

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
IN AND FOR SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA  
CRIMINAL DIVISION

STATE OF FLORIDA  
Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO: 2006 CT 02109 SC

JACK IRISH, et. al.\*  
Defendants.

\*(Attached is a complete list of all cases subject to this Order.)

CRIMINAL LAW  
FILED FOR RECORD  
2007 AUG 20 PM 4:15  
KAREN E. RUSHING  
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT  
SARASOTA COUNTY, FL

SECOND AMENDED ORDER ON STATE'S AND DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS FOR  
REHEARING

**THIS MATTER** originally came to this court pursuant to the Defendant's Motion for Supplemental Discovery, more specifically, requesting production of the software (source code) for the Intoxilyzer 5000. This court entered an Order on May 4, 2006 compelling the State to provide the source code for the Intoxilyzer 5000. The court further ordered that upon the State's failure to provide said source code,<sup>1</sup> the State must first lay the proper traditional scientific predicate as to the admissibility of the Intoxilyzer results before the breath test results may be admitted into evidence. Assuming the State would be able to lay the proper scientific predicate, the breath test result would then be admitted, however, the presumptions of impairment contained in Florida Jury Instructions would not be given. Finally, this court certified two questions as matters of great public importance to the Second District Court of Appeals. They were as follows:

1. *UNDER THE "FULL INFORMATION" PROVISION OF FLORIDA STATUTE 316.1932, IS A DEFENDANT WHO HAS PROVIDED A BREATH SAMPLE WITH THE INTOXILYZER 5000 AND IS CHARGED WITH DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE, ENTITLED (UNDER PROPER CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS) TO EXAMINE THE "SOURCE CODE" FOR THAT SAME INTOXILYZER 5000?*

2. *IF YES, WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY IF THE STATE IS UNABLE OR UNWILLING TO PROVIDE THE SOURCE CODE?*

While this matter was on appeal with the Second District Court of Appeals, both parties filed Motions for Reconsideration asking that the appellate court temporarily relinquish

<sup>1</sup> The State had advised the Court at the evidentiary hearing that it would be unable to provide the source code if it was ordered to do so because they did have it their possession.

jurisdiction and allow the county courts the opportunity to reconsider its prior rulings. The appellate court temporarily relinquished jurisdiction and both parties' Motions for Reconsideration were heard together by Judge Denkin<sup>2</sup> and Judge Henderson<sup>3</sup> on July 16, 2007.

In its Motion, the State asks that this court reverse their earlier ruling, and deny the Defendant's request for disclosure of the source code for the Intoxilyzer 5000.

The Defendants, in their Motion, ask that this court affirm the earlier decision ordering production of the source code and/or reverse the portion of the order that rejected the Defendant's claim that the subpoena duces tecum without deposition served on the resident agent of CMI for the production of the Intoxilyzer 5000 source code was lawfully served.<sup>4</sup> Further, the Defendants opine that this court should enter an Order to Show Cause against CMI as to why they failed to comply or respond to the lawfully served subpoena.

### **ANALYSIS**

Section 316.1932(1)(f)(4), Fla. Stat., (2005), specifically provided that "full information" regarding the test taken "shall be made available" to the persons tested or their attorney. It was the understanding of this court, at the time of the hearing, that the term "full information" meant full information.<sup>5</sup> That apparently is not the case.

In June 2006, the legislature amended §316.1932(f)4 and 327.352(e)4<sup>6</sup> 'redefining' or 'clarifying' what *full information* does and does not mean as it relates to tests determining the weight of alcohol in the defendant's blood or breath. This new definition specifically excluded software not in the actual possession of the State. This amendment became effective October 1, 2006.

In *Moe v. State*, 944 So.2d 1096 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 2006), the county court had certified the following question of great public importance:

---

<sup>2</sup> Judge David Denkin was assigned by administrative order as being responsible for all cases on this appeal.

<sup>3</sup> Manatee County Judge Doug Henderson was assigned by administrative order as being responsible for all of those cases out of Manatee on appeal on this same issue.

<sup>4</sup> In 2002, CMI registered with the Florida Secretary of State to transact business within the State of Florida. CMI has filed annual reports with the Florida Secretary of State since 2002 through February 2007. A subpoena duces tecum without deposition was served on the appointed resident agent of CMI on March 29, 2006.

<sup>5</sup> "Full" is defined by Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary as "...containing as much or as many as is possible or normal; especially in detail, number, or duration; containing all that is wanted or needed." "Information" is defined by Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary as "the communication or reception of knowledge or intelligence."

<sup>6</sup> This is the statute dealing with boating under the influence cases.

UNDER THE CRIMINAL RULES OF DISCOVERY AND THE HOLDING IN *STATE V. MULDOWNY*, [871 So.2d 911 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004)], CAN THE STATE OF FLORIDA BE REQUIRED TO PRODUCE THE SOURCE CODE FOR THE SERIES 5000 INTOXILYZER?

The court noted that no challenge had been advanced pertaining to the accuracy of *Moe*'s particular test results. The parties in *Moe* stipulated that the machine had been tested in accordance with applicable regulations and that all of the tests revealed that the machine's test results were within acceptable tolerances. The court stated that under the facts presented, they answered the question in the negative and, by doing so, approved the ruling of the county court. The *Moe* court found that there was nothing in the language of 316.1932(1)(f)4 that manifests a legislative intent that the State must furnish information that cannot be obtained by it. The court went on to point out that it was never their intent to *interpret the statute* in a manner that requires the State to produce the source code.

Next, in *Turner v. State*, 951 So.2d 1036 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 2007), the fourth district court of appeals issued a per curiam opinion affirming the ruling of the circuit court, citing *Moe v. State*, 944 So.2d 1096 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 2006).

Later, in *Pflieger v. State*, 952 So.2d 1251 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 2007), the majority of the court's opinion dealt with the issue of whether, pursuant to the Confrontation Clause, annual inspection reports of breath testing instrument were admissible without testimonial evidence as to the actual annual inspection. In two sentences, at the end of the opinion, the *Pflieger* court stated:

“ . . . Appellant next argues the trial court erred in admitting the breath test results when it ruled appellant was not entitled to the manufacturers' proprietary “source code” information for the Intoxilyzer 5000. We affirm as to this issue. *Id. at 1254*; See *Moe v. State*, 944 So.2d 1096 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 2006).”

Unfortunately, the brevity of the court's ruling on this issue makes it virtually impossible to know the factual and legal record presented by the parties in the lower court.

This court has also reviewed recent decisions from Connecticut and New York denying Defendant's request for production of the source code. See *State v. Burnell*, 2007 WL 241230 (Conn.Super. 2007); *State v. Walters*, 2007 WL 785393 (Conn.Super. 2007); *People v. Cialino*, 831 N.Y.S.2d 680 (Crim.Ct. New York, 2007). (All of these cases involved CMI, Inc. and the Intoxilyzer 5000.)

In response to the aforementioned cases and statutory changes, the Defendants have provided the court with recent opinions from New Jersey and Minnesota in support of their

argument that they are entitled to disclosure of the Intoxilyzer 5000 software (source code). *See State v. Chun*, 923 A.2d 226 (N.J. 2007); *Underdahl v. Comm. Of Public Safety*, Case No. 2007 WL 2127888 (Minn.). This court believes that both cases are distinguishable on their facts.

The *Chun* case involved a situation where the parties (the Defendants, the State, and the attorney for the manufacturer of the alcohol testing instrument<sup>7</sup>) had apparently entered into a stipulation where the source codes, and any future modifications, would be analyzed by one agreed to expert. There was also testimony presented before the Special Master regarding problems with the instrument specifically dealing with a temperature issue, thereby challenging the accuracy of some of the Defendant's breath test results. In the case at hand, the parties have entered into no such stipulation, and there have been no problems advanced by any of the Defendants challenging the accuracy of their breath test results (although subsequent issues have arisen with the current use of the Intoxilyzer 8000).

In *Underdahl*, the Minnesota Supreme Court was asked to enter a writ of prohibition preventing the district court from enforcing an Order requiring the State to provide the Defendant with "...an operational Intoxilyzer 5000EN<sup>8</sup> **and the complete source code** (emphasis added) for its' operation." The court first noted that a writ of prohibition is an extraordinary writ and is only used in extraordinary cases. Second, the court noted that under the particular contract between the State of Minnesota and CMI, the state owned the source code for the Intoxilyzer 5000EN. The Minnesota Supreme Court further noted that the lower court was not 'clearly erroneous,'<sup>9</sup> *given the state's concession that it owned that portion of the source code created exclusively for the Intoxilyzer 5000EN*. The Court further noted that *CMI had agreed with the State of Minnesota, in their contract, to provide the attorneys representing individual charged with crimes "in which a test with the [Intoxilyzer 5000EN] is part of the evidence" the information necessary to comply with a court's order.*

It therefore appears that the agreement between CMI and Minnesota allows for the Defendants to obtain much more information concerning the breath testing instrument (Intoxilyzer 5000), unlike what this court has been told of the agreement between CMI and Florida.<sup>10</sup> And, it appears Minnesota has no legislation, as does Florida, limiting the Defendant's

---

<sup>7</sup> The instrument used in New Jersey is called the Alcotest 7110 and is manufactured by Draeger Safety Diagnostics, Inc.

<sup>8</sup> This instrument is manufactured by CMI, Incorporated, which is the same manufacturer of Florida's Intoxilyzer 5000 and 8000.

<sup>9</sup> This is the standard necessary to issue a writ of prohibition in this instance.

<sup>10</sup> The court is only left to wonder why, considering the instruments in Minnesota and Florida appear to be almost identical and are used for the same purposes.

access to information about the breath test instrument. See §316.1932(f)4 and 327.352(e)4, Fla. Stat. (2006).

There has been no evidence presented to this court indicating that the State of Florida has actual or constructive possession of the source code for the Intoxilyzer 5000. There has also been no evidence presented to indicate that CMI entered into the same or similar contractual obligation with Florida as they did with Minnesota. To the contrary, the record is clear that CMI has refused to provide the source code to the State. Therefore, based upon the recent appellate court opinions and new legislation, it is the decision of this Court that it cannot order the State to provide the Defendants with the source code for the Intoxilyzer 5000.

However, that does not end the matter.

The final issue brought to reconsider concerns the Defendants' request that this court reverse its earlier position and enter an order to show cause against CMI as to why they should not be held in contempt for failing to comply or respond to the subpoena duces tecum without deposition served on CMI, Inc. The Defendants had a subpoena duces tecum without deposition issued by the clerk and served on the resident agent of CMI, Inc. located in Westin, Florida on March 29, 2006. CMI, Inc. never filed any action in Florida contesting the legal sufficiency of that subpoena.<sup>11</sup>

In *General Motors Corporation v. State*, 357 So.2d 1045 (Fla. 3<sup>rd</sup> DCA 1978), General Motors filed a petition for writ of prohibition against the State of Florida alleging that service of a subpoena duces tecum on its resident agent in Florida was improper service. The State Attorney of Dade County was conducting a criminal investigation and had served the Florida Resident Agent of General Motors. General Motors argued that the exclusive method to be employed was that which is provided under by Chapter 942, Florida Statutes (1975) relating to interstate extradition of witnesses. Chapter 942, Florida Statutes (2006) was found by the Third District Court of Appeals to apply only when a party sought to acquire the attendance and the testimony of witnesses located outside of Florida. The court went on to state that the law as it presently reads, clearly does not apply to the mere production of documents.

---

<sup>11</sup> They did contest the matter in their home state of Kentucky. See *In Re: Subpoena Duces Tecum 2006-CT-002109* (Kentucky Daviess Dist. Ct. April 25, 2006) where the Kentucky court was faced with CMI, Inc.'s Motion to Quash Defendant's subpoena duces tecum served by the Defendants. The Kentucky District Court found that the Uniform Act to Secure the Attendance of Witnesses from Within or Without a State in a Criminal Proceeding (*in Florida it is found in Chapter 942*), applies to subpoena duces tecum and to CMI, Inc., and must be followed by the Defendants in this case. The court went on to hold that the Defendants did not follow the statutory procedures of first making a showing before a Florida Court that there is a material need for the witness.

That language has not changed since the opinion was rendered in *General Motors*. See Chapter 942, *Florida Statutes* (2006). Section 607.15101, Florida Statutes (2006), provides that process may be served upon a foreign corporation by properly serving the corporation's resident agent in Florida. §48.081, Fla. Stat. (2006); §48.091, Fla. Stat. (2006); *General Motors Corporation v. State*, 357 So.2d 1045 (Fla. 3<sup>rd</sup> DCA 1978). It follows then that once service of process is effectuated consistent with the provisions of Florida law, that party may be required by the court to perform acts outside the territorial jurisdiction of the court. *Id.* The court concluded that since the instant subpoena duces tecum requested only the production of documents and since it was directed to a foreign corporation authorized to do, registered to do and doing business in Florida, the Uniform Law is inapplicable. *General Motors Corporation v. State*, 357 So.2d 1045 at 1047 (Fla. 3<sup>rd</sup> DCA 1978).

This court finds the holding in *General Motors* to be on point and therefore finds that CMI, Inc. was properly served with a subpoena duces tecum without deposition.

CMI, Inc. is not without recourse. They certainly have the right to file and argue, for example, a Motion to Quash, Motion for Protective Order or argue that the subpoena duces tecum without deposition is overbroad before a court where the subpoena was issued, which in this instance would be Sarasota or Manatee County. Why CMI has chosen not to appear through counsel to challenge the subpoena duces tecum without deposition for any one of number of possible grounds is beyond the knowledge of this court.<sup>12</sup>

## **CONCLUSION**

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the Defendant's Motion to Compel production of the source code is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that CMI, Inc was properly served with a subpoena duces tecum without deposition. Since CMI, Inc. has refused and or failed to

---

<sup>12</sup> The court would note however that at the original evidentiary hearing, two members of CMI, Inc. did appear in person to testify at the request of the prosecution. The court has been advised that in the case of *Stephen Udice and Kyle Woods v. CMI, Inc. of Kentucky*, Case No. 2007 CC 002095 SC, a declaratory action was filed by Plaintiffs requesting a determination as to whether (1) Sarasota County Court has jurisdiction to issue a subpoena duces tecum without deposition on CMI, Inc. a foreign corporation registered to transact business in Florida; (2) Whether the subpoena duces tecum can be served on the resident agent, in Florida, of CMI, Inc. without complying with the Uniform Interstate Extradition of Witnesses; and (3) Is CMI, Inc. limited to challenge the subpoena duces tecum without deposition in Sarasota County. A default was entered for failure of CMI, Inc. to file any responsive pleading after being served through their resident agent in Westin, Florida. The court was however provided by Plaintiff's counsel with a copy of a letter from CMI, Inc. addressed to Sarasota County, Assistant State Attorney Don Hartery, advising him of this lawsuit and their decision not to respond because they believe Sarasota County is without subject matter jurisdiction and they "...decline to expend resources appearing in the Sarasota County action filed against it ...".

respond to the subpoena by either compliance or by filing a motion contesting the subpoena, this Court shall issue by separate order an Order to Show Cause against CMI, Inc.

In consideration of the complex issues in this case, and recognizing that courts throughout Florida and the United States have addressed this and related issues, being presented with various witnesses and documents, with varying results, the court believes it is necessary to have a consistent and uniform policy within this circuit, district and state so that all parties will be properly advised of their rights and obligations. Due to the large volume of DUI cases in general and in particular in which this issue has arisen and will continue to arise throughout, a direct certification to the District Court of Appeal will provide a more efficient means of establishing uniform guidelines. Therefore, the court, on its own motion, certifies the following questions as ones of great public importance to the Second District Court of Appeal:

1. CAN A DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE OBTAIN A SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM WITHOUT DEPOSITION AND HAVE IT SERVED ON A FOREIGN CORPORATION (CMI, INC.), THROUGH ITS RESIDENT AGENT IN FLORIDA, WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH THE PROCEEDURES SET FORTH IN CHAPTER 942, FLORIDA STATUTE?

2. IF YES, WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY IF CMI, INC. FAILS OR REFUSES TO EITHER COMPLY WITH THE SUBPOENA, OR FILE ITS OBJECTIONS WITHIN THE STATE OF FLORIDA, WITH THE COURT WHERE THE SUBPOENA WAS ISSUED?

DONE AND ORDERED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007.

  
COUNTY JUDGE DAVID L. DENKIN

CC: Robert Harrison, Esq. Defendant(s)  
Jarrod Malone, Esq. State Attorney Office

List of Consolidated Cases  
Re: Jack E. Irish, Case No. 2006 CT 2109 SC

Jack E. Irish	2006 CT 002109 SC ✓
Nathan Richard Benn	2006 CT 003909 SC
Jeffrey M. Bradshaw	2004 CT 000181 NC
Rosemary Corcoran	2006 CT 000133 SC
Ryan Eugene Copenhaver	2005 CT 020668 NC
Judith Hindson	2005 CT 020899 SC
Beverly Mahalick	2006 CT 003649 NC
David B. Morse	2006 CT 001389 SC
Andre Olen	2006 CT 004463 SC
Amy Turnock Raho	2005 CT 023206 SC
Carter E. Roth	2006 CT 004612 SC
Deborah R. Walksler	2006 CT 005765 SC
Evelynne Gwen Wartzman	2006 CT 004132 SC
Dana Pekas	2006 CT 000473 NC
Elzibieta Wozniak	2005 CT 023664 NC
Johnny Puga	2005 CT 019027 NC
Britton Williams	2005 CT 009283 NC
David Apgar	2005 CT 019752 NC
Ceilia Brannen	2006 CT 005753 NC
Carol A. Bridwell	2006 CT 000409 NC
Dianna Darst	2005 CT 019821 NC
Michael D. Dohnalek	2006 CT 000359 NC
Michael R. Garcia	2005 CT 022515 NC
Daryl B. Hall	2005 CT 013264 NC
Laura Henry	2005 CT 022020 NC
Robert A. Jones	2005 CT 020929 NC
Stephanie Klos	2005 CT 019392 SC
Brandon J. Leware	2006 CT 005524 SC
Jacob S. Lough	2006 CT 003309 NC
Shari Margolis	2005 CT 020579 NC
Dragomir Solujic	2006 CT 001402 SC
Robert M. Vigo	2006 CT 002534 NC
Kathleen A. Dickerson	2005 CT 019241 SC
Debra Ann Doherty	2005 CT 017955 NC
Robert Johnson	2005 CT 022634 SC
Matthew S. Snelson	2006 CT 000763 NC
Justin Civon	2005 CT 017401 SC
James Freeman	2005 CT 021513 NC
Dale Bramel	2005 CT 017131 NC
Frank Monateri	2006 CT 005090 NC
Floyd Bontrager	2005 CT 012654 NC
John Farley	2005 CT 020889 NC



Jason Martino	2005 CT 013780 NC
John Toombs	2005 CT 017165 NC
Gaeton Dellapenna	2006 CT 002189 NC
Linda Kirby	2005 CT 001220 NC
Harold Craig Nicholson	2005 CT 018052 NC
Stanley Bruce Moore	2005 MM 17640 NC
Bobbie Walsh	2005 CT 021214 NC
Caitlin Whiteaker	2005 CT 023258 SC
Mark Carlton Fox	2005 MM 19561 NC
Robert Fritz	2005 CT 022882 SC
Betty Garrabrant	2006 CT 003019 SC
James Grant	2005 CT 015346 SC
Mary Pardy	2005 CT 014678 SC
Marie Wise	2005 CT 016900 SC
Barbara Tryner	2006 CT 001865 SC
Jude J. Keenan	2005 CT 021108 SC
Kelly Pope	2005 CT 015690 SC
Tamara Doutrich	2005 CT 018499 NC
David Mattox	2005 CT 022294 NC
Marcelo Sanders	2005 MM 18762 NC
Barbara Schnurr	2006 CT 000929 NC
Philip Spaziani	2005 CT 021996 NC
Charles Talley	2005 CT 020635 NC
Randall Thompson	2006 CT 002376 NC
Susana Turkowsky	2005 CT 017612 NC
Jesus Velazquez	2005 CT 021193 NC
David Williams	2006 CT 000890 NC
Melissa Wilson	2005 CT 016242 NC
Bradley Wooden	2005 CT 020049 NC
Anthony Wright	2005 CT 019247 NC
Stephen Young	2005 CT 023213 NC
Heather Younkman	2005 CT 020581 NC
Kevin Brogan	2005 CT 022413 NC
Jan Michael Ringlever	2005 CT 019759 NC
John Gregory Wampler	2005 CT 013897 NC
Marjorie MacMaster	2005 CT 017114 NC
Harold Holley	2005 CT 019463 NC
Urbano Laguna	2005 CT 015163 NC
Robert McFadden	2006 CT 005745 NC
Mark Davis	2005 CT 018604 SC
Fernando Lopez	2006 CT 002842 NC
Jason Stroud	2005 CT 019564 NC
Danny J. Chandler	2006 CT 004159 SC
Nicholas Dota	2005 CT 021318 NC
Glenn Gauntt	2005 CT 017976 NC
Arlene Green	2005 CT 023061 NC

Norman Jewett	2005 MM 16274 NC
Michael Kaye	2004 CT 019360 NC
Joseph Kenny	2005 CT 016114 NC
Phillip Kreis	2006 CT 002621 NC
Anthony Lewis	2005 CT 016465 SC
Roy Long	2005 CT 017503 NC
Sais Maharaj	2005 CT 023253 NC
Richard Olson	2005 CT 014274 NC
Brain Ray	2005 CT 022223 NC
David Shepard	2005 CT 022015 NC
Dean Wilson	2006 CT 003291 NC
Edmund Wood	2005 CT 020145 NC
Jose Zelayamatute	2005 CT 023295 NC
Lisa Amole	2005 CT 021510 NC
Charles Anthony Davis	2005 CT 020576 SC
Lisa A. Dallis	2005 CT 016709 SC
Linda Cannon	2005 CT 022895 SC
Eloy S. Delfin	2005 CT 022886 SC
Trion Dengelegi	2005 CT 022938 SC
Blake Elford	2006 CT 004570 SC
Joseph P. Faber	2005 CT 021494 SC
Julie Cousins Hannon	2005 CT 019540 SC
Charles A. Kestner	2005 CT 021291 SC
Edward Koon	2006 CT 002684 SC
Louis P. Levite	2005 CT 010590 SC
Cheryl Linkert	2006 CT 003652 SC
Janice Lutes	2006 CT 005123 SC
Samantha A. Maciel	2005 CT 023260 SC
Sharon D. Martin	2006 CT 000919 SC
Douglas R. McIsack	2005 CT 020643 SC
Scott Montgomery	2006 CT 002103 SC
Raymond Morrison	2006 MM 03547 SC
John P. Myers	2005 CT 019042 SC
Kirk A. Ray	2004 CT 000037 SC
Diane Rose	2005 CT 021512 SC
Jeffrey R. Sowulewski	2005 CT 005315 SC
Sandra M. Sudnik	2005 CT 016300 SC
Robert V. Warner	2005 CT 023477 SC
Michelle A. Wilson	2005 CT 015686 SC
Michael Allen Zepf	2005 CT 018286 SC
Garcia S. Maddox	2005 CT 013276 NC
Humberto R. Martinez	2005 CT 018563 NC
Nelson D. Miramontes	2005 CT 018815 NC
Luis Montalvan	2005 CT 014660 NC
David Wayne Myers	2005 MM 19347 NC
Patricia Pate	2005 CT 014345 NC

Laura M. Peace	2005 CT 014160 NC
Jules S. Pierre	2004 CT 017710 NC
Dennis J. Pigott	2005 CT 016894 NC
Lynn L. Ashkettle	2005 CT 002063 NC
Gregory N. Frey	2005 CT 019534 NC
Wallace R. Gilchrist	2005 CT 016233 NC
Kory K. Harden	2005 CT 016916 SC
Christy L. Holliday	2005 CT 004284 NC
Rodney Mobley	2005 CT 021990 NC
Eddie C. Roden	2005 CT 011852 SC
Ralph E. Rush	2005 CT 020044 SC
Nancy A. Stedman	2005 CT 019797 NC
Laurie L. Wentland	2005 CT 018742 NC
Gerald Winkowski	2005 CT 020052 NC
Chris Scott	2005 CT 015865 SC
Teri Riley	2005 MM 19422 NC
Jose Pagan	2005 CT 009889 NC
John Massey	2005 CT 018570 NC
John Chrisman	2005 CT 016204 SC
John Myers	2005 CT 018134 SC
Todd Southwick	2006 CT 003365 SC
Sara Theriac	2005 CT 016605 NC