

**OFFICIAL
LEGAL JOURNAL
OF SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY, PA**

34th Judicial District

Vol. 4 ★ January 17, 2020 ★ Montrose, PA ★ No. 42



IN THIS ISSUE

COURT OPINION, PT. 4	4
LEGAL NOTICES	9
SHERIFF'S SALES	11
MORTGAGES & DEEDS	13

CASES REPORTED

Amanda Martel and John Wooster, Plaintiffs,
v.
Ralph Reynolds, and Mary Ann Reynolds, and
Fred Barrett, Francis Barrett, and Christian Barrett, Defendants

© 2020 Legal Journal of Susquehanna County



**Court of Common Pleas
34th Judicial District:**

The Hon. Jason J. Legg
President Judge

The Hon. Kenneth W. Seamans
Senior Judge

The Legal Journal of Susquehanna County contains decisions of the Susquehanna County Court, legal notices, advertisements & other matters of legal interest. It is published every Friday by the Susquehanna County Bar Association.



The Official Legal Publication of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania



Legal Journal of Susquehanna County

Michael Briechle, Esq., Editor
mike@briechlelaw.com

Publisher:
Bailey Design and Advertising
3305 Lake Ariel Highway, Suite 3
Honesdale, PA 18431
P: 570-251-1512
F: 570-647-0086
susqco.com

Submit advertisements to
baileyd@ptd.net

OFFICERS

President
Michael Briechle, Esq.

Vice-President
Francis X. O'Connor, Esq.

Secretary
Rachael A. Ballard-Thomas, Esq.

Treasurer
Zachary D. Morahan, Esq.

Court Administrator
Cathy Hawley

Cover illustration by Kathleen Howell, an award-winning Pennsylvania artist. Her renderings of the “Pennsylvania County Courthouse Series” are on display at the Pennsylvania Judicial Center in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

The Legal Journal of Susquehanna County is published and produced by the Susquehanna County Bar Association and Bailey Design and Advertising.

By requirement of Law and Order of Court the *Legal Journal of Susquehanna County* is made the medium for the publication of all Legal Advertisements required to be made in Susquehanna County, and contains all Notices of the Sheriff, Register, Clerk of the Courts, Prothonotary and all other Public Officers, Assignees, Administrators and Executors, Auditors, Examiners, Trustees, Insolvents, the formation and dissolution of Partnerships, affording indispensable protection against loss resulting from want of notice. It also contains the Trial and Argument Lists of all the Courts in Susquehanna County, and selected Opinions and Decisions of the Courts of Susquehanna County.

All legal notices must be submitted either via email or in typewritten form and are published exactly as submitted by the advertiser. *The Legal Journal* assumes no responsibility to edit, make spelling corrections, eliminate errors in grammar or make any changes in context. As pertains to all content in each issue, all efforts have been made to accurately publish the information provided by court sources, however Publisher and Susquehanna County Bar Association cannot be held liable for any typographical errors or errors in factual information contained therein.

Legal notices must be received before 10:00 AM on the Monday preceding publication or, in the event of a holiday, on the preceding Friday.

MESSAGE FROM THE SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION



The Legal Journal of Susquehanna County is a comprehensive weekly guide containing legal decisions of the 34th Judicial District encompassing civil actions filed; mortgages and deeds filed; legal notices; advertisements and other matters of legal interest. On behalf of the Susquehanna County Bar Association, we appreciate the opportunity to serve the legal community by providing a consolidated source of significant matters of legal importance.

PRICING & RATES

Notice Pricing

One time Insertions

Incorporation Notices	\$45
Fictitious Name Registration	\$45
Petition for Change of Name	\$45
Estate Notice (3-time insertion)	\$65
Orphans Court; Accounting on Estates (2-time insertion)	\$45

All other notices will be billed at \$1.90 per line. Minimum insertion fees apply.

A fee of \$10 will be added to all legal notices for the Notarized Proof of Publication.

Subscription Rates

Per Year

Mailed Copy	\$100
Emailed Copy	\$50
Mailed & Emailed	\$125

Individual copies available for \$5 each

Subscription Year: March–February

Prorated subscriptions available

SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY OFFICIALS

Judge of the Court of Common Pleas

Jason J. Legg, *President Judge*
Kenneth W. Seamans, *Senior Judge*

Magisterial District Judges

Jeffrey Hollister
Jodi L. Cordner, Esq.
Suzanne Brainard

Court Administrator

Cathy Hawley

Sheriff

Lance Benedict

District Attorney

Marion O’Malley, Esq.

Prothonotary, Clerk of The Court

Jan Krupinski

Chief Public Defender

Linda LaBarbara, Esq.

Commissioners

Alan M. Hall
Elizabeth M. Arnold
MaryAnn Warren

Treasurer

Jason D. Miller

Register of Wills/Recorder of Deeds/

Clerk of The Orphan’s Court
Michelle Estabrook

Coroner

Anthony J. Conarton

Auditors

George Starzec
Susan Jennings
Richard Suraci

Susquehanna County Courthouse — 105 Maple Street, Montrose, PA 18801 ★ 570.278.4600
Hours: Monday–Friday, 8:30 a.m.–4:30 p.m.

COURT OPINION

No. 2017 - 788 C.P.

AMANDA MARTEL and JOHN WOOSTER
Plaintiffs,

v.

**RALPH REYNOLDS, and MARY ANN REYNOLDS, and FRED BARRETT,
FRANCIS BARRETT, and CHRISTIAN BARRETT**
Defendants

Opinion continued from the January 10, 2020 issue

iv. Implied Easement for Use of Circular Driveway

Reynolds contends that he (and his tenants) have an implied easement that allows them to use the circular driveway on the Wooster property. “Easements by implied reservation . . . are based on the theory that continuous use of a permanent right-of-way gives rise to the implication that the parties intended that such use would continue, notwithstanding the absence of necessity for the use.” Bucciarelli v. DeLisa, 691 A.2d 446, 449 (Pa. 1997). An implied easement can only arise upon the original severance of title ownership to two tracts of land. See Phillippi v. Knotter, 748 A.2d 757, 762 (Pa. Super. 2000).¹⁴ In assessing the existence of an implied easement, Pennsylvania courts have used two different tests:

The traditional test has been described as follows: ‘Three things are regarded as essential to create an easement by implication on the severance of the unity of ownership in an estate: first, a separation of title; second, before the separation of title takes place, the use which gives rise to the easement shall

¹⁴ For instance, in Rosano v. Wagner, 2019 WL 4880957 (Pa. Super. Ct. Oct. 3, 2019), the common grantor acquired title to two separate parcels of real estate, the Rutt Road property in 1950, and the Locke Heights Road property in 1963. Id. at *1. The common grantor then used a driveway on the Rutt Road property to access a basement garage on the Locke Heights property. Id. Upon the common grantor’s death, the two parcels of real property were bequeathed separately with one parcel going to each of the common grantor’s sons. Id. The use of the use of the driveway across the Rutt Road property to access the Locke Heights property continued from 2008 until 2016 when the Rutt Road property was sold and the new owner blocked the driveway such that it could no longer be used to access the Locke Heights property. Id. The Superior Court rejected the argument that an implied easement could not exist because the two properties were not part of a common tract. Id. at *4. While Rosano is an unpublished opinion, the Superior Court now allows such opinions published after May 1, 2019 to be relied upon for their persuasive value. Pa. Super. Ct. I.O.P. § 65.37(B). As in Rosano, the common grantor in this case, Tyler, had unity of title of the Reynolds property and the Wooster property when he conveyed the Reynolds property to Reynolds.

have been so long continued, and so obvious or manifest, as to show that it was meant to be permanent; and third, that the easement shall be necessary to the beneficial enjoyment of the land granted or retained. To these three, another essential element is sometimes added – that the servitude shall be continuous and self-acting, as distinguished from discontinuous and used only from time to time.'

The view expressed in RESTATEMENT OF PROPERTY § 474 [sic] and expressly adopted in Pennsylvania . . . 'emphasizes a balancing approach, designed to ascertain the actual or implied intention of the parties. No single factor under the Restatement approach is dispositive. Thus, the Restatement approach and the more restrictive tests . . . co-exist in Pennsylvania.

Gurecka v. Carroll, 155 A.3d 1071, 1076 (Pa. Super. Ct.) (internal citations and emphasis omitted) (quoting Doddona v. Thorpe, 749 A.2d 475, 481-82 (Pa. Super. 2000), appeal denied, 169 A.3d 1059 (Pa. 2017).¹⁵

As it relates to the traditional test, Reynolds has proved (1) that Tyler possessed unity of title prior to his conveyance of the Reynolds property to Reynolds; (2) prior to the separation of title, Tyler, his tenants and their invitees had utilized the circular driveway on the Wooster property continuously from approximately 1989 through 2002; (3) the circular driveway was manifest and obvious on the Wooster property and connected to the Reynolds property to the extent that it was visible upon the ground and Tyler had removed section of the border fence so as to allow vehicles to pass along the circular driveway,¹⁶ and (4) the use of the circular driveway was necessary to the beneficial use of the Reynolds property as it provide an additional means of ingress and

15 The Restatement approach requires consideration of the following factors: (1) whether the claimant is the grantor or the grantee; (2) the terms of the conveyance; (3) the consideration given for the conveyance; (4) whether the claim is made against a simultaneous conveyance; (5) the extent of necessity of the easement to the claimant; (6) whether reciprocal benefits result to the conveyor and the donee; (7) how the land was used prior to the conveyance; and (8) the extent to which the prior use was or might have been known to the parties. See Phillippi v. Knotter, 748 A.2d 757, 762 (Pa. Super. Ct.), appeal denied, 748 A.2d 757 (Pa. 2000). As it relates to these factors, the record demonstrates: (1) Reynolds is the grantee; (2) the deed itself contained no reference to any easement but it was a commercial property with difficult access issues in the absence of the circular driveway; (3) Reynolds paid valuable consideration to Tyler for the Reynolds property; (4) Reynolds utilized the driveway with essentially no interruption from Tyler from 2002 through 2016; (5) Reynolds use of the circular driveway allows for easier ingress and egress for tenants and guests to access different rental units located in the building on the Reynolds property as well as to maintain the building given its close proximity to the boundary line; (6) the only benefit arising from the use of the easement accrues to Reynolds not plaintiffs; (7) Tyler had utilized the circular driveway for more than a decade for the same purpose that Reynolds has utilized the circular driveway from 2002 through 2016; and (8) the prior use was open and apparent at the time Reynolds purchased the Reynolds property from Tyler and likewise open and obvious when plaintiffs purchased the Wooster property from Tyler. In considering these factors, they weigh heavily in favor of finding an implied easement in favor of Reynolds to use the circular driveway over the Wooster property for the benefit of the Reynolds property.

16 An aerial photograph of the properties demonstrates just how manifest the existing circular driveway appeared on the ground. (Plf. Ex. 13, Ex. 7.)

egress from the Reynolds property as well as providing the only means of maintaining the rear of the building located on the Reynolds property. In applying the traditional test for an implied easement, Reynolds has satisfied his burden of demonstrating that an implied easement exists for Reynolds, his tenants and their guests to use the circular driveway over the Wooster property.

Two very recent Superior Court decisions provide strong persuasive authority as to the existence of an implied easement over the Wooster property. First, in *Rosano v. Wagner*, *supra*, in 2019 WL 4880957 (Pa. Super. Ct. Oct. 3, 2019), a common grantor acquired title to two separate parcels of real estate, the Rutt Road property in 1950, and the Locke Heights Road property in 1963. *Id.* at *1. After acquiring the Locke Heights property, the common grantor used a driveway on the Rutt Road property to access a basement garage on the Locke Heights property. *Id.* Upon the common grantor's death, the two parcels of real property were bequeathed separately with one parcel going to each son without any express reservation in the deeds of an easement over the Rutt Road property for the benefit of the Locke Heights property. After the transfer of the properties by the common grantor's estate, the use of the driveway continued from 2008 until 2016. The Rutt Road property was then sold whereupon the new owner blocked the driveway such that it could no longer be used to access the garage on the Locke Heights property. *Id.* Litigation ensued wherein the trial court determined that an implied easement had been established over the driveway on the Rutt Road property for ingress and egress to the garage located on the Locke Heights property. In affirming the trial court, the Superior Court noted that the record supported the conclusion that the common grantor intended to create an easement across the Rutt Road property for the benefit of the Locke Heights property even where no such intent was evidenced by any written or oral statement of the common grantor. *Id.* at *4.¹⁷

17 In the present dispute, the court acknowledges that Tyler testified during his deposition that he never gave Reynolds permission to use the circular driveway and that it was not his intent to do so. (Pl. Ex. 13, at 19, 37.) Tyler did not testify in person and the parties stipulated to the admission of his deposition transcript in lieu of his testimony. Likewise, Reynolds and Fred Barrett testified that Tyler eventually told them that they could not use the circular driveway but that this occurred after the purchase of the Reynolds property. This testimony fails to resolve the question as to whether an implied easement was intended at the time of the conveyance itself. During his deposition testimony, it was apparent that Tyler now has a strong dislike for Reynolds and his tenants. (*Id.* at 18 (referring to Reynolds and his tenants as "pigs"))). Tyler clearly testified that he had installed the circular driveway as a result of the difficulties presented with the parking in the Reynolds' lot, that the circular driveway was necessary to avoid those parking problems, and that the circular driveway was likewise necessary for maintenance purposes given the close proximity between the building addition and the boundary line. (*Id.* at 9-11, 29-30.) In a judge trial, the credibility of deposition testimony remains with the trial judge. See *First Nat'l Bank of Portland v. Hartman Co.*, 24 A.2d 582, 582 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1942). In reviewing the deposition testimony, coupled with the other testimony provided as well as photograph evidence of the circular driveway, the court finds that Tyler's testimony is not credible. In this regard, there is no dispute that Reynolds continued to use the circular driveway from 2002 through 2016 – and that Tyler's opposition to Reynolds' use of the circular driveway developed sometime after the 2002 conveyance itself. As such, the court finds that at the time of the conveyance to Reynolds, the parties intended that an implied easement exist to allow Reynolds and his tenants to use the circular driveway across the Wooster property as it was necessary to alleviate parking difficulties with the Reynolds property, to provide tenants with access to other parts of the building on the Reynolds property, and to provide Reynolds with the ability to perform maintenance on the building.

In Starliper v. Negley, 2019 WL 4899221 (Pa. Super. Ct. Oct. 4, 2019), the Superior Court considered a remarkably similar case that involved the recognition of an implied easement based upon the need for access to a neighboring property in order to perform building maintenance. In that case, the real property was initially used as the Sunnyside Female Seminary, which was later subdivided into an eastern and western parcel. *Id.* at *1. At the time of the division of the property, the western property contained a building with an exterior wall that ran along the boundary line with the eastern property. A subsequent purchaser of the western property added an addition to that building along the same boundary line. Thereafter, the eastern property owners challenged the ability of the western property owner to cross the eastern property for the purpose of maintaining the exterior wall and improvements on the western parcel. In recognizing that an implied easement existed, the Superior Court concluded as follows:

Although there was no testimony regarding the maintenance of the wall before 1872, when the western half of the property was conveyed, a reasonable landowner would have required access to the exterior wall of the home for ordinary maintenance and repairs, and the only access to the western wall of the [western] property was by way of [the eastern property's] yard. The original owners of the [eastern property] would have reasonably foreseen the continued need for access, and thus we presume the parties intended an implied easement to that portion of the [eastern] property.

Moreover, [the owners of the western property] testified that the exterior wall now contains two windows, air vents, vinyl siding and a rain gutter. These modern improvements would have been open and visible to the [eastern property owners] at the time that they purchased the property, and would have indicated that the [western property owners'] ongoing need to access their exterior. The [eastern property owners'] argument that the easement is unnecessary because there are alternate measures available to the court is misplaced, as an easement by implication need not be absolutely necessary, but only contemplated as an ongoing use by the parties at the time of severance of title.

Id. at *5 (citations omitted).

Likewise, in this case, the court has found that the circumstances surrounding the conveyance between Tyler and Reynolds demonstrate that the parties intended for Reynolds to have an easement to utilize the circular driveway across the Wooster property. The existence of a clearly marked circular driveway at the time of the purchase coupled with the unique construction of the parking and building on the Reynolds' property confirm that the parties intended such an easement. This conclusion is buttressed by Reynolds uninterrupted use of the circular driveway from 2002 through 2016. When Plaintiffs purchased the Wooster property, they were aware of the consistent use of the circular driveway for the benefit of the Reynolds property. Indeed, Martel conceded that she had personally used the circular driveway across the Wooster property while Tyler still

owned the Wooster property and that her use of the circular driveway was necessary for her to access her daughter's apartment which was located in the building on the Reynolds property. Like Starliper, the close proximity of the Reynolds' building to the boundary line further placed any prospective purchaser of the Wooster lot on notice that Reynolds required access to the Wooster property in order to maintain his building.

For all these reasons, the court finds that an implied easement exists in favor of Reynolds use of the circular driveway across the Wooster property for the purpose of ingress and egress from the parking area of the Reynolds property as well as to provide Reynolds with the ability to perform maintenance on his building.¹⁸

B. Plaintiffs' Trespass Claim

Based upon the establishment of the boundary line between the Reynolds property and the Wooster property along the boundary fence under the common grantor theory coupled with the establishment of an implied easement that permits Reynolds to utilize the circular driveway, Plaintiffs' trespass claim must fail.

C. Plaintiffs' Permanent Injunction Count

Based upon the establishment of the boundary line between the Reynolds property and the Wooster property along the boundary fence under the common grantor theory coupled with the establishment of an implied easement that permits Reynolds to utilize the circular driveway, Plaintiffs' permanent injunction claim must fail as Reynolds has established the existence of an implied easement to enter the Wooster property for means of ingress and egress around the building on the Reynolds property as well as to perform maintenance on the building itself.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth herein, the boundary line between the Reynolds property and the Wooster property is established under the common grantor theory as the fence line between the two properties. Further, the Reynolds property has the benefit of an implied easement that allows for the use of the circular driveway across the Wooster property for ingress and egress from the parking lot area on the Reynolds property as well as for maintenance of the building located on the Reynolds property. For these reasons, Plaintiffs' claim must fail and judgment will be entered in favor of Reynolds on his counterclaim relating to the boundary line and implied easement counts.



¹⁸ Reynolds also asserted a claim for an easement by estoppel. "An easement by estoppel – traditionally considered an irrevocable license in Pennsylvania – will arise when a landowner permits a use of property under circumstances suggesting that the permission will not be revoked, and the user changes his or her position in reasonable reliance on that permission." *Kapp v. Norfolk Southern Railway Co.*, 350 F. Supp.2d 597, 611-12 (M.D. Pa. 2004). In this case, Reynolds has failed to present any evidence that Reynolds ever changed his position in any manner, i.e., there is no showing of prejudice based upon Reynolds' reasonable reliance upon his belief that he was permitted to use the circular driveway.

LEGAL NOTICES

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

ESTATE NOTICES

Notice is hereby given that, in the estate of the decedents set forth below, the Register of Wills, has granted letters testamentary or of administration to the persons named. All persons having claims or demands against said estates are requested to present the same without delay and all persons indebted to said estates are requested to make immediate payment to the executors or administrators or their attorneys named below.

EXECUTRIX NOTICE

Estate of George A. Kachur
Late of Oakland Borough
EXECUTRIX
Alice Deutsch
143 Jeremy Lane
Statesville, NC 28677
ATTORNEY
Michael Briechle
4 Chestnut Street
Montrose, PA 18801

1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020 • 1/31/2020

ESTATE NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that Letters of Administration have been granted in the ESTATE OF JEFFREY A. LIND a/k/a JEFFREY LIND a/k/a JEFFREY J. LIND, late, of Hallstead, Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, who died on the 23rd day of September, 2019, to WILLIAM C. WEBB, Administrator. All persons indebted

to the said estate are required to make payment, and those having claims or demands to present the same without delay to William C. Webb or to Levene Gouldin & Thompson, LLP, attorneys for the estate, 450 Plaza Drive, Vestal, New York 13850.

1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020 • 1/31/2020

ADMINISTRATOR NOTICE

Estate of Peter John Foltyn AKA Peter J. Foltyn
Late of Silver Lake Township
ADMINISTRATOR
Donald K. Foltyn
802 Trendy Lane
Apex, NC 27502
ATTORNEY
Michael J. Giangrieco, Esquire
Giangrieco Law, PC
P.O. Box 126
Montrose, PA 18801

1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020 • 1/31/2020

ESTATE NOTICE

In the Estate of MABEL PAYNE a/k/a MABEL I. PAYNE, of Harford Township, Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania.

Letters Testamentary in the above estate having been granted to Frank Payne. All persons indebted to said estate are requested to make prompt payment and all having

claims against said estate will present them without delay to:

Marissa McAndrew, Esquire
Briegle Law Offices, P.C.
707 Main Street PO Box 157
Forest City, PA 18421
Attorney for the Estate

1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020 • 1/31/2020

EXECUTOR NOTICE

Estate of Gerald E. Zick AKA
Gerald Zick AKA Gerald Edward
Zick AKA Jerry Zick
Late of New Milford Borough
EXECUTOR
Christopher L. Zick
1342 Osborne Rd.
New Milford, PA 18834

1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020

EXECUTOR NOTICE

Estate of Peter George Hammond
AKA Peter Hammond AKA Peter
G. Hammond
Late of Harford Township
EXECUTOR
Peter Wade Hammond
572 South Harmony Road
Kingsley, PA 18826
ATTORNEY
Michael Briegle, Esq.
4 Chestnut Street
Montrose, PA 18801

1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020

ADMINISTRATRIX NOTICE

Estate of Michael F. Budzinski
AKA Michael Frank Budzinski
Late of Lathrop Township
ADMINISTRATRIX
Dianne M. Budzinski
P.O. Box 488
Nicholson, PA 18446

1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020

ADMINISTRATRIX NOTICE

Estate of Dale A. Williams AKA
Dale Williams
Late of Friendsville Borough
ADMINISTRATRIX
June Miller-Williams
1471 Main Street
Friendsville, PA 18818
ATTORNEY
Michael J. Giangrieco, Esquire
Giangrieco Law, PC
P.O. Box 126
Montrose, PA 18801

1/3/2020 • 1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020

ADMINISTRATOR NOTICE

Estate of Kimberlin Irene
MacPherson
Late of Oakland Township
ADMINISTRATOR
Matthew Welch
911 Skinner Rd.
Susquehanna, PA 18847
ATTORNEY
Abbey K. Lewis
Beardsley Law PLLC
37 Public Ave.
Montrose, PA 18801

1/3/2020 • 1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020

EXECUTOR NOTICE

Estate of Marian A. Nye AKA
Marion A. Nye
Late of Forest Lake Township
EXECUTOR
David H. Nye
181 Nagle Rd.
Friendsville, PA 18818
ATTORNEY
John R. Dean
Attorney at Law
72 Public Avenue
Montrose, PA 18801

1/3/2020 • 1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020

OTHER NOTICES

NOTICE OF DISSOLUTION

NOTICE OF DISSOLUTION is hereby given that Susquehanna County Land Sales, Inc., a Pennsylvania business corporation, with its registered office at 158 Main Street, New Milford, PA, is winding up its affairs in the manner prescribed by section 1975 of the Business Corporation Law of 1988, so that its corporate existence shall cease upon the filing of Articles of Dissolution in the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thomas R. Daniels, Esq. 34 East Tioga Street, Tunkhannock, PA 18657.

1/17/2020

NOTICE OF FILING OF SHERIFF'S SALES

Individual Sheriff's Sales can be cancelled for a variety of reasons. The notices enclosed were accurate as of the publish date. Sheriff's Sale notices are posted on the public bulletin board of the Susquehanna County Sheriff's Office, located at 105 Maple Street, Montrose, PA.

SHERIFF'S SALE MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE FEBRUARY 25, 2020

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY, upon Judgment entered therein, there will be exposed to public sale and outcry in the Sheriff's Office, Susquehanna County Courthouse Montrose, Pennsylvania, the following described real estate, to wit:

SALE DATE AND TIME

02/25/2020 09:00 AM

Writ of Execution No.:

2019-1356 CP

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 5317

Prospect Street fka 16 Prospect Street, Susquehanna, PA 18847

LOCATION: Oakland Borough

Tax ID #: 054/10-1,049.00,000

IMPROVEMENTS: ONE – TWO STORY WOOD FRAME DWELLING

ONE – 8x14 WOOD FRAME SHED

DEFENDANTS: Mario Button

Mario A. Button

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF:

M. Troy Freedman, Esq.

(215) 886-8790

NOTICE

The Sheriff shall not be liable for

loss or damage to the premises sold resulting from any cause whatsoever and makes no representation or warranty regarding the condition of the premises. **Notice** is hereby given and directed to all parties in interest and claimants that a Schedule of Distribution will be filed by the Sheriff no later than 30 days after the sale and that distribution will be made in accordance with that Schedule unless exceptions are filed thereto within ten (10) days thereafter. Full amount of bid plus poundage must be paid on the date of the sale by 4:30 p.m. or deed will not be acknowledged. For details on individual Sheriff Sales please go to: www.susqco.com, then select Law Enforcement, Sheriff's Office, Sheriff's Sales.

Lance M. Benedict,
Susquehanna County Sheriff

1/3/2020 • 1/10/2020 • 1/17/2020

**SHERIFF'S SALE
MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE
MARCH 10, 2020**

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY, upon Judgment entered therein, there will be exposed to public sale and outcry in the Sheriff's Office, Susquehanna County Courthouse Montrose, Pennsylvania, the following described real estate, to wit:

**SALE DATE AND TIME
03/10/2020 09:30 AM**
Writ of Execution No.:

2019-1412 CP
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 5749 State Route 267, Meshoppen, PA 18630
LOCATION: Auburn Township
Tax ID #: 196.00-2,048.01,000
IMPROVEMENTS: ONE - 1 story bi-level wood framed dwelling
ONE - 24' x 36' metal garage
DEFENDANTS: Sheri Newhart and Timothy D. Newhart
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF: Edward J. McKee, Esq.
(215) 572-8111

NOTICE

The Sheriff shall not be liable for loss or damage to the premises sold resulting from any cause whatsoever and makes no representation or warranty regarding the condition of the premises. **Notice** is hereby given and directed to all parties in interest and claimants that a Schedule of Distribution will be filed by the Sheriff no later than 30 days after the sale and that distribution will be made in accordance with that Schedule unless exceptions are filed thereto within ten (10) days thereafter. Full amount of bid plus poundage must be paid on the date of the sale by 4:30 p.m. or deed will not be acknowledged. For details on individual Sheriff Sales please go to: www.susqco.com, then select Law Enforcement, Sheriff's Office, Sheriff's Sales.

Lance M. Benedict,
Susquehanna County Sheriff

1/17/2020 • 1/24/2020 • 1/31/2020

MORTGAGES AND DEEDS

*RECORDED FROM DECEMBER 24, 2019 TO DECEMBER 31, 2019
ACCURACY OF THE ENTRIES IS NOT GUARANTEED.*

MORTGAGES

Information:	Consideration: \$70,000.00
Mortgagor: BLUE RIDGE PROPERTY MANAGERS LLC	Mortgagee: ZECK, MICHALA MARIE
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality HARFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$45,000.00
Mortgagor: GRAY, THERESA MARIA	Mortgagee: HOWELL, GEORGE DALE 2 - HOWELL, ABAGAIL
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality OAKLAND BOROUGH
Information:	Consideration: \$252,000.00
Mortgagor: ELK VIEW LLC	Mortgagee: MERIDIAN BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 190.00-1,063.00,000.	Municipality HERRICK TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$337,400.00
Mortgagor: LANE, JOHN F III	Mortgagee: MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS INC 2 - FULTON BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 266.11-1,002.00,000.	Municipality CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$118,501.00
Mortgagor: GOFF, RICHARD A	Mortgagee: MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS INC 2 - MORTGAGE RESEARCH CENTER LLC (DBA) 3 - VETERANS RESEARCH CENTER LLC
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 108.00-2,037.00,000.	Municipality NEW MILFORD TOWNSHIP
Information: OPEN-END MTG	Consideration: \$50,000.00
Mortgagor: KANNA, MARK	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
2 - KANNA, BERNADETTE	
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 066.00-1,034.00,000.	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information: OPEN-END MTG	Consideration: \$25,000.00
Mortgagor: BROWN, JOHN C	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
2 - BROWN, MARY E	
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 054.11-1,041.00,000.	Municipality OAKLAND BOROUGH
Information: OPEN-END MTG	Consideration: \$175,000.00
Mortgagor: COOPER, KENNETH L	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
2 - COOPER, SUSAN F	
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 046.00-1,020.00,000.	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information: OPEN-END MTG	Consideration: \$46,750.00
Mortgagor: BLANEY, KEVIN RAY	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
2 - BLANEY, JESSIE PUZO (AKA)	
3 - BLANEY, JESSIE	
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 105.00-2,030.00,000.	Municipality BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP

Information:	Consideration: \$18,000.00
Mortgagor: SZUCH, JOHN DAVID	Mortgagee: WAYNE BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 172.00-1,074.00,000.	Municipality ARARAT TOWNSHIP
Information: OPEN-END MTG	Consideration: \$25,000.00
Mortgagor: DELLONGO, THOMAS J JR 2 - DELLONGO, JEANINE M	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 109.06-1,041.00,000.	Municipality NEW MILFORD BOROUGH
Information:	Consideration: \$300,000.00
Mortgagor: MCCAREY, JASON	Mortgagee: PEOPLES SECURITY BANK AND TRUST COMPANY
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 226.00-1,060.05,000.	Municipality CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Information: OPEN-END MTG	Consideration: \$45,000.00
Mortgagor: MCKEEBY, AMY M	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 124.17-3,062.00,000.	Municipality MONTROSE 2W
Information:	Consideration: \$150,000.00
Mortgagor: SHERMAN, MELISSA RAY (AKA) 2 - HUNSINGER, MELISSA R 3 - SHERMAN, REUBEN L	Mortgagee: COMMUNITY BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 217.00-2,003.00,000.	Municipality SPRINGVILLE TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$111,000.00
Mortgagor: HERTZOG, STEVEN R 2 - HERTZOG, JOAN SNYDER (AKA) 3 - HERTZOG, JOAN	Mortgagee: FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF PENNSYLVANIA
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 267.00-1,049.00,000.	Municipality CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$194,400.00
Mortgagor: TALMADGE, KATHLEEN 2 - KELLETT, NICOLE H TALMADGE	Mortgagee: BANK OF AMERICA 2 - MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS INC
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 045.16-1,004.00,000.	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$25,000.00
Mortgagor: HERTZOG, STEVEN R 2 - HERTZOG, JOAN SNYDER (AKA) 3 - HERTZOG, JOAN	Mortgagee: FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF PENNSYLVANIA
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 267.00-1,049.00,000.	Municipality CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$51,000.00
Mortgagor: ATON, NATHANIEL R (BY ATTY)	Mortgagee: NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 045.12-1,067.00,000.	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$157,700.00
Mortgagor: WEST, ELIZABETH A	Mortgagee: UNITED STATES RURAL HOUSING SERVICE 2 - UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 102.00-1,034.00,000.	Municipality FOREST LAKE TOWNSHIP

Information:	Consideration: \$365,000.00
Mortgagor: BUTTON, MATTHEW 2 - BUTTON, KELLY	Mortgagee: LANDMARK COMMUNITY BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 050.00-2,035.00.000.	Municipality GREAT BEND TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$225,000.00
Mortgagor: PASSETTI, DAVID A 2 - PASSETTI, LAURIE J	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 054.00-2,015.00.000. 2 - 054.00-1,020.00.000.	Municipality OAKLAND TOWNSHIP OAKLAND TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$50,000.00
Mortgagor: PAYNE, JENNY	Mortgagee: NBT BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 184.11-1,005.00.000.	Municipality HARFORD TOWNSHIP

DEEDS

Information:	Consideration: \$45,000.00
Grantor: HOWELL, GEORGE DALE 2 - HOWELL, ABAGAIL	Grantee: GRAY, THERESA MARIA
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 054.07-1,012.00.000.	Municipality OAKLAND BOROUGH
Information:	Consideration: \$24,500.00
Grantor: WESOLOSKI, HELEN	Grantee: REYNOLDS, ROBERT H 2 - REYNOLDS, KAREN L
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 026.01-1,020.00.000.	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information: WARRANTY DEED	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: LOWCHER, CHRISTIANE	Grantee: THE CHRISTIANE LOWCHER LIVING TRUST
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 159.00-1,028.00.000.	Municipality JESSUP TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$315,000.00
Grantor: SOLEBELLO, MICHAEL W 2 - SOLEBELLO, SUSAN E	Grantee: ELK VIEW LLC
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 190.00-1,063.00.000.	Municipality HERRICK TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: BACHMANN, HEDWIG (ESTATE)	Grantee: SCHERBNER, LINDA ANNA 2 - BACHMANN, FRANZ V 3 - BUSCH, MATTHEW 4 - HALLER, ELYSE 5 - BUSCH, LORI 6 - BUSCH, ANDREA
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality HARFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: POTTS, DONALD J 2 - POTTS, PEARL MARY	Grantee: POTTS, DONALD J 2 - POTTS, PEARL MARY
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality FOREST LAKE TOWNSHIP

★ L E G A L J O U R N A L O F S U S Q U E H A N N A C O U N T Y ★

Information:	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: MAGNOTTI, SAMUEL J 2 - MAGNOTTI, SUE P	Grantee: MAGNOTTI, SAMUEL J 2 - MAGNOTTI, SUE P
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: MAGNOTTI, SAMUEL J 2 - MAGNOTTI, SUE P	Grantee: MAGNOTTI, SAMUEL J 2 - MAGNOTTI, SUE P
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP
Information: WK 3 UNIT 46	Consideration: \$100.00
Grantor: GOODMAN, ROY E 2 - INGRAM, JAMES R 3 - INGRAM, ROBERT F 4 - MAGAKIS, GARY S	Grantee: BREMER HOF OWNERS INC
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality HERRICK TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$64,000.00
Grantor: ROE, CRAIG T	Grantee: MCCOLLUM, MARIANNE
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality HALLSTEAD BOROUGH
Information:	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: SZUCH, ELLEN	Grantee: SZUCH, ELLEN
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality ARARAT TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$83,400.00
Grantor: HETH, PHILIP 2 - HETH, ROSEMARY 3 - HETH, DANIEL T 4 - HETH, DEBORAH F	Grantee: WILSON, JUSTIN M 2 - WILSON, KATHLYN R
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality HERRICK TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: ROUGHT, ROXANNE 2 - HARTMAN, ROBERT W	Grantee: ROUGHT, ROXANNE
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 214.02-1,014.00,000.	Municipality AUBURN TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$243,000.00
Grantor: HALEY, ELLEN	Grantee: TALMADGE, KATHLEEN 2 - KELLETT, NICOLE H TALMADGE
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$60,000.00
Grantor: KNICKERBOCKER, DONALD J (ESTATE)	Grantee: ATON, NATHANIEL R
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 045.12-1,067.00,000.	Municipality SILVER LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$2,095.47
Grantor: BARRY, JAY (BY SHERIFF) 2 - CANFIELD, JACQUELINE BARRY (BY SHERIFF)	Grantee: CNB REALTY TRUST (ASSIGNEE OF) 2 - NBT BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 054.12-2,040.00,000.	Municipality SUSQUEHANNA

Information:	Consideration: \$110,000.00
Grantor: CHICHVAR, JEFFERY C (AKA) 2 - CHICHVAR, JEFFREY C 3 - CHICHVAR, BENILDA G	Grantee: SHERMAN, REUBEN L 2 - SHERMAN, MELISSA R
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality DIMOCK TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$152,000.00
Grantor: POTTS, DONALD J 2 - POTTS, PEARL MARY	Grantee: WEST, ELIZABETH A
Locations: Parcel # 1 - N/A	Municipality FOREST LAKE TOWNSHIP
Information: QUITCLAIM DEED	Consideration: \$1.00
Grantor: GELINGER, IAN	Grantee: GELINGER, AMY
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 032.00-2,008.01.000.	Municipality GREAT BEND TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$1,564.38
Grantor: CLAYTON, BARBARA A (BY SHERIFF AKA) 2 - KIBLER, BARBARA (BY SHERIFF) 3 - KIBLER, LONDON L SSR (BY SHERIFF AKA) 4 - KIBLER, LONDON (BY SHERIFF)	Grantee: US BANK (SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST) 2 - BANK OF AMERICA
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 031.15-1,053.00.000.	Municipality GREAT BEND BOROUGH
Information:	Consideration: \$1,341.34
Grantor: INNANEN, MARLENE L (BY SHERIFF) 2 - UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (BY AND THROUGH) 3 - UNITED STATES INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE	Grantee: CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 245.00-3,030.00.000.	Municipality CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$1,169.60
Grantor: EGGETON, WILLIAM (ESTATE BY SHERIFF) 2 - EGGETON, DANITA (BY SHERIFF)	Grantee: CITIZENS SAVINGS BANK
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 247.00-1,061.00.000.	Municipality CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP
Information:	Consideration: \$250,000.00
Grantor: BENNETT, TRACY WAYNE	Grantee: AYOTTE, JAMES S 2 - AYOTTE, ASHLEY E
Locations: Parcel # 1 - 175.00-1,073.00.000.	Municipality RUSH TOWNSHIP



Susquehanna Legal Journal Subscription Form PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone (_____) _____ - _____

Email Address _____ @ _____

Subscription Options and Rates

<input type="checkbox"/> Mailed Copy ONLY	\$100 per year
<input type="checkbox"/> Emailed Copy ONLY	\$50 per year
<input type="checkbox"/> Mailed and Emailed	\$125 per year

Individual copies \$5 each

Your subscription year begins when we receive your form and payment.
SUS Legal Journal is published every Friday, except for Holidays.

Please fax completed form to 570-647-0086 or email to baileyadv@ptd.net

MAKE CHECK PAYABLE TO BAILEY DESIGN AND ADVERTISING

Display Advertising Available

Please call for Rates — 570-251-1512 or email baileyadv@ptd.net

Susquehanna County LEGAL JOURNAL

3305 Lake Ariel Highway, Suite 3
Honesdale, PA 18431
Phone: 570-251-1512
Fax: 570-647-0086

2018 LEGAL ADVERTISING RATES

Incorporation Notices \$45

One (1) time insertion

Fictitious Name Registration \$45

One (1) time insertion

Petition for Change of Name \$45

One (1) time insertion

All other notices will be billed at \$1.90 per line.

Certain restrictions and minimum insertion fees apply.

A fee of \$10.00 will be added to all legal notices for the Notarized Proof of Publication.



General Advertising Rates

All Advertisements Are Pre-Pay

Subject to approval

Subject to space availability

Credit Cards accepted—Mastercard and Visa only.

Prices are based upon your advertisement

submitted camera-ready or via email in PDF

or JPG format.

Certain Restrictions Apply

The Legal Journal of Susquehanna County is published every Friday—52 issues per year.

The deadline for all advertising is 10 AM on

Monday for the Friday publication.

Contact for Advertising Details:

Phone: 570-251-1512

Fax: 570-647-0086

Email: baileyd@ptd.net

	One Insertion	Quarterly 13 Issues	Semi-Annual 26 Issues	Annual 52 Issues
Full Page	\$100	\$850	\$1,300	\$2,100
Half Page	\$75	\$525	\$795	\$1,265
Quarter Page	\$50	\$325	\$475	\$745
Eighth Page	\$35	\$195	\$275	\$435

All charges subject to artwork, advertisement fees, call for details

Subscription Rates

One Issue	\$5 per issue
Mailed Copy	\$100 per year
Emailed Copy	\$50 per year
Mailed & Emailed Copies	\$125 per year

Full Page:

4" W X 7" H

Half Page:

4" W X 3 1/2" H

Quarter Page:

2" W X 3 1/2" H

4" W X 1 3/4" H

Eighth Page:

2" W X 1 3/4" H

Legal Journal of Susquehanna County
3305 Lake Ariel Highway, Suite 3
Honesdale, PA 18431

