

# Erie County Legal Journal

September 19, 2014

Vol. 97 No. 38

USPS 178-360



---

97 ERIE

---

# Erie County Legal Journal

*Reporting Decisions of the Courts of Erie County  
The Sixth Judicial District of Pennsylvania*

Managing Editor: Heidi M. Weismiller

**PLEASE NOTE: NOTICES MUST BE RECEIVED AT THE ERIE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION OFFICE BY 3:00 P.M. THE FRIDAY PRECEDING THE DATE OF PUBLICATION.**

All legal notices must be submitted in typewritten form and are published exactly as submitted by the advertiser. The Erie County Bar Association will not assume any responsibility to edit, make spelling corrections, eliminate errors in grammar or make any changes in content.

The *Erie County Legal Journal* makes no representation as to the quality of services offered by an advertiser in this publication. Advertisements in the *Erie County Legal Journal* do not constitute endorsements by the Erie County Bar Association of the parties placing the advertisements or of any product or service being advertised.

## INDEX

<b>NOTICE TO THE PROFESSION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PBA FORMAL OPINION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>BANKRUPTCY COURT .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>COURT OF COMMON PLEAS</b>	
Change of Name Notice .....	22
Fictitious Name Notice .....	22
Incorporation Notice .....	22
Legal Notice .....	22
<b>ORPHANS' COURT</b>	
Audit List .....	27
Estate Notices .....	28
<b>CHANGES IN CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ECBA MEMBERS .....</b>	<b>31</b>

## 2014 BOARD OF DIRECTORS ——— Edwin W. Smith, President

Richard A. Lanzillo, First Vice President  
Melissa H. Shirey, Second Vice President  
John M. Quinn, Jr., Past President  
Valerie H. Kuntz, Treasurer  
Adam J. Williams, Secretary

Lisa R. Ferrick  
Tina M. Fryling  
John J. Mead

Craig Murphey  
Eric J. Purchase  
Christopher J. Sinnott  
Gary V. Skiba

Eugene C. Sundberg, Jr.  
Gregory P. Zimmerman  
Mark T. Wassell

ERIE COUNTY LEGAL JOURNAL (ISSN 0730-6393) is published every Friday for \$57 per year (\$1.50 single issues/\$5.00 special issues, i.e. Seated Tax Sales). Owned and published by the Erie County Bar Association (Copyright 2014©) 302 West 9th St., Erie, PA 16502 (814/459-3111). Periodical Postage paid at Erie, PA 16515. POSTMASTER: Send Address changes to THE ERIE COUNTY LEGAL JOURNAL, 302 West 9th St., Erie, PA 16502-1427.

## ECBA NOMINATING COMMITTEE TO MEET

In accordance with Article V, Section (2) of the Erie County Bar Association (ECBA) By-Laws, the membership is hereby notified that the Nominating Committee will meet on Thursday, September 25, 2014 at 8:00 a.m. at the Bar Association Headquarters. Any Association member wishing to nominate a candidate for any of the following offices may do so in writing to the ECBA office prior to the September 25th meeting:

Second Vice-President (1 year term); Treasurer (1 year term); Four (4) Board Members (3 year terms each).

Positive leadership characteristics of nominees include, among other things, a willingness to devote the necessary time to this commitment; integrity, intelligence, vision, decisiveness, reliability, open-mindedness; interest in and support of the ECBA and its mission, exhibited through current or recent involvement in the Association's work; is an ethical and respected member of the ECBA; unlikely to embarrass the ECBA by words or deeds; works well with staff.

It will be the duty of the Nominating Committee to place in nomination the names of one candidate for each seat to be filled by election. Nominations to be considered will come from the membership and from the Nominating Committee itself. No other nominations may be made from the floor at the election meeting.

Sept. 12, 19

**Dennis Lagan & Associates, Inc.**  
INVESTIGATORS AND CONSULTANTS

### NORTHWEST PENNSYLVANIA'S PREMIER INVESTIGATIVE TEAM

*Over 100 years combined PSP, FBI and CIA experience*

Dennis Lagan | Gerald Nichols  
Jennifer Mazur  
Mark Noce | David J. Peck

- ✦ DOMESTIC, CIVIL, CRIMINAL
- ✦ WRITTEN STATEMENTS
- ✦ SURVEILLANCE
- ✦ WIRETAP/"BUG" DETECTION
- ✦ POLYGRAPH

814-455-7007  
877-99-LAGAN  
[www.laganpi.com](http://www.laganpi.com)



*Your Other Partner*

## FORMAL OPINION 2014-300

### ETHICAL OBLIGATIONS FOR ATTORNEYS USING SOCIAL MEDIA

---

#### **I. Introduction and Summary**

“Social media” or “social networking” websites permit users to join online communities where they can share information, ideas, messages, and other content using words, photographs, videos and other methods of communication. There are thousands of these websites, which vary in form and content. Most of these sites, such as Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter, are designed to permit users to share information about their personal and professional activities and interests. As of January 2014, an estimated 74 percent of adults age 18 and over use these sites.<sup>1</sup>

Attorneys and clients use these websites for both business and personal reasons, and their use raises ethical concerns, both in how attorneys use the sites and in the advice attorneys provide to clients who use them. The Rules of Professional Conduct apply to all of these uses.

The issues raised by the use of social networking websites are highly fact-specific, although certain general principles apply. This Opinion reiterates the guidance provided in several previous ethics opinions in this developing area and provides a broad overview of the ethical concerns raised by social media, including the following:

1. Whether attorneys may advise clients about the content of the clients’ social networking websites, including removing or adding information.
2. Whether attorneys may connect with a client or former client on a social networking website.
3. Whether attorneys may contact a represented person through a social networking website.
4. Whether attorneys may contact an unrepresented person through a social networking website, or use a pretextual basis for viewing information on a social networking site that would otherwise be private/unavailable to the public.
5. Whether attorneys may use information on a social networking website in client-related matters.
6. Whether a client who asks to write a review of an attorney, or who writes a review of an attorney, has caused the attorney to violate any Rule of Professional Conduct.
7. Whether attorneys may comment on or respond to reviews or endorsements.
8. Whether attorneys may endorse other attorneys on a social networking website.
9. Whether attorneys may review a juror’s Internet presence.
10. Whether attorneys may connect with judges on social networking websites.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheets/social-networking-fact-sheet/>

This Committee concludes that:

1. Attorneys may advise clients about the content of their social networking websites, including the removal or addition of information.
2. Attorneys may connect with clients and former clients.
3. Attorneys may not contact a represented person through social networking websites.
4. Although attorneys may contact an unrepresented person through social networking websites, they may not use a pretextual basis for viewing otherwise private information on social networking websites.
5. Attorneys may use information on social networking websites in a dispute.
6. Attorneys may accept client reviews but must monitor those reviews for accuracy.
7. Attorneys may generally comment or respond to reviews or endorsements, and may solicit such endorsements.
8. Attorneys may generally endorse other attorneys on social networking websites.
9. Attorneys may review a juror's Internet presence.
10. Attorneys may connect with judges on social networking websites provided the purpose is not to influence the judge in carrying out his or her official duties.

This Opinion addresses social media profiles and websites used by lawyers for business purposes, but does not address the issues relating to attorney advertising and marketing on social networking websites. While a social media profile that is used exclusively for personal purposes (*i.e.*, to maintain relationships with friends and family) may not be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct relating to advertising and soliciting, the Committee emphasizes that attorneys should be conscious that clients and others may discover those websites, and that information contained on those websites is likely to be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct. Any social media activities or websites that promote, mention or otherwise bring attention to any law firm or to an attorney in his or her role as an attorney are subject to and must comply with the Rules.

## **II. Background**

A social networking website provides a virtual community for people to share their daily activities with family, friends and the public, to share their interest in a particular topic, or to increase their circle of acquaintances. There are dating sites, friendship sites, sites with business purposes, and hybrids that offer numerous combinations of these characteristics. Facebook is currently the leading personal site, and LinkedIn is currently the leading business site. Other social networking sites include, but are not limited to, Twitter, Myspace, Google+, Instagram, AVVO, Vine, YouTube, Pinterest, BlogSpot, and Foursquare. On these sites, members create their own online "profiles," which may include biographical data, pictures and any other information they choose to post.

Members of social networking websites often communicate with each other by making their latest thoughts public in a blog-like format or via e-mail, instant messaging, photographs, videos, voice or videoconferencing to selected members or to the public at large. These services permit members to locate and invite other members into their personal networks (to "friend" them) as well as to invite friends of friends or others.

Social networking websites have varying levels of privacy settings. Some sites allow users to restrict who may see what types of content, or to limit different information to certain

defined groups, such as the “public,” “friends,” and “others.” For example, on Facebook, a user may make all posts available only to friends who have requested access. A less restrictive privacy setting allows “friends of friends” to see content posted by a specific user. A still more publicly-accessible setting allows anyone with an account to view all of a person’s posts and other items.

These are just a few of the main features of social networking websites. This Opinion does not address every feature of every social networking website, which change frequently. Instead, this Opinion gives a broad overview of the main ethical issues that lawyers may face when using social media and when advising clients who use social media.

### **III. Discussion**

#### **A. Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct: Mandatory and Prohibited Conduct**

Each of the issues raised in this Opinion implicates various Rules of Professional Conduct that affect an attorney’s responsibilities towards clients, potential clients, and other parties. Although no Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct specifically addresses social networking websites, this Committee’s conclusions are based upon the existing rules. The Rules implicated by these issues include:

- Rule 1.1 (“Competence”)
- Rule 1.6 (“Confidentiality of Information”)
- Rule 3.3 (“Candor Toward the Tribunal”)
- Rule 3.4 (“Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel”)
- Rule 3.5 (“Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal”)
- Rule 3.6 (“Trial Publicity”)
- Rule 4.1 (“Truthfulness in Statements to Others”)
- Rule 4.2 (“Communication with Person Represented by Counsel”)
- Rule 4.3 (“Dealing with Unrepresented Person”)
- Rule 8.2 (“Statements Concerning Judges and Other Adjudicatory Officers”)
- Rule 8.4 (“Misconduct”)

The Rules define the requirements and limitations on an attorney’s conduct that may subject the attorney to disciplinary sanctions. While the Comments may assist an attorney in understanding or arguing the intention of the Rules, they are not enforceable in disciplinary proceedings.

#### **B. General Rules for Attorneys Using Social Media and Advising Clients About Social Media**

Lawyers must be aware of how these websites operate and the issues they raise in order to represent clients whose matters may be impacted by content posted on social media websites. Lawyers should also understand the manner in which postings are either public or private. A few Rules of Professional Conduct are particularly important in this context and can be generally applied throughout this Opinion.

Rule 1.1 provides:

A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

As a general rule, in order to provide competent representation under Rule 1.1, a lawyer should advise clients about the content of their social media accounts, including privacy issues, as well as their clients' obligation to preserve information that may be relevant to their legal disputes.

Comment [8] to Rule 1.1 further explains that, "To maintain the requisite knowledge and skill, a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology...." Thus, in order to provide competent representation in accordance with Rule 1.1, a lawyer should (1) have a basic knowledge of how social media websites work, and (2) advise clients about the issues that may arise as a result of their use of these websites.

Another Rule applicable in almost every context, and particularly relevant when social media is involved, is Rule 8.4 ("Misconduct"), which states in relevant part:

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

...

(c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;

This Rule prohibits "dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation." Social networking easily lends itself to dishonesty and misrepresentation because of how simple it is to create a false profile or to post information that is either inaccurate or exaggerated. This Opinion frequently refers to Rule 8.4, because its basic premise permeates much of the discussion surrounding a lawyer's ethical use of social media.

### **C. Advising Clients on the Content of their Social Media Accounts**

As the use of social media expands, so does its place in legal disputes. This is based on the fact that many clients seeking legal advice have at least one account on a social networking site. While an attorney is not responsible for the information posted by a client on the client's social media profile, an attorney may and often should advise a client about the content on the client's profile.

Against this background, this Opinion now addresses the series of questions raised above.

#### **1. Attorneys May, Subject to Certain Limitations, Advise Clients About The Content Of Their Social Networking Websites**

Tracking a client's activity on social media may be appropriate for an attorney to remain informed about developments bearing on the client's legal dispute. An attorney can reasonably expect that opposing counsel will monitor a client's social media account.

For example, in a Miami, Florida case, a man received an \$80,000.00 confidential settlement payment for his age discrimination claim against his former employer.<sup>2</sup> However, he forfeited that settlement after his daughter posted on her Facebook page "Mama and Papa Snay won the case against Gulliver. Gulliver is now officially paying for my vacation to Europe this summer. SUCK IT." The Facebook post violated the confidentiality agreement in the settlement and, therefore, cost the Plaintiff \$80,000.00.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Girl costs father \$80,000 with 'SUCK IT' Facebook Post, March 4, 2014: <http://www.cnn.com/2014/03/02/us/facebook-post-costs-father/>



The Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board<sup>3</sup> suspended an attorney for five years for (1) instructing his client to delete certain damaging photographs from his Facebook account, (2) withholding the photographs from opposing counsel, and (3) withholding from the trial court the emails discussing the plan to delete the information from the client's Facebook page. The Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board based the suspension upon the attorney's violations of Virginia's rules on candor toward the tribunal, fairness to opposing counsel, and misconduct. In addition, the trial court imposed \$722,000 in sanctions (\$542,000 upon the lawyer and \$180,000 upon his client) to compensate opposing counsel for their legal fees.<sup>4</sup>

While these may appear to be extreme cases, they are indicative of the activity that occur involving social media. As a result, lawyers should be certain that their clients are aware of the ramifications of their social media actions. Lawyers should also be aware of the consequences of their own actions and instructions when dealing with a client's social media account.

Three Rules of Professional Conduct are particularly important when addressing a lawyer's duties relating to a client's use of social media.

Rule 3.3 states:

- (a) A lawyer shall not knowingly:
  - (1) make a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer; ...
  - (3) offer evidence that the lawyer knows to be false. If a lawyer, the lawyer's client, or a witness called by the lawyer, has offered material evidence before a tribunal or in an ancillary proceeding conducted pursuant to a tribunal's adjudicative authority, such as a deposition, and the lawyer comes to know of its falsity, the lawyer shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal. A lawyer may refuse to offer evidence, other than the testimony of a defendant in a criminal matter, that the lawyer reasonably believes is false.
- (b) A lawyer who represents a client in an adjudicative proceeding and who knows that a person intends to engage, is engaging or has engaged in criminal or fraudulent conduct related to the proceeding shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal.
- (c) The duties stated in paragraphs (a) and (b) continue to the conclusion of the proceeding, and apply even if compliance requires disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6.

Rule 3.4 states:

A lawyer shall not:

- (a) unlawfully obstruct another party's access to evidence or unlawfully alter, destroy or conceal a document or other material having potential evidentiary value or assist another person to do any such act;

---

<sup>3</sup> *In the Matter of Matthew B. Murray*, VSB Nos. 11-070-088405 and 11-070-088422 (June 9, 2013)

<sup>4</sup> *Lester v. Allied Concrete Co.*, Nos. CL08-150 and CL09-223 (Charlotte, VA Circuit Court, October 21, 2011)



Rule 4.1 states:

In the course of representing a client a lawyer shall not knowingly:

- (a) make a false statement of material fact or law to a third person; or
- (b) fail to disclose a material fact to a third person when disclosure is necessary to avoid aiding and abetting a criminal or fraudulent act by a client, unless disclosure is prohibited by Rule 1.6.

The Rules do not prohibit an attorney from advising clients about their social networking websites. In fact, and to the contrary, a competent lawyer should advise clients about the content that they post publicly online and how it can affect a case or other legal dispute.

The Philadelphia Bar Association Professional Guidance Committee issued Opinion 2014-5, concluding that a lawyer may advise a client to change the privacy settings on the client's social media page but may not instruct a client to destroy any relevant content on the page. Additionally, a lawyer must respond to a discovery request with any relevant social media content posted by the client. The Committee found that changing a client's profile to "private" simply restricts access to the content of the page but does not completely prevent the opposing party from accessing the information. This Committee agrees with and adopts the guidance provided in the Philadelphia Bar Association Opinion.

The Philadelphia Committee also cited the Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association and its "Social Media Guidelines," which concluded that a lawyer may advise a client about the content of the client's social media page, to wit:

- A lawyer may advise a client as to what content may be maintained or made private on her social media account, as well as to what content may be "taken down" or removed, whether posted by the client or someone else, as long as there is no violation of common law or any statute, rule, or regulation relating to the preservation of information.
- Unless an appropriate record of the social media information or data is preserved, a party or nonparty may not delete information from a social media profile that is subject to a duty to preserve. This duty arises when the potential for litigation or other conflicts arises<sup>5</sup>

In 2014 Formal Ethics Opinion 5, the North Carolina State Bar concluded that a lawyer may advise a client to remove information on social media if not spoliation or otherwise illegal.<sup>6</sup>

This Committee agrees with and adopts these recommendations, which are consistent with Rule 3.4(a)'s prohibition against "unlawfully alter[ing], destroy[ing] or conceal[ing] a document or other material having potential evidentiary value." Thus, a lawyer may not instruct a client to alter, destroy, or conceal any relevant information, regardless whether that information is in paper or digital form. A lawyer may, however, instruct a client to delete information that may be damaging from the client's page, provided the conduct does not constitute spoliation or is otherwise illegal, but must take appropriate action to preserve

---

<sup>5</sup> *Social Media Ethics Guidelines*, The Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association, March 18, 2014 at 11 (footnote omitted).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.ncbar.com/ethics/printopinion.asp?id=894>

the information in the event it is discoverable or becomes relevant to the client's matter. Similarly, an attorney may not advise a client to post false or misleading information on a social networking website; nor may an attorney offer evidence from a social networking website that the attorney knows is false. Rule 4.1(a) prohibits an attorney from making "a false statement of material fact or law." If an attorney knows that information on a social networking site is false, the attorney may not present that as truthful information. It has become common practice for lawyers to advise clients to refrain from posting any information relevant to a case on any website, and to refrain from using these websites until the case concludes.

## **2. Attorneys May Ethically Connect with Clients or Former Clients on Social Media**

Social media provides many opportunities for attorneys to contact and connect with clients and other relevant persons. While the mode of communication has changed, the Rules that generally address an attorney's communications with others still apply.

There is no *per se* prohibition on an attorney connecting with a client or former client on social media. However, an attorney must continue to adhere to the Rules and maintain a professional relationship with clients. If an attorney connects with clients or former clients on social networking sites, the attorney should be aware that his posts may be viewed by clients and former clients.

Although this Committee does not recommend doing so, if an attorney uses social media to communicate with a client relating to representation of the client, the attorney should retain records of those communications containing legal advice. As outlined below, an attorney must not reveal confidential client information on social media. While the Rules do not prohibit connecting with clients on social media, social media may not be the best platform to connect with clients, particularly in light of the difficulties that often occur when individuals attempt to adjust their privacy settings.

## **3. Attorneys May Not Ethically Contact a Represented Person Through a Social Networking Website**

Attorneys may also use social media to contact relevant persons in a conflict, but within limitations. As a general rule, if contacting a party using other forms of communication would be prohibited,<sup>7</sup> it would also be prohibited while using social networking websites.

Rule 4.2 states:

In representing a client, a lawyer shall not communicate about the subject of the representation with a person the lawyer knows to be represented by another lawyer in the matter, unless the lawyer has the consent of the other lawyer or is authorized to do so by law or a court order.

---

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., Formal Opinion 90-142 (updated by 2005-200), in which this Committee concluded that, unless a lawyer has the consent of opposing counsel or is authorized by law to do so, in representing a client, a lawyer shall not conduct ex parte communications about the matter of the representation with present managerial employees of an opposing party, and with any other employee whose acts or omissions may be imputed to the corporation for purposes of civil or criminal liability.

Regardless of the method of communication, Rule 4.2 clearly states that an attorney may not communicate with a represented party without the permission of that party's lawyer. Social networking websites increase the number of ways to connect with another person but the essence of that connection is still a communication. Contacting a represented party on social media, even without any pretext, is limited by the Rules.

The Philadelphia Bar Association Professional Guidance Committee concluded in Opinion 2009-02,<sup>8</sup> that an attorney may not use an intermediary to access a witness' social media profiles. The inquirer sought access to a witness' social media account for impeachment purposes. The inquirer wanted to ask a third person, *i.e.*, "someone whose name the witness will not recognize," to go to Facebook and Myspace and attempt to "friend" the witness to gain access to the information on the pages. The Committee found that this type of pretextual "friending" violates Rule 8.4(c), which prohibits the use of deception. The action also would violate Rule 4.1 (discussed below) because such conduct amounts to a false statement of material fact to the witness.

The San Diego County Bar Legal Ethics Committee issued similar guidance in Ethics Opinion 2011-2,<sup>9</sup> concluding that an attorney is prohibited from making an *ex parte* "friend" request of a represented party to view the non-public portions of a social networking website. Even if the attorney clearly states his name and purpose for the request, the conduct violates the Rule against communication with a represented party. Consistent with this Opinion, this Committee also finds that "friending" a represented party violates Rule 4.2.

While it would be forbidden for a lawyer to "friend" a represented party, it would be permissible for the lawyer to access the public portions of the represented person's social networking site, just as it would be permissible to review any other public statements the person makes. The New York State Bar Association Committee on Professional Ethics issued Opinion 843,<sup>10</sup> concluded that lawyers may access the public portions of other parties' social media accounts for use in litigation, particularly impeachment. The Committee found that there is no deception in accessing a public website; it also cautioned, however, that a lawyer should not request additional access to the social networking website nor have someone else do so.

This Committee agrees that accessing the public portion of a represented party's social media site does not involve an improper contact with the represented party because the page is publicly accessible under Rule 4.2. However, a request to access the represented party's private page is a prohibited communication under Rule 4.2

#### **4. Attorneys May Generally Contact an Unrepresented Person Through a Social Networking Website But May Not Use a Pretextual Basis For Viewing Otherwise Private Information<sup>11</sup>**

Communication with an unrepresented party through a social networking website is governed by the same general rule that, if the contact is prohibited using other forms of communication, then it is also prohibited using social media.

---

<sup>8</sup> Philadelphia Bar Assn., Prof'l Guidance Comm., Op. 2009-02 (2009).

<sup>9</sup> San Diego County Bar Assn., Legal Ethics Comm., Op. 2011-2 (2011).

<sup>10</sup> New York State Bar Assn., Comm. on Prof'l Ethics, Op. 843 (2010).

<sup>11</sup> Attorneys may be prohibited from contacting certain persons, despite their lack of representation. This portion of this Opinion only addresses communication and contact with persons with whom such contact is not otherwise prohibited by the Rules, statute or some other basis.

Rule 4.3 states in relevant part:

- (a) In dealing on behalf of a client with a person who is not represented by counsel, a lawyer shall not state or imply that the lawyer is disinterested. ...
- (c) When the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the unrepresented person misunderstands the lawyer's role in the matter, the lawyer should make reasonable efforts to correct the misunderstanding.

Connecting with an unrepresented person through a social networking website may be ethical if the attorney clearly identifies his or her identity and purpose. Particularly when using social networking websites, an attorney may not use a pretextual basis when attempting to contact the unrepresented person. Rule 4.3(a) instructs that "a lawyer shall not state or imply that the lawyer is disinterested." Additionally, Rule 8.4(c) (discussed above) prohibits a lawyer from using deception. For example, an attorney may not use another person's name or online identity to contact an unrepresented person; rather, the attorney must use his or her own name and state the purpose for contacting the individual. In Ohio, a former prosecutor was fired after he posed as a woman on a fake Facebook account in order to influence an accused killer's alibi witnesses to change their testimony<sup>12</sup>. He was fired for "unethical behavior," which is also consistent with the Pennsylvania Rules. Contacting witnesses under false pretenses constitutes deception.

Many Ethics Committees have addressed whether an attorney may contact an unrepresented person on social media. The Kentucky Bar Association Ethics Committee<sup>13</sup> concluded that a lawyer may access the social networking site of a third person to benefit a client within the limits of the Rules. The Committee noted that even though social networking sites are a new medium of communication, "[t]he underlying principles of fairness and honesty are the same, regardless of context."<sup>14</sup> The Committee found that the Rules would not permit a lawyer to communicate through social media with a represented party. But, the Rules do not prohibit social media communication with an unrepresented party provided the lawyer is not deceitful or dishonest in the communication.

As noted above, in Opinion 2009-02,<sup>15</sup> the Philadelphia Bar Association Professional Guidance Committee concluded that an attorney may not access a witness' social media profiles by deceptively using a third party intermediary. Use of an alias or other deceptive conduct violates the Rules as well, regardless whether it is permissible to contact a particular person.

The New Hampshire Bar Association Ethics Committee agreed with the Philadelphia Opinion in Advisory Opinion 2012-13/05,<sup>16</sup> concluding that a lawyer may not use deception to access the private portions of an unrepresented person's social networking account. The Committee noted, "A lawyer has a duty to investigate but also a duty to do so openly and honestly, rather than through subterfuge."

---

<sup>12</sup> "Aaron Brockler, Former Prosecutor, Fired for Posing as Accused Killer's Ex-Girlfriend on Facebook," June 7, 2013. <http://www.cnn.com/2014/03/02/us/facebook-post-costs-father/>

<sup>13</sup> Kentucky Bar Assn., Ethics Comm., Formal Op. KBA E-434 (2012).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>15</sup> Philadelphia Bar Assn., Prof'l Guidance Comm., Op. 2009-02 (2009).

<sup>16</sup> New Hampshire Bar Assn., Ethics Comm., Op. 2012-13/05 (2012).

The Oregon State Bar Legal Ethics Committee concurred with these opinions as well in Opinion 2013-189,<sup>17</sup> concluding that a lawyer may request access to an unrepresented party's social networking website if the lawyer is truthful and does not employ deception. These Committees consistently conclude that a lawyer may not use deception to gain access to an unrepresented party's page, but a lawyer may request access using his or her real name. There is, however, a split of authority among these Committees. The Philadelphia and New Hampshire Committees would further require the lawyer to state the purpose for the request, a conclusion with which this Committee agrees. These Committees found that omitting the purpose of the contact implies that the lawyer is disinterested, in violation of Rule 4.3(a).

This Committee agrees with the Philadelphia Opinion (2009-02) and concludes that a lawyer may not use deception to gain access to an unrepresented person's social networking site. A lawyer may ethically request access to the site, however, by using the lawyer's real name and by stating the lawyer's purpose for the request. Omitting the purpose would imply that the lawyer is disinterested, contrary to Rule 4.3(a).

### **5. Attorneys May Use Information Discovered on a Social Networking Website in a Dispute**

If a lawyer obtains information from a social networking website, that information may be used in a legal dispute provided the information was obtained ethically and consistent with other portions of this Opinion. As mentioned previously, a competent lawyer has the duty to understand how social media works and how it may be used in a dispute. Because social networking websites allow users to instantaneously post information about anything the user desires in many different formats, a client's postings on social media may potentially be used against the client's interests. Moreover, because of the ease with which individuals can post information on social media websites, there may be an abundance of information about the user that may be discoverable if the user is ever involved in a legal dispute.

For example, in 2011, a New York<sup>18</sup> court ruled against a wife's claim for support in a matrimonial matter based upon evidence from her blog that contradicted her testimony that she was totally disabled, unable to work in any capacity, and rarely left home because she was in too much pain. The posts confirmed that the wife had started belly dancing in 2007, and the Court learned of this activity in 2009 when the husband attached the posts to his motion papers. The Court concluded that the wife's postings were relevant and could be deemed as admissions by the wife that contradicted her claims.

Courts have, with increasing frequency, permitted information from social media sites to be used in litigation, and have granted motions to compel discovery of information on private social networking websites when the public profile shows relevant evidence may be found. For example, in *McMillen v. Hummingbird Speedway, Inc.*,<sup>19</sup> the Court of Common Pleas of Jefferson County, Pennsylvania granted a motion to compel discovery of the private portions

---

<sup>17</sup> Oregon State Bar, Legal Ethics Comm., Op. 2013-189 (2013).

<sup>18</sup> *B.M. v D.M.*, 31 Misc. 3d 1211(A) (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2011).

<sup>19</sup> *McMillen v. Hummingbird Speedway, Inc.*, 2010 Pa. Dist. & Cnty. Dec. LEXIS 270 (Pa. County Ct. 2010).

of a litigant's Facebook profile after the opposing party produced evidence that the litigant may have misrepresented the extent of his injuries. In a New York case, *Romano v. Steelcase Inc.*,<sup>20</sup> the Court similarly granted a defendant's request for access to a plaintiff's social media accounts because the Court believed, based on the public portions of plaintiff's account, that the information may be inconsistent with plaintiff's claims of loss of enjoyment of life and physical injuries, thus making the social media accounts relevant.

In *Largent v. Reed*,<sup>21</sup> a Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas granted a discovery request for access to a personal injury plaintiff's social media accounts. The Court engaged in a lengthy discussion of Facebook's privacy policy and Facebook's ability to produce subpoenaed information. The Court also ordered that plaintiff produce her login information for opposing counsel and required that she make no changes to her Facebook for thirty-five days while the defendant had access to the account.

Conversely, in *McCann v. Harleysville Insurance Co.*,<sup>22</sup> a New York court denied a defendant access to a plaintiff's social media account because there was no evidence on the public portion of the profile to suggest that there was relevant evidence on the private portion. The court characterized this request as a "fishing expedition" that was too broad to be granted. Similarly, in *Trail v. Lesko*,<sup>23</sup> Judge R. Stanton Wettick, Jr. of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County denied a party access to a plaintiff's social media accounts, concluding that, under Pa. R.Civ.P. 4011(b), the defendant did not produce any relevant evidence to support its request; therefore, granting access to the plaintiff's Facebook account would have been needlessly intrusive.

## **6. Attorneys May Generally Comment or Respond to Reviews or Endorsements, and May Solicit Such Endorsements Provided the Reviews Are Monitored for Accuracy**

Some social networking websites permit a member or other person, including clients and former clients, to recommend or endorse a fellow member's skills or accomplishments. For example, LinkedIn allows a user to "endorse" the skills another user has listed (or for skills created by the user). A user may also request that others endorse him or her for specified skills. LinkedIn also allows a user to remove or limit endorsements. Other sites allow clients to submit reviews of an attorney's performance during representation. Some legal-specific social networking sites focus exclusively on endorsements or recommendations, while other sites with broader purposes can incorporate recommendations and endorsements into their more relaxed format. Thus, the range of sites and the manner in which information is posted varies greatly.

Although an attorney is not responsible for the content that other persons, who are not agents of the attorney, post on the attorney's social networking websites, an attorney (1) should monitor his or her social networking websites, (2) has a duty to verify the accuracy of any information posted, and (3) has a duty to remove or correct any inaccurate endorsements.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Romano v. Steelcase Inc.*, 30 Misc. 3d 426 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2010).

<sup>21</sup> *Largent v. Reed*, No. 2009-1823 (Pa.Ct.Com.Pl. Franklin Cty. 2011).

<sup>22</sup> *McCann v. Harleysville Ins. Co. of N.Y.*, 78 A.D.3d 1524 (N.Y. App. Div. 4th Dep't 2010).

<sup>23</sup> *Trail v. Lesko*, 2012 Pa. Dist. & Cnty. Dec. LEXIS 194 (Pa. County Ct. 2012).



For example, if a lawyer limits his or her practice to criminal law, and is “endorsed” for his or her expertise on appellate litigation on the attorney’s LinkedIn page, the attorney has a duty to remove or correct the inaccurate endorsement on the LinkedIn page. This obligation exists regardless of whether the information was posted by the attorney, by a client, or by a third party. In addition, an attorney may be obligated to remove endorsements or other postings posted on sites that the attorney controls that refer to skills or expertise that the attorney does not possess.

Similarly, the Rules do not prohibit an attorney from soliciting reviews from clients about the attorney’s services on an attorney’s social networking site, nor do they prohibit an attorney from posting comments by others.<sup>24</sup> Although requests such as these are permissible, the attorney should monitor the information so as to verify its accuracy.

Rule 7.2 states, in relevant part:

- (d) No advertisement or public communication shall contain an endorsement by a celebrity or public figure.
- (e) An advertisement or public communication that contains a paid endorsement shall disclose that the endorser is being paid or otherwise compensated for his or her appearance or endorsement.

Rule 7.2(d) prohibits any endorsement by a celebrity or public figure. A lawyer may not solicit an endorsement nor accept an unsolicited endorsement from a celebrity or public figure on social media. Additionally, Rule 7.2(e) mandates disclosure if an endorsement is made by a paid endorser. Therefore, if a lawyer provides any type of compensation for an endorsement made on social media, the endorsement must contain a disclosure of that compensation.

Even if the endorsement is not made by a celebrity or a paid endorser, the post must still be accurate. Rule 8.4(c) is again relevant in this context. This Rule prohibits lawyers from dishonest conduct and making misrepresentations. If a client or former client writes a review of a lawyer that the lawyer knows is false or misleading, then the lawyer has an obligation to correct or remove the dishonest information within a reasonable amount of time. If the lawyer is unable to correct or remove the listing, he or she should contact the person posting the information and request that the person remove or correct the item.

The North Carolina State Bar Ethics Committee issued Formal Ethics Opinion 8,<sup>25</sup> concluding that a lawyer may accept recommendations from current or former clients if the lawyer monitors the recommendations to ensure that there are no ethical rule violations. The Committee discussed recommendations in the context of LinkedIn where an attorney must accept the recommendation before it is posted.<sup>26</sup> Because the lawyer must review the recommendation before it can be posted, there is a smaller risk of false or misleading communication about the lawyer’s services. The Committee also concluded that a

---

<sup>24</sup> In *Dwyer v. Cappell*, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 15361 (3d Cir. N.J. Aug. 11, 2014), the Third Circuit ruled that an attorney may include accurate quotes from judicial opinions on his website, and was not required to reprint the opinion in full.

<sup>25</sup> North Carolina State Bar Ethics Comm., Formal Op. 8 (2012).

<sup>26</sup> Persons with profiles on LinkedIn no longer are required to approve recommendations, but are generally notified of them by the site. This change in procedure highlights the fact that sites and their policies and procedures change rapidly, and that attorneys must be aware of their listings on such sites.



lawyer may request a recommendation from a current or former client but limited that recommendation to the client's level of satisfaction with the lawyer-client relationship. This Committee agrees with the North Carolina Committee's findings. Attorneys may request or permit clients to post positive reviews, subject to the limitations of Rule 7.2, but must monitor those reviews to ensure they are truthful and accurate.

### **7. Attorneys May Comment or Respond to Online Reviews or Endorsements But May Not Reveal Confidential Client Information**

Attorneys may not disclose confidential client information without the client's consent. This obligation of confidentiality applies regardless of the context. While the issue of disclosure of confidential client information extends beyond this Opinion, the Committee emphasizes that attorneys may not reveal such information absent client approval under Rule 1.6. Thus, an attorney may not reveal confidential information while posting celebratory statements about a successful matter, nor may the attorney respond to client or other comments by revealing information subject to the attorney-client privilege. Consequently, a lawyer's comments on social media must maintain attorney/client confidentiality, regardless of the context, absent the client's informed consent.

This Committee has opined, in Formal Opinion 2014-200,<sup>27</sup> that lawyers may not reveal client confidential information in response to a negative online review. Confidential client information is defined as "information relating to representation," which is generally very broad. While there are certain circumstances that would allow a lawyer to reveal confidential client information, a negative online client review is not a circumstance that invokes the self-defense exception.

As Rule 1.6 states:

- (a) A lawyer shall not reveal information relating to representation of a client unless the client gives informed consent, except for disclosures that are impliedly authorized in order to carry out the representation, and except as stated in paragraphs (b) and (c).
- (b) A lawyer shall reveal such information if necessary to comply with the duties stated in Rule 3.3.
- (c) A lawyer may reveal such information to the extent that the lawyer reasonably believes necessary:
  - (4) to establish a claim or defense on behalf of the lawyer in a controversy between the lawyer and the client, to establish a defense to a criminal charge or civil claim or disciplinary proceeding against the lawyer based upon conduct in which the client was involved, or to respond to allegations in any proceeding concerning the lawyer's representation of the client
- (d) A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client.
- (e) The duty not to reveal information relating to representation of a client continues after the client-lawyer relationship has terminated.

---

<sup>27</sup> Pennsylvania Bar Assn, Ethics Comm., Formal Op. 2014-200 (2014).

Thus, any information that an attorney posts on social media may not violate attorney/client confidentiality.

An attorney's communications to a client are also confidential. In *Gillard v. AIG Insurance Company*,<sup>28</sup> the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ruled that the attorney-client privilege extends to communications from attorney to client. The Court held that "the attorney-client privilege operates in a two-way fashion to protect confidential client-to-attorney or attorney-to-client communications made for the purpose of obtaining or providing professional legal advice."<sup>29</sup> The court noted that communications from attorney to client come with a certain expectation of privacy. These communications only originate because of a confidential communication from the client. Therefore, even revealing information that the attorney has said to a client may be considered a confidential communication, and may not be revealed on social media or elsewhere.

Responding to a negative review can be tempting but lawyers must be careful about what they write. The Hearing Board of the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission reprimanded an attorney for responding to a negative client review on the lawyer referral website AVVO<sup>30</sup>. In her response, the attorney mentioned confidential client information, revealing that the client had been in a physical altercation with a co-worker. While the Commission did not prohibit an attorney from responding, in general, to a negative review on a site such as AVVO, it did prohibit revealing confidential client information in that type of reply.

The Illinois disciplinary action is consistent with this Committee's recent Opinion and with the Pennsylvania Rules. A lawyer is not permitted to reveal confidential information about a client even if the client posts a negative review about the lawyer. Rule 1.6(d) instructs a lawyer to make "reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of . . . information relating to the representation of a client." This means that a lawyer must be mindful of any information that the lawyer posts pertaining to a client. While a response may not contain confidential client information, an attorney is permitted to respond to reviews or endorsements on social media. These responses must be accurate and truthful representations of the lawyer's services.

Also relevant is Rule 3.6, which states:

- (a) A lawyer who is participating or has participated in the investigation or litigation of a matter shall not make an extrajudicial statement that the lawyer knows or reasonably should know will be disseminated by means of public communication and will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding in the matter.

This Rule prohibits lawyers from making extrajudicial statements through public communication during an ongoing adjudication. This encompasses a lawyer updating a social media page with information relevant to the proceeding. If a lawyer's social media account is generally accessible publicly then any posts about an ongoing proceeding would

<sup>28</sup> *Gillard v. AIG Insurance Co.*, 15 A.3d 44 (Pa. 2011).

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* at 59.

<sup>30</sup> *In Re Tsamis*, Comm. File No. 2013PR00095 (Ill. 2013).

be a public communication. Therefore, lawyers should not be posting about ongoing matters on social media when such matters would reveal confidential client information. For example, the Supreme Court of Illinois suspended an attorney for 60 days<sup>31</sup> for writing about confidential client information and client proceedings on her personal blog. The attorney revealed information that made her clients easily identifiable, sometimes even using their names. The Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission had argued in the matter that the attorney knew or should have known that her blog was accessible to others using the internet and that she had not made any attempts to make her blog private. Social media creates a wider platform of communication but that wider platform does not make it appropriate for an attorney to reveal confidential client information or to make otherwise prohibited extrajudicial statements on social media.

### **8. Attorneys May Generally Endorse Other Attorneys on Social Networking Websites**

Some social networking sites allow members to endorse other members' skills. An attorney may endorse another attorney on a social networking website provided the endorsement is accurate and not misleading. However, celebrity endorsements are not permitted nor are endorsements by judges. As previously noted, Rule 8.4(c) prohibits an attorney from being dishonest or making misrepresentations. Therefore, when a lawyer endorses another lawyer on social media, the endorsing lawyer must only make endorsements about skills that he knows to be true.

### **9. Attorneys May Review a Juror's Internet Presence**

The use of social networking websites can also come into play when dealing with judges and juries. A lawyer may review a juror's social media presence but may not attempt to access the private portions of a juror's page.

Rule 3.5 states:

A lawyer shall not:

- (a) seek to influence a judge, juror, prospective juror or other official by means prohibited by law;
- (b) communicate ex parte with such a person during the proceeding unless authorized to do so by law or court order;
- (c) communicate with a juror or prospective juror after discharge of the jury if:
  - (1) the communication is prohibited by law or court order;
  - (2) the juror has made known to the lawyer a desire not to communicate; or
  - (3) the communication involves misrepresentation, coercion, duress of harassment; or
- (d) engage in conduct intended to disrupt a tribunal.

During jury selection and trial, an attorney may access the public portion of a juror's social networking website but may not attempt or request to access the private portions of the website. Requesting access to the private portions of a juror's social networking website

---

<sup>31</sup> *In Re Peshek*, No. M.R. 23794 (Il. 2010); Compl., *In Re Peshek*, Comm. No. 09 CH 89 (Il. 2009).

would constitute an *ex parte* communication, which is expressly prohibited by Rule 3.5(b). Rule 3.5(a) prohibits a lawyer from attempting to influence a juror or potential juror. Additionally, Rule 3.5(b) prohibits *ex parte* communications with those persons. Accessing the public portions of a juror's social media profile is ethical under the Rules as discussed in other portions of this Opinion. However, any attempts to gain additional access to private portions of a juror's social networking site would constitute an *ex parte* communication. Therefore, a lawyer, or a lawyer's agent, may not request access to the private portions of a juror's social networking site.

American Bar Association Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility Formal Opinion 466 concluded that a lawyer may view the public portion of the social networking profile of a juror or potential juror but may not communicate directly with the juror or jury panel member. The Committee determined that a lawyer, or his agent, is not permitted to request access to the private portion of a juror's or potential juror's social networking website because that type of *ex parte* communication would violate Model Rule 3.5(b). There is no *ex parte* communication if the social networking website independently notifies users when the page has been viewed. Additionally, a lawyer may be required to notify the court of any evidence of juror misconduct discovered on a social networking website.

This Committee agrees with the guidance provided in ABA Formal Opinion 466, which is consistent with Rule 3.5's prohibition regarding attempts to influence jurors, and *ex parte* communications with jurors.

#### **10. Attorneys May Ethically Connect with Judges on Social Networking Websites Provided the Purpose is not to Influence the Judge**

A lawyer may not ethically connect with a judge on social media if the lawyer intends to influence the judge in the performance of his or her official duties. In addition, although the Rules do not prohibit such conduct, the Committee cautions attorneys that connecting with judges may create an appearance of bias or partiality.<sup>32</sup>

Various Rules address this concern. For example, Rule 8.2 states:

- (a) A lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, adjudicatory officer or public legal officer, or of a candidate for election or appointment to judicial or legal office.

In addition, Comment [4] to Canon 2.9 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, effective July 1, 2014, states that "A judge shall avoid comments and interactions that may be interpreted as *ex parte* communications concerning pending matters or matters that may appear before the court, including a judge who participates in electronic social media." Thus, the Supreme Court has implicitly agreed that judges may participate in social media, but must do so

---

<sup>32</sup> American Bar Association Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility Formal Opinion 462 concluded that a judge may participate in electronic social networking, but as with all social relationships and contacts, a judge must comply with the relevant provisions of the Code of Judicial Conduct and avoid any conduct that would undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality, or create an appearance of impropriety.

with care.

Based upon this statement, this Committee believes that attorneys may connect with judges on social media websites provided the purpose is not to influence the judge, and reasonable efforts are taken to assure that there is no *ex parte* or other prohibited communication. This conclusion is consistent with Rule 3.5(a), which forbids a lawyer to “seek to influence a judge” in an unlawful way.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Social media is a constantly changing area of technology that lawyers keep abreast of in order to remain competent. As a general rule, any conduct that would not be permissible using other forms of communication would also not be permissible using social media. Any use of a social networking website to further a lawyer’s business purpose will be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Accordingly, this Committee concludes that any information an attorney or law firm places on a social networking website must not reveal confidential client information absent the client’s consent. Competent attorneys should also be aware that their clients use social media and that what clients reveal on social media can be used in the course of a dispute. Finally, attorneys are permitted to use social media to research jurors and may connect with judges so long as they do not attempt to influence the outcome of a case or otherwise cause the judge to violate the governing Code of Judicial Conduct.

Social media presents a myriad of ethical issues for attorneys, and attorneys should continually update their knowledge of how social media impacts their practice in order to demonstrate competence and to be able to represent their clients effectively.

---

<p><b>CAVEAT:</b> THE FOREGOING OPINION IS ADVISORY ONLY AND IS NOT BINDING ON THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA OR ANY COURT. THIS OPINION CARRIES ONLY SUCH WEIGHT AS AN APPROPRIATE REVIEWING AUTHORITY MAY CHOOSE TO GIVE IT.</p>
---

**BANKRUPTCY NOTICE**

In re: Chapter 13 Bankruptcy Case  
No. 12-10079TPA

NOTICE OF A NON-  
EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON  
MOTION FOR PRIVATE SALE  
OF REAL AND /OR PERSONAL  
PROPERTY FREE AND  
DIVESTED OF LIENS:

The Debtor in this Bankruptcy  
seeks an Order to sell the personal  
and/or real property located at 5306  
Fairlawn Street, Erie, Pennsylvania,  
as more fully described in the  
Agreement of Sale attached to the  
Motion as Exhibit "C". Objections  
to the sale must be filed and served  
by September 29, 2014. A hearing  
shall take place on October 15, 2014  
@ 11:00 a.m. in the Bankruptcy  
Courtroom at the United States  
Courthouse, 17 South Park Row,  
Erie, Pennsylvania 16501. The  
Court will entertain higher offers at

the hearing. The gross sales price  
must be paid at the closing of this  
sale. Examination of the property  
can be obtained by contacting the  
attorney for the Debtor, listed below.  
Terms of the Sale: \$170,000.00 w/  
\$2,000.00 down payment and the  
remainder due at the time of closing.  
Attorney for Movant/Applicant  
Michael S. Jan Janin, Esquire  
The Quinn Law Firm  
2222 West Grandview Blvd.  
Erie, Pennsylvania 16506  
(814)833-2222  
PA ID#38880

Sept. 19

## BETTS MEDIATION & DISPUTE RESOLUTION LLC

Commercial Litigation & Business Disputes/  
Securities Litigation & Arbitrations

### Experienced

Over 30 years -  
business and securities litigation

### Balanced

Representation of individuals and  
businesses, on both sides of the "v"


### Creative

Customized mediation approaches -  
facilitative/evaluative/hybrid

### Reasonable Fees

No charges for travel time or expenses

Michael J. Betts



The Frick Building, 437 Grant Street, Suite 200, Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
412.223.5004 | [www.bettsmediationllc.com](http://www.bettsmediationllc.com)

**CHANGE OF NAME NOTICE**

In the Court of Common Pleas of Erie County, Pennsylvania  
Docket No. 2014-12226

In re: Scott Douglas Aldrich

Notice is hereby given that a petition has been filed in the above named Court requesting an Order to change the name of Scott Douglas Aldrich to Douglas Mylow Elwell, Jr.. The Court has fixed the 25th day of September, 2014 at 11:30 a.m. in the Courtroom of Hon. Stephanie Domitrovich, Room 223, Erie County Court House, 140 West 6th Street, Erie, PA 16501 as the time and place for the hearing on said Petition, where all interested parties may appear, and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the Petitioner should not be granted.

Sept. 19

**FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE**

Pursuant to Act 295 of December 16, 1982 notice is hereby given of the intention to file with the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a "Certificate of Carrying On or Conducting Business under an Assumed or Fictitious Name." Said Certificate contains the following information:

**FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE**

1. Fictitious Name: Life Science Training Institute
2. Address of the principal place of business, including street and number: 5340 Fryling Road, Suite 300, Erie, PA 16510
3. The real name(s) and address, including street and number, of the persons who are parties to the registration: VertMarkets, Inc., 5340 Fryling Road, Suite 300, Erie, PA 16510; Thomas J. Roberts, 2092 Deep Meadow Lane, Lansdale, PA 19446; Mark E. Simpson, 5770 Nickel Drive, Erie, PA 16509; Richard J. Peterson, 565 Worth Street, Corry, PA 16407
4. An application for registration of a fictitious name under the Fictitious Name Act was filed on August 22, 2014 with the Department of State.

Sept. 19

**INCORPORATION NOTICE**

McKean Community Development Group, Inc. has been incorporated under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Nonprofit Corporation Law of 1988, for the civic, charitable, and educational purposes of the beautification of downtown McKean Borough and McKean Township. The Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Pennsylvania Department of State on August 12, 2014.

John J. Shimek, III, Esq.  
1001 State Street, Suite 1400  
Erie, PA 16501

Sept. 19

**LEGAL NOTICE**

NOTICE ON HEARING ON  
PETITION TO INVOLUNTARY  
TERMINATE PARENTAL  
RIGHTS

IN RE: Adoption of Baby Boy Turk;  
Case No 87 of 2014 in the Orphan's  
Court Division of Westmoreland  
County, Pennsylvania.

Notice To: UNKNOWN BIRTH  
FATHER WITH A FIRST NAME  
OF "TOM" OF BABY BOY  
TURK, born March 1, 2014, at  
Forbes Regional Medical Center,  
Monroeville, PA 15146, and  
conceived in the area of Erie,  
Erie County, Commonwealth of  
Pennsylvania. The Court has set  
a hearing to consider ending your  
rights to your child. That hearing  
will be held before the Honorable  
Harry F. Smail, Jr., in Courtroom  
No. 10, Westmoreland County  
Courthouse, 2 North Main Street,  
Greensburg, Pennsylvania 15601,  
on October 22, 2014, at 2:30 P.M.  
You are warned that if you fail to  
appear at the scheduled hearing,  
the hearing will go on without you  
and your rights to your child may  
be ended by the Court without you  
being present.

You are also notified of Act  
101 of 2010 which allows  
for an enforceable voluntary  
agreement for continuing contact  
or communication following an  
adoption between an adoptive  
parent, a child, a birth parent and/  
or a birth relative of the child, if  
all parties agree and the written

voluntary agreement is approved by  
the court.

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO  
BE REPRESENTED AT THE  
HEARING BY A LAWYER. YOU  
SHOULD TAKE THIS PAPER TO  
YOUR LAWYER AT ONCE. IF  
YOU DO NOT HAVE A LAWYER  
OR CANNOT AFFORD ONE,  
GO TO OR TELEPHONE THE  
OFFICE SET FORTH BELOW  
TO FIND OUT WHERE YOU  
CAN GET LEGAL HELP. THIS  
OFFICE CAN PROVIDE YOU  
WITH INFORMATION ABOUT  
HIRING A LAWYER.

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

WESTMORELAND BAR  
ASSOCIATION. P.O. BOX 565;  
GREENSBURG, PA 15601; (724)  
834-8490; <http://lrs.westbar.org>.  
JEFFREY J. LOCHNER,  
ESQUIRE, Attorney at Law, 4232  
Brownsville Road, Suite 315;  
Pittsburgh, PA 15227; (412) 881-  
4380.

Sept. 19



## The USI Affinity Insurance Program

We go beyond professional liability to offer a complete range of insurance solutions covering all of your needs.

USI Affinity's extensive experience and strong relationships with the country's most respected insurance companies give us the ability to design customized coverage at competitive prices.

- Lawyers Professional Liability
- Business Insurance
- Medical & Dental
- Life Insurance
- Disability Insurance



[www.usiaffinity.com](http://www.usiaffinity.com)

**Call 1.800.327.1550 for your FREE quote.**



Raymond J. Sammartino, MAI, SRA  
Robert G. Stout, Jr., MAI



**Sammartino & Stout, Inc.** is committed to providing regional real estate valuation and consulting expertise which meets or exceeds our clients' expectations in a timely, concise, and reliable manner.

State Certified General Appraisers in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York.

We provide real estate valuation and consulting expertise for:

- **Litigation Support**
- **Eminent Domain (Condemnation)**
- **Conservation Easements**
- **Tax Appeals**
- **Mortgage Underwriting**
- **Market/Feasibility Studies**

Sammartino & Stout, Inc. subscribes to the Code of Ethics and Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) as promulgated by the Appraisal Institute, assuring our clients of the highest standards in valuation and consulting services.

**3111 State St., Erie, PA 16508 814-456-2900, Fax (814) 456-8070**

**E-mail:**

Raymond J. Sammartino, MAI, SRA [rsam@sas-rea.com](mailto:rsam@sas-rea.com)

Robert G. Stout, Jr., MAI [rstout@sas-rea.com](mailto:rstout@sas-rea.com)

**Visit our website: [www.sas-rea.com](http://www.sas-rea.com)**



## MALONEY, REED, SCARPITTI & COMPANY, LLP

Certified Public Accountants and Business Advisors

[www.mrs-co.com](http://www.mrs-co.com)

### Forensic Accounting Specialists

Expertise in fraud detection, prevention and investigation

Certified Fraud Examiner

**Joseph P. Maloney, CPA, CFE**

3703 West 26<sup>th</sup> St.  
Erie, PA 16506  
814/833-8545

113 Meadville St.  
Edinboro, PA 16412  
814/734-3787

Joseph P. Maloney, CPA, CFE • Michael J. Reed, CPA • James R. Scarpitti, CPA • Rick L. Clayton, CPA

*Confidential inquiries by phone or email to [mrsinfo@mrs-co.com](mailto:mrsinfo@mrs-co.com).*

# ROCCO'S

## AUCTIONS & APPRAISALS

- » Real Estate
- » Antiques
- » Estates
- » Commercial
- » Industrial
- » Certified Appraisals
- » 26 Years Experience
- » Licensed and Bonded



**Tim Rocco, CAI, AARE**

**Auctioneer Certified Appraiser**

**Office: 814/476-1217**

**Cell: 814/449-3162**

**5041 East Avenue  
McKean, PA 16426**

Check our auction calendar at **[www.roccoauctions.com](http://www.roccoauctions.com)**.





RVM's Director of Forensics, Greg Cancilla, was recently named Best Individual Expert Witness in Technology for Litigation Support by the *New York Law Journal* Reader Rankings Survey. Greg has performed countless digital forensic investigations and has been called to offer expert testimonies in numerous cases, one of which rendered the largest single plaintiff verdict in the State of Ohio's history - *Ronald Luri v. Republic Services, Inc., et al.*



rvminc.com 800.525.7915  
New York • Chicago • Cleveland



# Outstanding Referral and Co-Counsel Opportunities



Your Go-To  
Law Firm For  
Referrals



Local attorneys have long referred all types of injury, DUI, and criminal cases to The Travis Law Firm. We provide compassionate and dedicated representation in:

Motorcycle Accidents	Nursing Home Neglect
Car Accidents	Wrongful Death
Workers' Compensation	Medical Malpractice

Our firm's DUI and criminal defense practice gives local attorneys a trusted team to refer sensitive DUI and criminal matters to.



## Super Lawyers

Who's Who in American Law



The Best Lawyers  
in America  
Consumers' Guide

Please contact us to discuss referral fee arrangements in injury cases.

**ERIE OFFICE**  
**455-3839**

**EDINBORO OFFICE**  
**734-6076**

**WARREN OFFICE**  
**723-6120**

AUDIT LIST  
NOTICE BY  
PATRICK L. FETZNER

Clerk of Records,  
Register of Wills and Ex-Officio Clerk of  
the Orphans' Court Division, of the  
Court of Common Pleas of Erie County, Pennsylvania

The following Executors, Administrators, Guardians and Trustees have filed their Accounts in the Office of the Clerk of Records, Register of Wills and Orphans' Court Division and the same will be presented to the Orphans' Court of Erie County at the Court House, City of Erie, on **Monday, September 29, 2014** and confirmed Nisi.

**October 23, 2014** is the last day on which Objections may be filed to any of these accounts.

Accounts in proper form and to which no Objections are filed will be audited and confirmed absolutely. A time will be fixed for auditing and taking of testimony where necessary in all other accounts.

<u>2014</u>	<u>ESTATE</u>	<u>ACCOUNTANT</u>	<u>ATTORNEY</u>
217.	Mary Louise Kennedy, a/k/a Mary Lue Kennedy, a/k/a Mary Lou Kennedy .....	Samuel Fargiorgio II, Administrator .....	Pro Se
218.	Donna E. Davis .....	Susan P. Davis, Executrix .....	Thomas J. Minarcik, Esquire
219.	Gladys L. Hopwood .....	Lisa J. Nelson and Penny S. Valvo Co-Executors .....	Gary H. Nash, Esquire
220.	Raymond W. Swift a/k/a Raymond Swift .....	Dennis L. Swift, Administrator .....	David R. Devine, Esquire

PATRICK L. FETZNER  
Clerk of Records  
Register of Wills &  
Orphans' Court Division

Sept. 19, 26

**ESTATE NOTICES**

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

**FIRST PUBLICATION**

**BABCOCK, MARJORIE E.,  
deceased**

Late of Amity Township, Erie County, Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Richard Oscar Boyd, 1731 Old Wattsburg Road, Waterford, Pennsylvania 16441  
*Attorney:* John R. Falcone, Esq., 4845 West Lake Rd., Suite 100, Erie, PA 16505

**BEARDSLEY, RICHARD J.,  
deceased**

Late of North East Boro, County of Erie, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Jeffrey S. Beardsley, c/o Elliot J. Segel, Esquire, Segel & Solymosi, 818 State Street, Erie, PA 16501  
*Attorney:* Elliot J. Segel, Esquire, Segel & Solymosi, 818 State Street, Erie, PA 16501

**DAILY, CLIFFORD O.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Corry, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Domonic D. Daily, c/o 210 West Sixth Street, Erie, PA 16507  
*Attorney:* Joseph T. Messina, Esquire, 210 West Sixth Street, Erie, PA 16507

**DEAN, JOHN A.,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of Harborcreek, Erie County, PA  
*Executrix:* Virginia Dean Brocki, 4406 Kahn Drive, Erie, PA 16509  
*Attorney:* Christine Hall McClure, Esquire, Knox McLaughlin Gornall & Sennett, P.C., 120 West Tenth Street, Erie, PA 16501

**FINK, PATRICIA A.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Mary Pat MacMurtrie, PO Box 65, Erie, PA 16512  
*Attorney:* Thomas J. Buseck, Esquire, The McDonald Group, L.L.P., 456 West Sixth Street, Erie, PA 16507-1216

**GUAGLIARDI, CHARLES E.,  
deceased**

Late of Millcreek Township, Erie County, Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Charles F. Guagliardi, 121 Glencoe Road, Erie, PA 16509  
*Attorney:* Thomas C. Hoffman, II, Esq., Knox McLaughlin Gornall & Sennett, P.C., 120 West Tenth Street, Erie, PA 16501

**HESLING, MARGARET E.,  
deceased**

Late of North East Borough, Erie County, North East, Pennsylvania  
*Administrator:* Stewart B. Garnow, c/o 33 East Main Street, North East, Pennsylvania 16428  
*Attorney:* Edward Orton, Esq., Orton & Jeffery, P.C., 33 East Main Street, North East, Pennsylvania 16428

**HUDAK, LOUISE M.,  
deceased**

Late of Millcreek Township, Erie County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Administrator:* Marjorie A. Meyer  
*Attorney:* John P. Iurlano, Esq., 125 Hidden Valley Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15237

**HUTCHISON, CLIFFORD M.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Corry, Erie County, Pennsylvania  
*Co-Administrators:* Clifford T. Hutchison and Cheryl A. Foulk, 311 Walnut Street, Meadville, PA 16335  
*Attorney:* Brian J. Lindsay, Esquire, 311 Walnut Street, Meadville, PA 16335

**JOHN, RICHARD A.,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of North East, County of Erie, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Co-Executors:* Cathryn J. Volanakis & Caren J. Konys, c/o Quinn, Buseck, Leemhuis, Toohey & Kroto, Inc., 2222 West Grandview Blvd., Erie, PA 16506-4508  
*Attorney:* Valerie H. Kuntz, Esq., Quinn, Buseck, Leemhuis, Toohey & Kroto, Inc., 2222 West Grandview Blvd., Erie, PA 16506-4508

**MAYER, ELSIE F.,  
deceased**

Late of the Borough of Wesleyville, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executrix:* Mary L. Mayer, c/o Stephen A. Tetuan, Esq., Suite 300, 300 State Street, Erie, PA 16507  
*Attorneys:* Marsh, Spaeder, Baur, Spaeder & Schaaf, LLP, Suite 300, 300 State Street, Erie, PA 16507

**NIETUPSKI, WANDA M.,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of Greenfield  
*Co-Executors:* Nancy L. Munson and Thomas E. Nietupski  
*Attorney:* Joseph M. Walsh, III, Esq., Shapira, Hutzelman, Berlin, Ely, Smith and Walsh, 305 West 6th Street, Erie, PA 16507



**QUICK, CATHERINE M.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Administratrix:* Edward W. Quick, c/o 504 State Street, 3rd Floor, Erie, PA 16501

*Attorney:* Michael J. Nies, Esquire, 504 State Street, 3rd Floor, Erie, PA 16501

**VARNER, NORMA JEAN, a/k/a  
NORMA J. VARNER, a/k/a  
NORMA VARNER,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Administrator:* William C. Brown, Jr., c/o Peter W. Bailey, Esquire, 336 East Sixth Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16507

*Attorney:* Peter W. Bailey, Esquire, 336 East Sixth Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16507

**SECOND PUBLICATION**

**BILETNIKOFF, PETER,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Mark Biletnikoff

*Attorney:* Thomas J. Minarcik, Esquire, Elderkin Law Firm, 150 East 8th Street, Erie, PA 16501

**CHIARELLI, ELLEN H.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Rodney Chiarelli, 707 Shenley Drive, Erie, PA 16505

*Attorney:* Kevin W. Barron, Esquire, 821 State Street, Erie, PA 16501

**DINICOLA, VINCENT A.,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of Millcreek, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Joseph P. DiNicola, c/o Zanita Zacks-Gabriel, Esq., 402 West 6th Street, Erie, PA 16507

*Attorney:* Zanita Zacks-Gabriel, Esq., 402 West 6th Street, Erie, PA 16507

**LAMARY, PAMELA J.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executrix:* Tammy M. Lamary-Toman, c/o 504 State Street, Suite 300, Erie, PA 16501

*Attorney:* Alan Natalie, Esquire, 504 State Street, Suite 300, Erie, PA 16501

**LEONE, ANTHONY P.,  
deceased**

Late of the Erie City, Erie County, Pennsylvania

*Executors:* Fiore Leone, 1364 West 32nd Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16508 and Danny Leone, 1820 Poplar Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16502

*Attorney:* John R. Falcone, Esq., 3820 Liberty Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16509

**MALLORY, RUTH M.,  
deceased**

Late of Harborcreek Township, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Thomas A. Mallory

*Attorney:* Thomas J. Minarcik, Esquire, Elderkin Law Firm, 150 East 8th Street, Erie, PA 16501

**PALKOVIC, JOHN P., a/k/a  
JOHN PALKOVIC,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, Erie County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* John Patrick Palkovic, c/o Jeffrey D. Scibetta, Esquire, 120 West Tenth Street, Erie, PA 16501

*Attorney:* Jeffrey D. Scibetta, Esquire, Knox McLaughlin Gornall & Sennett, P.C., 120 West Tenth Street, Erie, PA 16501

**PINCKNEY, WILLIAM H.,  
deceased**

Late of Girard, Springfield Township, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Wendell S. Pinckney, c/o Brenc Law, 9630 Moses Road, Springboro, PA 16435

*Attorney:* Andrew S. Brenc, Esq., 9630 Moses Road, Springboro, PA 16435

**PLATZ, DONNA M.,  
deceased**

Late of Franklin Township, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Administrator:* Patrick O. Platz, c/o Norman A. Stark, Esq., Suite 300, 300 State Street, Erie, PA 16507

*Attorneys:* Marsh, Spaeder, Baur, Spaeder & Schaaf, LLP, Suite 300, 300 State Street, Erie, PA 16507

**REICHARD, MARY JANE,  
a/k/a MARY J. REICHARD,  
deceased**

Late of the Borough of Lake City, County of Erie, State of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Charles E. Reichard, 5260 Northern Drive, Fairview, PA 16415

*Attorney:* James R. Steadman, Esq., 24 Main St. E., PO Box 87, Girard, PA 16417

**SCROFANO, ANNA,  
deceased**

Late of Millcreek Township, County of Erie, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

*Executor:* Gaetana Taylor, 2568 N. Tracy Drive, Erie, PA 16505

*Attorney:* Charles N. Lafferty, Esq., 365 Main Street, PO Box 499, Conneaut, Ohio 44030

**SHEWAN, PATRICIA ANN,  
a/k/a PATRICIA A. SHEWAN,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of Millcreek, Erie County, Pennsylvania

*Co-Executrices:* Michelle L. Hermsdorf and Tammie L. Kimmy, c/o 731 French Street, Erie, PA 16501

*Attorney:* M. Kathryn Karn, Esquire, 731 French Street, Erie, PA 16501



**WEBER, ELIZABETH R.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* John F. Weber, III  
*Attorney:* Thomas J. Minarcik, Esquire, Elderkin Law Firm, 150 East 8th Street, Erie, PA 16501

**WILLIAMS, DOLORES M.,  
a/k/a DOLORES WILLIAMS,  
a/k/a DOLORES M. THOMPSON,  
a/k/a DOLORES THOMPSON,  
deceased**

Late of Harborcreek Township, County of Erie and State of Pennsylvania  
*Administrator:* Barbara S. Wright, 5034 Ebersole Drive, Erie, PA 16511  
*Attorney:* Ronald J. Susmarski, Esq., 4030 West Lake Road, Erie, PA 16505

**WILLIAMS, RUSSELL T.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executrix:* Suzanne E. Williams  
*Attorney:* David J. Rhodes, Esquire, Elderkin Law Firm, 150 East 8th Street, Erie, PA 16501

**THIRD PUBLICATION**

**BARR, MARGARET J.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Frank L. Kroto, Jr., c/o Quinn, Buseck, Leemhuis, Toohey & Kroto, Inc., 2222 West Grandview Blvd., Erie, PA 16506  
*Attorney:* Frank L. Kroto, Jr., Esq., Quinn, Buseck, Leemhuis, Toohey & Kroto, Inc., 2222 West Grandview Blvd., Erie, PA 16506

**BAUMANN, ROBERT C.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie  
*Executrix:* Mary Jo Baumann, c/o 246 West 10th Street, Erie, PA 16501  
*Attorney:* Evan E. Adair, Esq., 246 West 10th Street, Erie, PA 16501

**BRIODY, LILLIAN E., a/k/a  
LILY ANNA BRIODY,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Co-Administrator:* Rita L. Briody, c/o 3820 Liberty Street, Erie, PA 16509  
*Attorney:* W. Atchley Holmes, Esquire, 3820 Liberty Street, Erie, PA 16509  
*Co-Administrator:* Richard J. Briody, c/o 605 Kibler Drive, Girard, PA 16417  
*Attorney:* None

**ERICH, JOSHUA D.,  
deceased**

*Administrator:* David A. Erich, 351 South Ridge Road, St. Marys, PA 15857  
*Attorneys:* Meyer & Wagner, 115 Lafayette Street, St. Marys, PA 15857

**LONG, STEPHEN C., JR.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Albion  
*Executor:* Stephen C. Long, Sr., 2101 Raspberry Street, Erie, PA 16502  
*Attorney:* Daniel P. Mamen, Esq., Sebald & Hackwelder, 2525 West 26th Street, Erie, PA 16506

**PLOSS, HANNAH J., a/k/a  
HANNAH JANE PLOSS, a/k/a  
HANNAH PLOSS,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of Millcreek, County of Erie, State of Pennsylvania  
*Executrix:* Frances C. Lapping, 3021 Tamarack Drive, Erie, PA 16506  
*Attorney:* Grant M. Yochim, Esq., 24 Main St. E., PO Box 87, Girard, PA 16417

**PRITTIE, COLLEEN E.,  
deceased**

Late of the Township of Millcreek, Erie County  
*Executrix:* Colleen E. Prittie  
*Attorney:* Stanley G. Berlin, Esquire, Shapira, Hutzelman, Berlin, Ely, Smith and Walsh, 305 West 6th Street, Erie, PA 16507

**SELLARO, SALVATORE R.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, Erie County, Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* BNY Mellon, 500 Grant Street, Suite 2740, Pittsburgh, PA 15258  
*Attorney:* Michael A. Agresti, Esq., Agresti Law Firm, 4934 Peach Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16509

**TEODORSKI, VIVIAN J.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executrix:* Elaine M. Pitzer  
*Attorney:* Tibor R. Solymosi, Esquire, Segel & Solymosi, 818 State Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16501

**VESHECCO, MICHAEL J.,  
deceased**

Late of the City of Erie, County of Erie and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Executor:* Nathan Veshecco, 440 Polecat Road, Yellow Springs, OH 45387  
*Attorney:* Paul J. Susko, Esquire, The Conrad - F.A. Brevillier House, 502 Parade Street, Erie, PA 16507

**WALKER, RONALD A., a/k/a  
RONALD ARRON WALKER,  
deceased**

Late of North East Township, Erie County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
*Administratrix:* Noretta J. Otto, c/o Leigh Ann Orton, Esq., 11 Park Street, North East, PA 16428  
*Attorney:* Leigh Ann Orton, Esq., Knox McLaughlin Gornall & Sennett, P.C., 11 Park Street, North East, PA 16428

## CHANGES IN CONTACT INFORMATION OF ECBA MEMBERS

JOHN R. FALCONE ----- (814) 838-7777  
West Lake Professional Building  
4845 West Lake Raod  
Erie, PA 16505 ----- *jrfalcone@adelphia.net*

MICHAEL RIORDAN ----- (412) 227-2500  
Blumling & Gusky  
1200 Koppers Building  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219 ----- *mriordan@bglaw-llp.com*

SARA L. CARLSON ----- (910) 603-8837  
222 Colony Drive  
Charlottesville, VA 22903 ----- *sara.carlson00@gmail.com*

The Erie County Bar Foundation and its Justice Samuel J. Roberts Scholarship Fund continue to be in need of contributions to support this scholarship program.

Have you made your tax deductible contribution yet?

If not, you can find information about the scholarship and make an online contribution at [www.eriebar.com](http://www.eriebar.com) or contact the ECBF at 459-3111.

INTERESTED IN JOINING THE ERIE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION?

GO TO OUR WEBSITE AT [WWW.ERIEBAR.COM](http://WWW.ERIEBAR.COM) AND COMPLETE THE ONLINE APPLICATION OR CALL (814) 459-3111 AND AN APPLICATION WILL BE MAILED TO YOU

ADDRESS CHANGE?

PLEASE CONTACT THE LEGAL JOURNAL OFFICE AT (814) 459-3111  
OR [ADMIN@ERIEBAR.COM](mailto:ADMIN@ERIEBAR.COM). THANK YOU.

## LOOKING FOR A LEGAL AD PUBLISHED IN ONE OF PENNSYLVANIA'S LEGAL JOURNALS?



► Look for this logo on the Erie County Bar Association website as well as Bar Association and Legal Journal websites across the state.

► It will take you to THE website for locating legal ads published in counties throughout Pennsylvania, a service of the Conference of County Legal Journals.

LOGIN DIRECTLY AT [WWW.PALEGALADS.ORG](http://WWW.PALEGALADS.ORG). IT'S EASY. IT'S FREE.

*Quality...Experience...Results...  
It's what your clients deserve.*

*Medical Malpractice • Auto Accidents • Personal Injury*



**GISMONDI**  
& ASSOCIATES

412-281-2200 • [www.gislaw.com](http://www.gislaw.com) • 700 Grant Bldg., 310 Grant St., Pgh., PA 15219