IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	*	BEFORE JOY L. PHILLIPS,
OF ELLA I. ELWAYS,	*	AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
CLAIMANT,	*	OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	*	OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*	OAH NO.: DLR-HIC-02-12-22601
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*	MHIC NO.: 10 (90) 199
OMISSIONS OF JOHNNY NICHOLS,	*	
T/A JOHNNY NICHOLS, Reg. # 45256,	*	
AGGERGATE PAVING,1	*	
RESPONDENT	*	

RECOMMENDED DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
ISSUES
SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE
FINDINGS OF FACT
DISCUSSION
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
RECOMMENDED ORDER

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On May 6, 2010, Ella I. Elways, (Claimant), filed a claim with the Maryland Home Improvement Commission (MHIC) Guaranty Fund (Fund) for reimbursement of \$11,112.00 in

¹ The Fund's licensing information refers to the Respondent's trade name as Aggergate Paving. (Fund Ex. 3.) I suspect it should read Aggregate Paving. The Respondent does not use that name on his Contract, however. (Fund Ex. 6.) Rather, the Contract merely uses the company name "Johnny Nichols," with a second line reading "Paving and Seal Coating." The Contract does include the Respondent's registration number of 45256. The Hearing Order refers to the Respondent's trade name as simply "Johnny Nichols" (Fund Ex. 2) and throughout the scheduling documents, the MHIC refers to the Respondent's trade name as "Johnny Nichols." In the caption of this decision, I have used the Respondent's trade name just as printed in Fund Ex. 3 as well as his name and registration number, for clarity.

and the second of the second o

and the si

istodij namasviji Vistoram silova

化氯化物 医抗性衰竭

g sakit sa ay yee

reconstruction of the second section of the section of the second section of the second section of the second section of the section of the second section of the s

State of the property of the prop

The state of the s

actual losses she allegedly suffered as a result of a home improvement contract with Johnny Nichols t/a Johnny Nichols, Reg. # 45256, Aggergate Paving (Respondent).

I held a hearing on November 8, 2012, at the Office of Administrative Hearings, 11101 Gilroy Road, Hunt Valley, MD, 21031. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-312, 8-407 (2010 & Supp. 2012). Chris King, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (Department), represented the Fund. The Claimant and Respondent represented themselves.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the procedural regulations of the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, and the Rules of Procedure of the Office of Administrative Hearings govern procedure in this case. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2009 & Supp. 2012); Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 09.01.03, 09.08.02 and 28.02.01.

ISSUES

Did the Claimant sustain an actual loss as a result of the Respondent's acts or omissions, and if so, what amount is the Claimant entitled to recover from the Fund?

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

I admitted the following exhibits on the Claimant's behalf:

- Clmt Ex. 1 Baltimore County Deck Construction Guidelines
 - Ex. 2 Packet of photographs, marked 2a-k
 - Ex. 3 Packet of photographs, marked 3a-o
 - Ex. 4 Packet of large photographs, marked 4a-l
 - Ex. 5 Estimate for removal and replacement of deck, by Jeffery Wall, Home
 - Depot Home Services, dated February 23, 2011 and November 8, 2012
 - Ex. 6 Packet of receipts
 - Ex. 7 Copies of checks written to Johnny Nichols

The production of the producti

Continue to the control of the contr

174.12.83

Lord Complies Suffrage of Mark (Complied Complied Superior Superio

I admitted the following exhibits on the Fund's behalf:

- Fund Ex. 1 Notice of Hearing, dated August 13, 2012
 - Ex. 2 Hearing Order, dated May 17, 2012
 - Ex. 3 Computer generated printout of license information for the Respondent
 - Ex. 4 Home Improvement Claim Form, dated May 6, 2010
 - Ex. 5 Letter to Respondent from the HIC, dated May 14, 2010
 - Ex. 6 Contract between Johnny Nichols, grandson of the Respondent, and the Claimant, dated March 20, 2009

The Respondent offered no documents to be admitted into evidence.

Testimony

The Claimant testified on her own behalf and presented the testimony of William Elways, her husband, and Jonathan Nichols, the Respondent's grandson.

The Respondent testified on his own behalf and presented no additional testimony.

The Fund presented no testimony.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I find the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

- 1. At all times relevant to the subject of this hearing, the Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor under MHIC license number # 45256. (Fund Ex. 3.)
- 2. The Respondent's grandson, Jonathan Nichols (Nichols), worked for his grandfather and was learning the family business.
- Prior to March 2009, the Respondent resealed the Claimant's driveway pursuant to a contract that is not a part of this case.
- 4. After finishing the driveway work, Nichols spoke with the Claimant regarding proposed work she desired to have done to her deck. Initially, the Claimant refused Nichols' solicitation to do the deck work.
- 5. Several days later, the Claimant and Nichols spoke again about the deck. The Claimant

Make all aid at it starte to refer our best BOD At was man book or much over 1985 to be to be The Flore and Adolesies force otana adalah satu Parabagai pada da marapa sagaran da arabagai i në vetik për në aphele celefo homenete, i mga ma ma më 19 i di yukum ka 191a sebir 1944 sanar keriji ili maji 1992 ana ro an na ceoleim privi vondor, pa polei tempoji tili e o fili MOST of Figure 2 to 2000 and the P telepre a racoccinata on of assessment of leading the free cases of the respondent i de se arcifron Harris a recentar en el crefe el anciente. California de la compansión de la compan place and the compact lighted compatible configuration to the configuration And which calls have a place of the 医动物性结合 医心管性 re<mark>passaro 17</mark>4 in la carrela repagar y a quafi gor vejidi ad li ede i tika alak kelar baran sasi dan kabilan digapat belik dalah germatan di ilah in ili 1<mark>150 d</mark>emokratika kelebahan 140 dinapadan melalahan balan dila a din a distributa di Amerikana ngaharakan mga a berbitan 1990. naketika terresi sarunitra intak elate since the period of the elate in the background until 1969. It is to enable to be BORNIES GLANDINGER BUILD. man in all the steers are the state of the s carrier of the industrial recording to be personal at the recipions. He will Cook Cobied the reaction in Element of the control of the contro

Mean Royall or

wit bits another

ezerbeid anadleye

when it is

school Busmanii s

laga to bil di dega

i a ni dimenir

i che e en salbre

reachiei Toid I

Televisia be

- had received a "spec" sheet from another contractor whom the Claimant had consulted about the job. The Claimant agreed to let Nichols have the job and gave him the spec sheet.
- 6. On March 20, 2009, the Claimant and Nichols entered into a contract (the Contract) for the construction on the Claimant's property of a two-level deck to replace an old deck.

 The upper deck was to be sized 10' x 14' and built 9'5" above the ground. Stairs were to lead to the lower deck, to be sized 8' x 18'. The Contract called for the use of treated wood. Removal of the old deck was included in the parties' agreement concerning the work but was not specified in the Contract. (Fund Ex. 6.)
- 7. The Contract was drawn up on the Respondent's pre-printed contract form.
- 8. The Respondent was not involved in any of the discussions regarding construction of the Claimant's deck. He drove past the house one time to look at the deck from his car, but he never went onto the Claimant's property.
- 9. Although Nichols is not a licensed salesperson and neither he nor the Respondent has experience building decks, the Respondent permitted Nichols to enter into the Contract on behalf of the Respondent.
- 10. The original agreed upon Contract price was \$6,500.00. (Fund Ex. 6.) The Contract price was later increased to \$6,800.00 and the Claimant paid this amount in full. (Clmt Ex. 7.)
- 11. Nichols, who was not an experienced deck builder, hired two experienced deck builders to build the deck. Nichols purchased the materials for the job from Home Depot, but he was not at the job site throughout the deck construction.
- 12. Although Nichols knew a permit was required, he failed to obtain a permit for the deck.

botios คอดเมเท The first divisarion is occident and a model by it is between got tener di harr on inglasi je pomasalbi je tokoh posano prograživaciji na silojih pada. tion is the medical of stable to remain soft our 1980s, 25 given it will ani dalamaO w And States Bushasi ke kalinti di dia manangi tahungai dia tri an melantimpi da biti. refresser 1996 Misses and 100 or a consequence to be seen will arthur afetke A septimize Figure to the Graff Colly Pitches of Control cowed the or be t sugraphic and refinited plants. In order to part day, exist there is and will appear a common through the control of the growing to their and any to the first contact of a different contact and a second contact of the altin i debis, u mar i i mellesam sette si i televiam et i eleviam et a seconda a seconda este se de seconda este se de la comp the expension and the subsequences of the contract of the expension of garagan in Tropial State State Agency (1997) and a survey a en prima trada bio i comangapti i i akendafa an aki kilajibe dina e a Percentage of the control of the percentage of the control of the Berter Grand in e diglet barbert and a the last of The same witter at any year parties for each form transport its aliment in the first til i Maedlek di of agriculture. A control of the death of th and the second of the second o and the entire of the control of the Alle Brother s em eg il régul constant que ma cològique o gazant del

- 13. The Claimant mentioned to Nichols several times that she wanted the deck to be built on6" x 6" posts, but Nichols used 4" x 4" posts to support the deck.
- 14. The Claimant complained to Nichols about various aspects of the deck as it was being built. She did not like the large spaces that were left between steps and railings, as they created a dangerous situation for children. She believed the lag bolts were too far apart. She did not approve of nails being used instead of screws. She told Nichols that overall, she felt the deck was unstable. Nichols addressed some of her complaints, but not to the Claimant's satisfaction.
- 15. Within a matter of months after the deck was completed, the Claimant called Nichols to complain that the wood was splintering and cracking, that it was pulling away from joints, that it was discoloring and that it was warping.
- 16. Nichols inspected the deck and confirmed her complaints. He sent two sub-contractors to her home to offer to repair the deck, but the Claimant declined the offer, having lost her confidence in Nichols. He also suggested she contact Home Depot to complain about the quality of the wood.²
- 17. The Claimant arranged for Home Depot representatives (Reps) to inspect the deck and they noted additional problems with the construction, namely, that there was no flashing used. The Reps agreed with the Claimant that the quality of some of the wood was poor and that the rail and stair spacing was not up to code. The Reps gave the Claimant an estimate for replacing the deck and, in that estimate, agreed to a free upgrade to composite materials rather than wood. (Clmt Ex. 5.)

² The parties agreed that the wood used for a gate separating the deck from the pool was purchased at a different store than Home Depot and there was no complaint regarding that wood.

i diagnose de maio de la ligación escalados e los adimentos ambientos el la ligación de la ligac

and the first section of the section

the contract of the contract o

And the state of the second control of the s

A first of the following particles and the first subgroups σ

Charter of the different

The state of the s

ser thing of or sho

ा श्रीपुर्वा है भी। विभोगी जाता

To the line in the line of the control of the line of

tas Aris vairi Las Aris vairi Las Aris de Aris vairi Las Aris de Aris de Aris vairi

en grafia de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición de la composición de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela composición dela composición de la composición de la

The second of th

- 18. Although Nichols told the Claimant he would return in the spring to seal the deck wood, he never returned to the Claimant's home. The Claimant sealed it herself in the summer of 2012.
- 19. The Claimant received an estimate from Jeffrey Wall, Program Manager of the Home Depot Home Services, to remove the existing decks and replace them, using composite material. The first estimate, from February 23, 2011, was for \$11,112.00, plus \$250.00 for the construction permit. The Claimant did not accept this estimate or have the work done. The price increased on November 8, 2012, to \$12,554.00. Composite material is included in that price at no extra charge, an acknowledgement from Home Depot that the wood that was used by Nichols was of poor quality.

DISCUSSION

Pursuant to sections 8-405(a) and 8-407(e)(1) of the Maryland Annotated Code's Business Regulation Article, to recover compensation from the Fund, the Claimant must prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she incurred an actual loss, which resulted from a licensed contractor's acts or omissions. *See also* COMAR 09.08.03.03B(2). Actual loss "means the costs of restoration, repair, replacement, or completion that arise from an unworkmanlike, inadequate, or incomplete home improvement." Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-401 (2010). For the following reasons, I conclude that the Claimant has met this burden by proving that the Respondent failed to complete a workmanlike job and that the Claimant incurred an actual loss, entitling her to an award of \$6,800.00 from the Fund.

The Respondent was a licensed home improvement contractor at the time he allowed his grandson, Nichols, to enter into the contract with the Claimant. The parties knew Nichols had no experience building decks, but the Claimant agreed to let Nichols build the deck and the

ne legens i en amerika eta en en en la la alabari dad al legenselv. Al j legenselve eta elektronelli espesione l'amprimi terte di amprimi de successo. Le

The property of the second state of the second seco

REMEMBER 1

And the second of the second o

ta rotta. Los de l'ambregas area bolancal que vancan auscus del l'esta par est l'esta par l'esta de l'esta

्रोक्षेत्र स्टू त्रेप्रकार करी। वक्तापार दशक्रती (वि.री

Sanski san ko Odeograpio ordi Odeograpio ordi Storw satt sviga Storw satt sviga Storw satt sugati or

3 3 m. 3 l.

, or som provide these

्रहेलाको छ।

rangailead legi.

Self (SEC) 194

erionis Principalis

ole di kuma sai b

ार से अमृतिस्तर केरा क -

eir handthenin og blir gegin et a Respondent allowed Nichols to act on behalf of his company. The Respondent purportedly allowed Nichols to build the deck in order to teach him the family business.

Nichols, on behalf of the Respondent, performed unworkmanlike home improvement by building a deck that did not meet code standards and for which no permit was obtained. Nichols admitted during his testimony that he was not an experienced deck builder and that he did not know the relevant building code provisions for Baltimore County. He conceded that he knew a permit was required and knew that if a permit had been applied for, inspections would have been done by the county, but he stated that he did not realize the county could require a homeowner to remove a deck that did not meet the county building code. In deciding not to seek a building permit, he asserted that he simply was trying to save the Claimant money.

Nichols testified that he chose the size of the posts by looking at neighbors' decks, finding their posts to be 4" x 4". The Claimant testified that the neighbors' posts are 6" x 6" and that she asked Nichols to use 6" x 6" posts, but that he told her they were not available at Home Depot. The county code calls for 6" x 6" posts for decks over 8' 6" high. (Clmt Ex. 1). The upper deck was therefore not built within code guidelines, as it is 9'5" high. Regardless of how neighbors' decks are constructed, Nichols had an obligation to know the code provisions and to build accordingly. There was some testimony regarding Home Depot not having 6" x 6" posts available when Nichols tried to purchase them, but this is irrelevant to my decision that the posts used did not meet county building code requirements.

After the Claimant complained to Nichols about the quality of the deck, Nichols made some attempts to resolve the problems, namely, he added some rails and some stabilizing boards. These efforts were insufficient to satisfy the Claimant and also failed to bring the deck up to code. At an unknown later date, Nichols came to the home to look at the splintering, warping

- Hornestare

zá Longovougana. dur die desainet Park Lock and armeni (and a little nord aread larger. (*155 action) and water and a second

estrate take See Tells Tellsach . projeta: glejske Ex. to file प्रभृतिस् राज्यस्य ed filme and between State "6 & "Det ar in the Mary

to at Autor Arrend grasticisa er an Moch u grafight - Jacks

現れ第二日 - compació katasadan residencia (takana katasa kata) omiar di plante i chi mishimasa ni redigio de con e cali, ognati e sia dell'Albaia de ndiferas lewen brend be unbergeret au tertelolae in oat to make the larger of the manufacture of the control of the contro definition of the acceptance of the paragraph paragraphs of the paragraphs of the rm rate of the self than a plainty and consider thought a considered in the work of a set of the provided that is the form of had arranged with a fig. . The correction is a second of Talagor vibration and relations constrained and disciplination are in the constraint vibration or gather local coroning the first cannot be thought on along the coroning TERM IN SOMETHING OF THE BOOK OF THE SERVE THESE to be a first and a first of the manufacture of the country of

evolter i la Mattha fibrit hacea ha eria ate y Magda ta baya at rediar. approximated the state of the s and the latest contract and several the series of the second contract of the second alikativia<mark>s si</mark> taki turatiya kato ta daga rijga cara word in the confidence become a feet a second consistence. a a Morto fall regional in subtrective from the contract of th The raid provinces of the first program and the fall and a mantha bar The state of applications are also be a likely see

The same of the sa sa en men de como de comença de la comen (4) In an appropriate of the first of the second of the The transport of the property of the property

wood. He was surprised at what he saw and could not offer an explanation to the Claimant, except to proffer that some of the wood must have been bad. He offered to have his assistants repair it. Two men showed up at the Claimant's door one day, unannounced, and offered to repair the deck. The Claimant turned them away, as she did not know who they were and, by that point, she had understandably lost confidence in Nichols' workmanship.

I found both the Claimant and Nichols to be credible and sincere in their testimony. Indeed, their testimony did not differ in many respects. Nichols conceded that the deck was not up to code and that it fell outside the "standard practices" language contained in the preprinted information in the Contract. He agreed that he used 4" x 4" posts, which were too small for the higher of the two decks. He disagreed about the number of boards that had warped or split, but he conceded that there were at least ten and that, as per the language in the Contract, he was responsible for the quality of the wood used. Some of the Claimant's other allegations were not specifically addressed in Nichols' testimony.

The Respondent did not deny any of the Claimant's complaints. He simply testified that he was helping Nichols, his grandson, learn the family business and that he had nothing to do with the Claimant's job. I am concerned that a licensed contractor would permit an inexperienced employee to enter into a contract for a job that is outside of the company's expertise, solely for the purpose of teaching him the family business. Apparently, Nichols was given no supervision or advice on this project and, as a result, he built a deck that did not comply with the local building code. The deck is substandard because of the wood used and the poor workmanship of Nichols' crew. As a result, the Claimant will have to remove and replace the deck.

Consequently, I conclude that the Claimant has met her burden of proof and is entitled to an award from the Fund. With respect to such awards, COMAR 09.08.03.03B(b(3)(c) provides as follows:

- B. Measure of Awards from Guaranty Fund.
- (3) Unless it determines that a particular claim requires a unique measurement, the Commission shall measure actual loss as follows:
- (c) If the contractor did work according to the contract and the claimant has solicited or is soliciting another contractor to complete the contract, the claimant's actual loss shall be the amounts the claimant has paid to or on behalf of the contractor under the original contract, added to any reasonable amounts the claimant has paid or will be required to pay another contractor to repair poor work done by the original contractor under the original contract and complete the original contract, less the original contract price. If the Commission determines that the original contract price is too unrealistically low or high to provide a proper basis for measuring actual loss, the Commission may adjust its measurement accordingly.

Using the above formula, I conclude that the Claimant is entitled to an award of \$6,800.00 from the Fund, calculating the Claimant's actual loss as follows:

\$ 6,800.00 Amount the Claimant paid the Licensee

+ 12,554.00 Amount required to repair/complete the Licensee's Work

19,354.00 Contract price

\$ 12,554.00 The Claimant's actual loss

Pursuant to section 8-405(e)(5) of the Maryland Annotated Code's Business Regulation Article, the amount of any award against the Fund may not exceed the amount paid by a claimant to the contractor against whom the claim is filed. Consequently, the Claimant is entitled to an award of \$6,800.00 from the Fund.

no colony la più servicul imparia la consent submandi di fini e consent di servici di se

Lighter attending to write the property of the parameter of

uringtoper of second or operatoric but has tally one obtaining the Boundaries with margin or allowing their and the second test second as

categoriti. The application of the appropriate and the content of the categorities of

and the state of the state of the first than the state of the state of

resta a seriente el margarificado y los establicas en la 1946 que

The second of th

<u>. 196</u> elle Vandadischer State (1966) Palentin von State (1967)

jan kindan sekit bili di kita in nga garatir in nga manana an

au Halling (2007) and stopping particular transport of the section of the contract of

of the state of th

orbidutisse om

erbryong (pilitig)

्रिकी विद्यास्तर सम्बद्धिक क

post serios fraction traction contac contac arrestal

Joanny

ond sift of the confi-

Statement of State

man et foldstation

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Discussion, I conclude that the Claimant has met her burden of proving that she incurred an actual loss as a result of the Respondent's unworkmanlike performance of home improvement work for the Claimant. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. §§ 8-405(a) and 8-407(e)(1) (2010). The compensable amount of that loss is \$6,800.00, which the Claimant should be awarded from the Fund. *Id.*; COMAR 09.08.03.03B(3)(c).

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I PROPOSE that the Maryland Home Improvement Commission ORDER as follows:

- 1. The Claimant is awarded \$6,800.00 from the Maryland Home Improvement Commission Guaranty Fund;
- 2. The Respondent is ineligible for a Maryland Home Improvement Commission license until the Respondent reimburses the Guaranty Fund for all monies disbursed under this Order, plus annual interest of at least ten percent. Md. Code Ann., Bus. Reg. § 8-411(a) (2010); and
- 3. The records and publications of the Maryland Home Improvement Commission reflect this decision.

 Signature on File

December 6, 2012

Date Decision Mailed

Joy L. Phillips

Administrative Law Judge

JLP/kc # 138914

equal of the sold run is also as the figures of the property of a policy of the contract of th

to application of the contract of the property of the local parties of the contract of the con

Appell in the figure of the state of the sta

objal podretano i je vijeje i regjerjali i od tver odsti i obje

Luce in Bully 18, fi

"and etsail.

ardo allí estilla

Mirstrall

ridi Lika da.

14 17 (M) (M) (14)

and displayed to

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM	*	BEFORE JOY L. PHILLIPS,
OF ELLA I. ELWAYS,	*	AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
CLAIMANT,	*	OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
AGAINST THE MARYLAND HOME	*	OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
IMPROVEMENT GUARANTY FUND	*	OAH NO.: DLR-HIC-02-12-22601
FOR THE ALLEGED ACTS OR	*	MHIC NO.: 10 (90) 199
OMISSIONS OF JOHNNY NICHOLS,	*	
T/A JOHNNY NICHOLS, Reg. # 45256,	*	
AGGERGATE PAVING,	*	
RESPONDENT * * * * * *	*	* * * * * *
مه مه مه مه مه		-11111-

FILE EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibits

I admitted the following exhibits on the Claimant's behalf:

- Clmt Ex. 1 Baltimore County Deck Construction Guidelines
 - Ex. 2 Packet of photographs, marked 2a-k
 - Ex. 3 Packet of photographs, marked 3a-o
 - Ex. 4 Packet of large photographs, marked 4a-l
 - Ex. 4 Tucket of large photographs, marked 4a-1
 - Ex. 5 Estimate for removal and replacement of deck, by Jeffery Wall, Home
 - Depot Home Services, dated February 23, 2011 and November 8, 2012
 - Ex. 6 Packet of receipts
 - Ex. 7 Copies of checks written to Johnny Nichols

I admitted the following exhibits on the Fund's behalf:

- Fund Ex. 1 Notice of Hearing, dated August 13, 2012
 - Ex. 2 Hearing Order, dated May 17, 2012
 - Ex. 3 Computer generated printout of license information for the Respondent
 - Ex. 4 Home Improvement Claim Form, dated May 6, 2010
 - Ex. 5 Letter to Respondent from the HIC, dated May 14, 2010
 - Ex. 6 Contract between Johnny Nichols, grandson of the Respondent, and the Claimant, dated March 20, 2009

and a feet of the second 人名英格兰 医高性性 強節 對於 的复数人名伊莱尔 **有**等人的。例如1000年代的第二人 CONTRACTOR SEAL OF LABOUR OF THE TO A CHIEF TO A COLOR OF THE CONTROL AS THE TRACE OF PURE AND FOR THE PROPERTY OF A CONTRACTOR OF THE PORTS. TERROR DE L'ANDRE DE L 并,让这点面,他可以是对对方的特殊,更 WALLAND ALLE filedad a travered disease of the round resolution pile is applied to egidesk of Contraction (1987) in the Process of the The Additional State of the Control of the State of the S odileva stokenja tiji nosti kudi Heritaga karantzika an itana araba ta tadaga (ilila ja o de la prodição dos comos como compansados de la de-วรณฑาษารัฐโรมส่วนและ เลรียนอาร์ คากุม เ od a sind apaget days. Fig. 1. The spring was the plant of the ាស់ ស្រុក សំណុង 🖒 នាស្ថានស្រុក 🤞 ប្រសិទ្ធិ is the graph of section by the first section of the section $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ ang Amajah labah dan dan dan Salah surprise the topy of well the more and the market of the conand the specific of the organization of superthe and can will approximate to the post of I Barkera (Historia Romania Kamarana Harana Harana Harana Kamarana Kamarana Kamarana Kamarana Kamarana Kamaran

માર્થ લામફું પ્રાપ્ત

1341

· * 4:15

e chuk nashri

The Respondent offered no documents to be admitted into evidence.

regulates of militarity in a contraction of the con