

President Judge Colins, Judge Smith-Ribner, and Senior Judge Mirarchi² presided over the Philadelphia signature review, reviewing the signatures contained in Volumes A, B, C, D, E, and F of the Objections to the Candidates Nomination Papers. Judge McGinley and Judge Pollegriini presided in Allegheny County and reviewed the challenges involving Allegheny County. Senior Judge Kelley reviewed the challenges for the nomination papers circulated in the counties of Armstrong, Beaver, Blair, Butler, Cambria, Centre, Clearfield, Fayette, Fulton, Indiana, Jefferson, Somerset, Washington, and Westmoreland, and later assisted in the Philadelphia review. Senior Judge Juliante presided over the review of signatures for the nomination papers circulated in the counties of Clarion, Crawford, Elk, Erie, Lawrence, Mercer, Venango, and Warren; while Judge Friedman presided over the review of nomination papers circulated in Bucks County, and Judge Leadbetter presided over the nomination papers circulated in Montgomery County, later completing the review of Volume F of the Philadelphia challenges. Judge Cohn Jubelirer presided over the review of nomination papers circulated in Adams, Lancaster, Lebanon, Lehigh, Luzerne, Lycoming, Monroe, and Schuylkill Counties. Judge Simpson presided over the nomination papers circulated in Berks, Bradford, Columbia, Cumberland, Dauphin, and Lackawanna Counties, as well as those circulated in Montour, Northampton, Perry, Susquehanna, Wyoming, and York Counties. Senior Judge Flaherty presided over the signature review for those nomination papers circulated in Delaware and Chester Counties. There were four counties to which no challenges to the

² Senior Judge Mirarchi reviewed signatures that were designated as duplicates. As a result, Judge Leadbetter and Senior Judge Kelley were later assigned portions of the Philadelphia objections. Judge Leadbetter reviewed Volume E. Senior Judge Kelley reviewed Volume F. Senior Judge Mirarchi reviewed pp. 231-257 of Volume B.

nomination papers were filed. Those counties are Carbon (total signatures 3), Franklin (total signatures 1), Greene (total signatures 3), and Bergen County, New Jersey [sic] (total signatures 1), for a total of 8 unchallenged signatures.

This line-by-line review of individual signatures was both exhaustive and exhausting. Several Judges of this Court worked nonstop, 16 hours a day in order to complete the Supreme Court's mandate within a reasonable timeframe. Our final review indicates that 1,183 pages of nomination papers were filed, containing a total of 51,273³ signatures submitted by the candidates.

By this Court's Order of August 20, 2004, both sides were directed to be prepared to present their case in the various forums commencing Monday September 27, 2004 and were told that cooperation from both sides was necessary if the review were to be done in anything approaching a timely manner and that the Court would not tolerate intemperate or obstructionist conduct on the part of either the Candidates or the Objectors. The Candidates, through then counsel Samuel Stretton, Esq., were warned that a review of over 50,000 signatures was an ominous undertaking requiring a great deal of manpower and expense and that the Candidates' pre-hearing cooperation in examining challenged signatures with the Objectors, such that potentially valid and invalid signatures could be stipulated to, would be essential to an efficient and timely review. The Candidates chose to ignore this Court's warning and proceeded to do as little as possible prior to the hearings, in an initial attempt to prevent an accurate tally of the signatures.

The review of signatures in Philadelphia was conducted in three *ad hoc* courtrooms that were made available to the Court by the Philadelphia Voter Registration Division of the Philadelphia City Commissioners. With the assistance

³ This number differs from the Department of State's tally of 52,398.

of Commonwealth Court's Computer Department, each courtroom contained three computer monitors on which could be displayed voter registration information and scanned copies of voter signatures contained in the voter registration database of the Voter Registration Division. A fourth courtroom was subsequently added. The voter registration data reviewed by the Court was a true and accurate record of voter information contained in the Voter Registration Division's database as attested to by the Commission's Urban Registration Administrator, Robert Lee. A civil service employee of the Voter Registration Division operated a computer terminal in each courtroom. The Objectors provided the Court and the Candidates with three exhibits filed with the petitions to strike: exhibit 1, being a six volume document detailing the Philadelphia Objections; exhibit 2 set forth the "Global"⁴ challenges; and exhibit 3 set forth the forgery challenges. Exhibit 1 was distributed among President Judge Colins, who was initially assigned Volumes A and B, Judge Smith-Ribner, who was initially assigned Volumes C and D, and Senior Judge Mirarchi, who was initially assigned Volumes E and F. Prior to the hearing date of September 27, 2004, at the direction of this Court, Robert Lee, and members of his staff, prepared a detailed report of each signature challenged and prepared a detailed report setting forth their line-by-line findings regarding the Objectors' challenges to individual signatures. Copies of these reports were supplied to the candidates. The Court takes this opportunity to thank Mr. Lee and his entire staff for their tireless work on this project. Faced with an initial lack of cooperation from the Candidates, he and his staff produced records that were invaluable to this Court in resolving this matter.

⁴ These "Global" challenges refer to challenges made to all of the signatures contained in one page for a single reason such as a faulty circulator's affidavit.

When this Court's review began on September 27, 2004, the Candidates, in total disregard of this Court's order of August 20, 2004, were unprepared to respond to the allegations set forth in the Objectors' Petition and chose instead to focus on delay and obfuscation. From the very outset of the Philadelphia hearings, the Candidates repeatedly, and without foundation, charged that this Court had improperly shifted the burden of proof from the Objectors to the Candidates, ignoring the fact that, at all times, the burden of proof would rest with the Objectors. Rather than focus on the task at hand, the Candidates raised groundless issues of due process violations and repeatedly challenged the validity of our Supreme Court's decisions in *In re Nomination Petition of Silcox*, 674 A.2d 224 (Pa. 1996), and *In re Nomination Petition of Flaherty*, 770 A.2d 327 (Pa. 2001), decisions that had been re-affirmed by our Supreme Court in opinions filed as late as September 29, 2004, two days after these hearings began. In that opinion, *In Re: Nomination Papers of Ralph Nadar, et al.*, No. 154 MAP 2004, Madame Justice Newman writing for a majority of the Supreme Court, (unanimous in reaffirming the holding of *Flaherty* and *Silcox*), held that

The Commonwealth Court identified the correct standards that we have mandated in *Flaherty* and *Silcox*, regarding late registrations and the requirements for review of signatures and addresses. Further, Candidates' due process rights were not violated by the Secretary's rejection of signatures. Candidates' request for application of lesser standards may well portend their inability to meet the requirements we have established.

Id. at 32.

After three weeks of hearings and the expenditure of nearly a quarter of a million dollars of the taxpayers' money, this Court concludes that the Candidates have submitted only 18,818 valid signatures, and are thus not eligible

to have their names placed on the November 2004 ballot as candidates for President and Vice-President. The following procedures were employed to reach this conclusion.

The Candidates challenged the work product and methodology employed by the voter registration offices. Additionally, Candidates challenged the original election petitions, advancing the notion that there was no explanation for "black lines" and "red lines" that allegedly inexplicably appeared on the original nomination papers. In order to address these concerns, a joint hearing was held before President Judge Colins, Judge Smith-Ribner, and Senior Judge Mirarchi beginning on September 27, 2004.

The Court addressed the issue by placing on the record the procedures employed to maintain the chain of custody of the original nomination papers. The procedures are detailed as follows. The Department of State transported the nomination papers filed by the Candidates to the Harrisburg offices of the Commonwealth Court where the papers were immediately placed into the custody of an armed security officer of Commonwealth Court. That official transported the Philadelphia nomination papers to the office of this Judge. This Judge then caused the nomination papers to be distributed to both Judge Smith-Ribner and Senior Judge Mirarchi. At all times the papers have been in the custody and control of the Court. Having explained that procedure to the Candidates, Candidates continued to proffer the argument that there was no explanation of the black line or red markings on the nomination papers. This Judge then referenced the August 24, 2004 filing of the Department of State wherein the Department set forth that it reviewed the nomination papers and in instances where a defect was ascertained, the Department marked the signature with an "x" to the left of the line and circled

the defect. This Court further noted that such is the Department of State's usual practice in reviewing all nomination petitions and papers it receives. (See Department of State August 24, 2004 filed title "Reply to the Order of the Court.") The Candidate continued to assert that there was no explanation for the black lines on the nomination petitions and sought to question Mr. Lee regarding the procedure employed for uploading information to the City of Philadelphia's voter registration database, and the manner employed to review signatures.

On direct examination by the Candidate, Mr. Lee testified as to his duties and qualifications as Urban Registration Administrator for the City of Philadelphia. Further, he described the procedures by which voter registration records are received and maintained by the Division. Mr. Lee testified that he oversees the daily operations of the Voter Registration Division including maintaining the accuracy of the voter registration files. That process includes maintaining a file of eligible voters that is used at polling places for determining voter eligibility; a knowledge of and compliance with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, P.L. 103-21, 42 U.S.C. §§1973gg-1--1973gg-10, Pennsylvania Voter Registration Act (PVRA), Act of June 30, 1995, P.L. 170, *as amended*, 25 P.S. §§ 961.101--961.5109; and the Voting Rights Act, Act of June 29, 1982, 42 U.S.C. § 1973aa-6. (Notes of Testimony September 27, 2004, pp. 8-9.) Regarding the technology employed by the Division, Mr. Lee testified that the system used is a CICS operation, with an installed imaging add-on that allows the Division to scan and index the signatures and affidavit images to the data record for each voter in the mainframe. This in turn eliminates paper documents. He further explained that the system is isolated and not on the City of Philadelphia's computer network or any other network. There is no outside access; the system is

password protected at various levels. Only specific people in voter registration can access the system for maintenance and data input. (Notes of Testimony, September 27, 2004, pp. 9-12.) Finally, Mr. Lee testified that the system is designed so that once registrations have been entered; access is available to individual records by name, list of voters, and addresses. Mr. Lee testified that when preparing the reports for the Court, he did not use the original nomination papers but rather was working from copies of the nomination papers. The three Judges all found Mr. Lee's testimony 100% credible.

After it became obvious that the nomination papers were rife with forgeries, the campaign attorneys called Mr. Dominic Martino as a fact witness on September 29, 2004. Mr. Martino testified that he is the Campaign Coordinator for Pennsylvania. He testified that by June 2004 the campaign had gathered only 1,500 signatures on the nomination papers. (Notes of Testimony, September 29, 2004, p. 55.) John Steven proprietor of a professional "ballot access company" was called in to gather the remaining 24,000 signatures. That company prepared and distributed a flyer that stated:

CASH NOW!

\$100.00 to \$200.00

per day

Petition to allow Ralph Nader on

The November Ballot

We pay Daily Cash Advances! Paid by Signature!

See Exhibit marked "Objector -2", 9/29/04, appended hereto.

Mr. Martino further explained that he and John Steven were both aware that individuals were repeatedly signing the petitions, and that many of the signatures were not authenticated. Further, he testified that he himself, and other campaign workers, in reviewing the petitions prior to filing, "black lined" signatures that were obviously deficient. (See Notes of Testimony, September 29, 2004, pp. 55-60.) These "blacklined" signatures were tabulated by President Judge Colins as "withdrawn by candidate prior to submission." (This was in direct contravention of Mr. Nader's attorney's previous statements regarding the "blacklined" signatures.)

Based on the testimony presented this Judge makes the following findings.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. This Judge finds Mr. Lee's testimony credible.
2. This Judge accepts the work papers prepared by Mr. Lee and presented to this Judge at the hearings held September 27, 28, 29, 30, October 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 12. The findings made by Mr. Lee were reviewed by this Judge and have been incorporated into the document appended to this opinion and order and labeled findings of President Judge Colins.
3. Further, as to those signatures found to be a forgery, this Judge's findings are based on the credible testimony of Objectors' handwriting expert Ms. Renee Martin, as well as the Court's physical examination of the nomination papers.

4. This Judge finds the testimony of Mr. Martino credible as it relates to the gathering of signatures, and the "black lining" of signatures by Martino.

5. This Judge finds credible Mr. Martino's testimony that the campaign had knowledge that false signatures were submitted on the nomination papers of Candidates.

6. This Judge personally reviewed every line of those Philadelphia Nomination Papers occurring on Pages 4 to 230 from the whole of the nominating papers filed by the Candidates (referred to as the Volumes A and B pages).

7. This Judge incorporates by reference the findings of fact of Senior Judge Mirarchi as set forth at length as to the duplicate signatures.

8. This Judge incorporates fully the conclusions of Senior Judge Mirarchi regarding the fraud and impropriety involved in the Objector's circulation process.

9. This Judge's findings regarding the striking of individual signatures by page numbers and lines is set forth in the document attached hereto and named President Judge Colins Nader Summary Totals. This Judge merged the category of "forgery" and "signatures signed in the hand of another." (*Silcox* issue). This Judge merged the categories of Data Omitted and Printed Signatures.

10. This Judge's findings regarding the striking of signatures, represented in totals, are as follows:

Total Signatures Reviewed	10794
Total Signatures Not Registered	2304
Total Signatures Not Registered at the Address	2100

Total Signatures Not Registered on the Date Signed	714
Total Signatures marked Non-Existent or Out of County	271
Total Signatures Illegible	72
Total Signatures where data omitted	237
Total Signatures deemed forgeries	568
Total Signatures marked duplicates	168
Total Signatures withdrawn by Candidate at hearing	791
Total Signatures Blacklined Prior to Submission by Candidate	291
Total Signatures Stricken	7516
Total Signatures Valid	3278

CONCLUSIONS

1. This Judge reviewed a total of 10,794 signatures.
2. After reviewing the 10,794 signatures this Judge finds that
10,794 Signatures Reviewed.
7,516 Signatures Stricken :
3,278 Signatures Valid
3. With respect to Mr. Justice Saylor's concurring and dissenting opinion in *In re Nomination Papers of Nader*, ___ Pa. ___, ___ A.2d ___ (No. 171 MM 2004, filed October 1, 2004), directing that we consider grounds for striking signatures other than the fact that the electors are not registered, we report that the following signatures were stricken only on the grounds that the elector was not registered (2,304) (however, the Court does not make the corollary finding that all of the electors were subsequently validly registered), not registered at the address at the time of signing (2,100), and was not registered at the time of signing (714).

The specific page numbers and line numbers are set forth in the exhibit marked: President Judge Colins Nader Summary Totals.

In addition, this Court wishes to commend Basil Culyba, Esquire, admitted *pro hac vice*, who represented candidates commencing October 1, 2004 for showing the highest standards of professionalism and integrity. Mr. Culyba's conduct, legal knowledge, and ethics, as well as those of objectors' attorney, Gregory Harvey, are of the highest caliber ever witnessed by this Judge.

COURT CONSOLIDATED FINDINGS and CONCLUSIONS

1. The President Judge finds that the Candidates and Objectors, particularly in the nomination papers denominated the "Allegheny Petitions" entered various stipulations relating to withdrawn signatures. The President Judge finds that the total number of signatures submitted on the Candidates nomination papers equals 51,273, 1,119 less than the recorded by the Department of State.

2. The President Judge incorporates all findings and conclusions of the Judges of this Court which and sets forth that the totals for all nomination papers are as follows:

Total Signatures Not Registered	7506
Total Signatures Registered After the Date of Signing	1470
Total Signatures Not Registered at the Address	6411
Total Signatures Data Omitted	1869
Total Signatures Information Written in the Hand of Another	7851
Total Signatures Printed	8
Total Signatures Illegible	166
Total Signatures Forged	687

Total Signatures Nicknames or Initials	32
Total Signatures Duplicates	1087
Total Signatures Affidavit Problems	1855
Total Signatures Other	3513
Total Signatures Reviewed	51273
Total Signatures Stricken	32455
Total Signatures Valid	18818

3. After reviewing the 51,273 signatures this Court finds that
- 51,273 Signatures Reviewed
 - 32,455 Signatures Stricken
 - 18,818 Signatures Valid

4. With respect to Mr. Justice Saylor's concurring and dissenting opinion in *In re Nomination Papers of Nader*, ___ Pa. ___, ___ A.2d ___ (No. 171 MM 2004, filed October 1, 2004), directing that we consider grounds for striking signatures other than the fact that the electors are not registered, we report that the following signatures were stricken solely on the grounds that the elector was not registered at the time of signing (1,470), and that adding this number to the valid signatures would still leave the candidates 5,409 short. The specific page numbers and line numbers are set forth in the exhibit marked President Judge Collins Nader Summary Totals.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the President Judge must state that that he has served longer on the Commonwealth Court than any other Judge in the Court's history and, as a result thereof, has reviewed more nomination petitions than any other

Judge in the Court's history. I am compelled to emphasize that this signature gathering process was the most deceitful and fraudulent exercise ever perpetrated upon this Court. The conduct of the Candidates, through their representatives (not their attorneys), shocks the conscience of the Court. In reviewing signatures, it became apparent that in addition to signing names such as "Mickey Mouse," "Fred Flintstone," "John Kerry," and the ubiquitous "Ralph Nader," there were thousands of names that were created at random and then randomly assigned either existent or non-existent addresses by the circulators.


A detailed line-by-line breakdown of the pages and lines reviewed and the reasons for disqualification has been prepared by each judge and follows. Accordingly, the Court enters the following

ORDER

AND NOW this 13th day of October 2004, upon consideration of the Petitioner's Petition to set aside the nomination papers of Ralph Nader and Peter Miguel Camejo for the Office of President and Vice-President in the General Election of November 2, 2004 and the hearings related thereto conducted throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we find as follows: that the number of signatures required on the nomination papers for the office of President and Vice-President is 25,697 (25 P.S. §2911). The nomination papers consist of 51,273 signatures. Based on the evidence presented by Petitioner at the hearings, and the parties' various stipulations, the Court concludes that 18,818 valid signatures were submitted; therefore, the nomination papers contained 6,879

signatures less than the required 25,697 signatures. Accordingly, the petition to set aside is **GRANTED**.

Further, the Secretary of the Commonwealth is directed not to certify the names of Ralph Nader and Peter Miguel Camejo as candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States in the November 2, 2004 general election.


JAMES GARDNER COLINS, President Judge


CASH NOW!

**\$100.00 to \$200.00
per day**

**Petition to allow Ralph Nader on
the November Ballot**

**We're hiring RIGHT NOW! To qualify, you must be
EITHER: Registered to Vote in Pennsylvania; OR you
must have been a resident of the state for at least 30
days and otherwise be eligible to register to vote. (US
Citizen--Pennsylvania Resident--at least 18 years old)**

We pay Daily Cash Advances! Paid by signature!

**We hire 7 days per week: Monday thru Friday 9am till
5pm; on Saturdays and Sundays 12noon till 5pm.**

**Call or just come in: 215-552-8572
1535 Chestnut Suite 100 (2nd floor)**

	Not registered	Registered after date of signing	Not registered at address	Omitted information	Information written in hand of another	Printed signature	Illegible signature	Forged signatures	Nicknames or initials	Duplicate signatures	Affidavit problems	Other	Running total of valid signatures	Percent of reviewed lines stricken
Collins	2304	714	2160	237	1317		72	568	0	166		1353	5278	46.83%
MacDermott & Palmprint	1888	325	1425	1132	1317			111		48		426	5672	54.42%
Smith-Ribner	1173	68	1548	180	4506					338	873	751	3361	73.52%
Friedman	183	9	22	9	13	0	4	0			0	0	909	20.89%
Leadbetter (Mont)	342	13	16	21		5	5	0			0	0	588	40.61%
Leadbetter (Phil)	488	119	665	85	368	0	55	0	0	0	0	12	2040	45.16%
Coln Jubeliner	12	1	4	0		0	1	3			22	5	48	22.86%
Stimpson	23	2	7	1		0	1	0	1		82	3	135	47.06%
Kelley	121	9	36	23	3	0	0	0	2	4	51	10	632	29.07%
Kelley (Phil)	238	142	394	10	17	0	21	0	5	7	222	914	948	72.61%
Fairbairn	358	1	23	18	0	3	0	0	13	0	14	0	822	45.17%
Mirarachi	240	65	255	141	1827	0	7	5	0	521	554	23	270	92.72%
Liberman	38	2	28	12		0	0	0	11	1	37	16	273	34.38%
Unchallenged	7506	1470	6411	1869	7851	8	186	687	32	1087	1865	3513	18818	63.30%

COURT SUMMARIES

President Judge Collins Page Summary Totals for Ralph Nader Nomination Papers*

55	15	38	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	82	32	94
56	24	22	9	9	1	2	2	2	2	60	40	100
57	18	30	11	11	1	1	1	1	1	82	38	100
58	35	19	11	11	3	1	5	14	2	90	20	110
59	7	8	3	3	2	1	1	1	9	20	13	33
60	4	6	4	4	1	2	2	2	26	20	20	46
61	11	36	6	6	6	3	3	3	64	46	109	
62	13	28	17	17	2	1	1	1	63	47	110	
63	9	12	6	6	3	3	3	3	30	14	44	
64	22	29	10	10	7	4	3	3	80	30	110	
65	10	5			1	1	1	1	16	34	50	
66	17	10	15	15	3	4	4	4	0	0	0	
67	8	8	3	3	0	1	1	1	19	68	42	110
68	8	11	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	18	12	30
69	27	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	7	30	6	35
70	9	18	7	7	6	0	1	0	0	44	22	66
71	17	15	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	42	38	80
72	6	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	41	23	64
73	7	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	17	32	53
74	7	6	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	17	13	30
75										110	110	
76	7	20	17	17	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
77	9	16	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	47	30	77
78	20	17	10	10	11	4	6	0	13	44	24	68
79	16	11	8	8	10	0	6	0	8	85	25	110
80	5	18	6	6	10	0	6	0	0	63	49	102
81	18	18	6	6	3	0	1	0	0	13	37	50
82	6	15	7	7	6	0	6	0	0	56	5	61
83	6	15	7	7	6	0	6	0	0	100	5	100
84	6	15	7	7	6	0	6	0	0	39	24	63
85	21	17	13	13	1	3	1	0	2	58	47	103
86	26	8	12	12	4	0	2	1	1	54	19	73

*Individual Page and Line Review Follows as Appendix A (507 pages)

President Judge Collins Page Summary Totals for Ralph Nader Nomination Papers*

181	24	23	6	5	3	0	0	7	0	2	70	14	84
182											41	0	41
183											76	0	76
184											59	0	59
185											0	0	0
186											0	0	0
187											0	0	0
188											0	0	0
189											0	0	0
190											0	0	0
191											0	0	0
192											0	0	0
193	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	37	45
194	23	20	5	0	0	9	0	3	0	0	60	50	110
195	10	4								1	15	18	33
196	6	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	21	10	31
197	34	23	12	1	0	0	0	12	0	6	88	17	105
198	24	8	2	0	5	2	0	2	0	2	67	33	100
199	22	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	42	12	54
200	34	36	9	12	2	1	1	3	0	0	97	13	110
201	6	4	1	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	21	10	31
202	7	9	4	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	31	19	50
203	31	25	4	5	5	0	0	15	0	6	91	10	101
204	19	35	6	4	1	4	1	2	0	5	77	33	110
205	35	16	14	8	6	3	0	11	0	0	90	10	100
206	12	7	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	24	10	34
207	3	17	7	2	0	2	0	7	0	4	42	13	55
208											0	0	0
209	30	10	8	12	1	0	0	2	0	11	74	26	100
210	21	25	13	1				15		8	83	17	100
211	6	10	4							3	23	48	71
212	17	8	1	4						12	45	51	96

*Individual Page and Line Review Follows as Appendix A (507 pages)

President Judge Collins Page Summary Totals for Ralph Nader Nomination Papers*

193	18	38	13	11	6	12	3	90	20	110
194	43	17	5	1	1	12	14	93	14	107
195	11	24	6	6	4	10	5	66	44	110
196	6	13	4	1	8	8	4	36	15	51
197	6	8	6	6	2	1	1	31	22	53
198								0	0	0
199	25	30	1	1	1	1	4	58	52	110
200	1	15	6	8	1	8	4	35	1	36
201	30	28	9	1				72	38	110
202	51	20	4	10	2	3	2	92	18	110
203	7	17	12	1	4			41	69	110
204							87	87	13	100
205	2	17	4	1	7	2	5	38	31	69
206	8	28	4	1	6	0	7	51	40	91
207	8	18	7	1	3	0	7	50	53	103
208	17	19	2	0	0	1	9	51	15	66
209	6	24	4	4	4	2	1	45	15	60
210	37	23	11	0	1	0	2	74	28	100
211	15	10	1	3	4	2	1	36	5	41
212	27	12	1	1	2	10	8	62	8	70
213					3	21	1	25	25	50
214							64	64	0	64
215	63	39	1	2	0	3	0	98	7	105
216					7	1	13	20	6	25
217	4	19	9	1	1	1	22	68	13	71
218							110	110	0	110
219	5	8	1			3	1	18	6	24
220								0	0	0
221		2	1					3	3	6
222	36	29	9	8	1		4	87	23	110
223	44	21	14	3	5			88	21	110
224	29	30	1	1	7	3	0	72	38	110

*Individual Page and Line Review Follows as Appendix A (507 pages)

