 761 5070

naicir.com

A.H. and B.P.M., S.W. v. ....190  
 Adoption of Baby Boy Lundon (Father’s Appeal) ..... 70  
 Adoption of Baby Boy Lundon (Mother’s Appeal) ..... 76  
 Adoption of M.D.L. ....178  
 Adoption of M.E.L. ....178  
 Adoption of M.L.M. .... 60  
 Amos v. Amos ..... 62  
 Amos, Amos v. .... 62  
 A.T, S.T.E. v.. ....194

B.L., J.B. v. G.L., T.W., .....187  
 B.P.M., S.W. v. A.H. and .....190  
 Baby Boy Lundon, Adoption of (Father’s Appeal) ..... 70  
 Baby Boy Lundon, Adoption of (Mother’s Appeal) ..... 76

C.O., N.G. v. .... 1  
 C.S., V.H., and R.D., T.S. v. .... 81  
 City of Harrisburg, McFarland LP v. ....121  
 Commonwealth v. Forde ..... 11  
 Commonwealth, Kline v.....131  
 Commonwealth v. Lee..... 48  
 Commonwealth v. New Vision Management, LLC .....121  
 Commonwealth, Haymaker v. .... 26

Eisenhour v. Eisenhour. .... 38  
 Eisenhour, Eisenhour v. .... 38

Forde., Commonwealth v. .... 11

Garland v. PennDOT .....161  
 GAT Distribution Corp., et al., Mumma, et al. v. ....112  
 G.L., T.W., B.L., J.B. v. ....187

H.E. Rohrer, Inc. et.al, Kuhns v. .... 55  
 Haymaker v. Commonwealth ..... 26

J.B. v. G.L., T.W., B.L. ....187  
 J.D., M.S. v. .... 99

K.P., T.J. v. W.H., Jr. and .....106  
 Kapp v. Kapp v. Updegraff..... 64  
 Kapp, Kapp v. Updegraff..... 64  
 Kline v. Commonwealth .....131  
 Kuhns v H.E. Rohrer, Inc. et.al ..... 55

Lee, Commonwealth v..... 48

M.D.L., Adoption of .....178  
 M.E.L., Adoption of .....178  
 M.L.M., Adoption of ..... 60  
 M.S. v. J.D. .... 99  
 McFarland LP v. City of Harrisburg .....121  
 Mumma, et al. v. GAT Distribution Corp., et al. ....112

Table of Cases

N.G. v. C.O. .... 1  
New Vision Management, LLC v. Commonwealth .....121  
PennDOT, Garland v. ....161

R.D., T.S. v. C.S., V.H., and ..... 81  
R.S. v. S.Z and M.Z. ....168

S.T.E. v. A.T. ....194  
S.W. v. A.H. and B.P.M. ....190  
S.Z and M.Z., R.S. v. ....168

T.J. v. W.H., Jr. and K.P. ....106  
T.L. f/k/a T.D., W.T.D. v. ....150  
T.S. v. C.S., V.H., and R.D. .... 81  
T.W., B.L., J.B. v. G.L., ....187

Updegraff, Kapp v. Kapp v. .... 64

V.H., and R.D., T.S. v. C.S., ..... 81

W.H., Jr. and K.P., T.J. v. ....106  
W.T.D. v. T.L. f/k/a T.D. ....150

**BAR ASSOCIATION PAGE**  
**Dauphin County Bar Association**  
**213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101-1493**  
**Phone: (717) 232-7536 Fax: (717) 234-4582**

---

Board of Directors

**Matthew M. Haar**  
*President*

**Peter M. Good**  
*President-Elect*

**Brooks R. Foland**  
*Vice-President*

**Thomas P. Gacki**  
*Treasurer*

**Lisa M. Benzie**  
*Secretary*

**Edward F. Spreha, Jr.**  
*Past President*

**Joseph P. Cardinale**  
*Young Lawyers' Chair*

**Anthony M. Hoover**  
*Young Lawyers' Vice Chair*

Directors:

Directors

**William L. Adler**  
**Robert E. Chernicoff**  
**Scott B. Cooper**  
**Salvatore A. Darigo, Jr.**  
**Joshua A. Gray**  
**Amanda J. Lavis**  
**Scott E. Maier**  
**Alexis Miloszewski**

**David L. Narkiewicz**  
**Richard L. Placey**  
**Courtney Kishel Powell**  
**Gerald S. Robinson**  
**Margaret M. Simok**  
**Rhodia D. Thomas**  
**Ronald T. Tomasko**

The Board of Directors of the Bar Association meets on the third Thursday of the month at the Bar Association headquarters. Anyone wishing to attend or have matters brought before the Board should contact the Bar Association office in advance.

**REPORTING OF ERRORS IN ADVANCE SHEET**

The Bench and Bar will contribute to the accuracy in matters of detail of the permanent edition of the Dauphin County Reporter by sending to the editor promptly, notice of all errors appearing in this advance sheet. Inasmuch as corrections are made on a continuous basis, there can be no assurance that corrections can be made later than thirty (30) days from the date of this issue but this should not discourage the submission of notice of errors after thirty (30) days since they will be handled in some way if at all possible. Please send such notice of errors to: Dauphin County Reporter, Dauphin County Bar Association, 213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101-1493.

**DAUPHIN COUNTY COURT SECTION**  
*Opinions Not Yet Reported*

**BAR ASSOCIATION PAGE**  
**Dauphin County Bar Association**  
**213 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101-1493**  
**Phone: (717) 232-7536 Fax: (717) 234-4582**

---

---

**ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY:** Nauman Smith, an established business-oriented law firm in Harrisburg, seeks an associate attorney to assume and build the firm's taxation practice. A candidate for or recent graduate with an LLM in Taxation is preferred. This is a collegial firm where you will work on complex domestic and foreign corporate, trusts, and estate tax projects in close association with the partners. Strong academic credentials and writing skills a must coupled with a personality that will thrive within the firm culture. Please send resumé and writing sample to: J. Stephen Feinour, Hiring Partner; Nauman, Smith, Shissler & Hall, LLP; P.O. Box 840; Harrisburg, PA 17108-0840. d15-29

***Tri-State Shredding***



**“Your  
Document  
Shredding  
Specialist”**

***Are You HIPAA Compliant??***

**On-Site and Off-Site  
Document Shredding**

Bonded Personnel with 10 years experience  
***“DON'T THROW YOUR BUSINESS OUT  
WITH YOUR TRASH”***

**CALL 717-233-5606 TODAY**  
**[www.tristateshredding.com](http://www.tristateshredding.com)**

**INCORPORATION AND  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
FORMATION**

*CONVENIENT, COURTEOUS SAME DAY SERVICE*

*PREPARATION AND FILING SERVICES IN ALL STATES*

**CORPORATION OUTFITS AND  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY OUTFITS**

*SAME DAY SHIPMENT OF YOUR ORDER*

**CORPORATION, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
AND UCC FORMS**

**CORPORATE AND UCC, LIEN AND  
JUDGMENT SERVICES**

**M. BURRKEIM COMPANY**

*SERVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION SINCE 1931*

PHONE: (800) 533-8113      FAX: (888) 977-9386

*2021 ARCH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103*

[WWW.MBURRKEIM.COM](http://WWW.MBURRKEIM.COM)

**ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY / ETHICS MATTERS**

Representation, consultation and expert testimony in disciplinary matters and matters involving ethical issues, bar admissions and the Rules of Professional Conduct

**James C. Schwartzman, Esq.**

Chairman, Judicial Conduct Board of Pennsylvania • Former Chairman, Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of PA • Former Chairman, Continuing Legal Education Board of the Supreme Court of PA • Former Chairman, Supreme Court of PA Interest on Lawyers Trust Account Board • Former Federal Prosecutor • Named by his peers as Best Lawyers in America 2015 Philadelphia Ethics and Professional Responsibility Law "Lawyer of the Year"

**17 North Second Street, 16th Fl., Harrisburg, PA 17101 • (717) 255-7388**

## **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW**

- \* Patents
- \* Trademarks
- \* Copyrights
- \* Unfair Competition
- \* Trade Secrets
- \* Internet Matters

### **Hooker & Habib, P.C.**

150 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 203  
Camp Hill, PA 17011  
Telephone: 717-232-8771  
Facsimile: 717-232-8773  
E-mail: [hhpc@ptd.net](mailto:hhpc@ptd.net)  
Website: [www.h-hpc.com](http://www.h-hpc.com)

---

Serving Central Pennsylvania for over 47 years