

1  
2 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

3 A CAB, LLC; AND CREIGHTON J. NADY, )

4 Appellants, )

5 v. )

6 MICHAEL MURRAY; AND MICHAEL )  
7 RENO, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF )  
8 OF OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED, )

9 Respondents. )

Electronically Filed  
Oct 16 2018 04:49 p.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

**DOCKETING STATEMENT  
CIVIL APPEALS**

10 **GENERAL INFORMATION**

11 All appellants not in proper person must complete the docketing statement. NRAP 14(a). The  
12 purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction,  
13 classifying cases for en banc, panel, or expedited treatment, compiling statistical information  
14 and identifying parties and their counsel.

15 **WARNING**

16 This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14©. The Supreme  
17 Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided  
18 is incomplete or inaccurate *Id.* Failure to fill out the statement completely or to file it in a  
19 timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or  
20 dismissal of the appeal.

21 A complete list of the documents that must be attached appears as Question 27 on this  
22 docketing statement. Failure to attach all required documents will result in the delay of your  
23 appeal and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

24 This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14  
25 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable  
26 judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. *See KDI Sylvan*  
27 *Pools v. Workman*, 107, Nev. 340, 810 P.2d 1217 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate  
28 any attached documents.

1. Judicial District: Eighth Judicial District Court, State of Nevada

Department: I

County: Clark

Judge: Kenneth C. Cory

District Ct. Docket No. A669926

2. **Attorney(s) filing this docketing statement:**

Attorney: Michael K. Wall

Telephone: (702) 385-2500

Firm: Hutchison & Steffen, LLC

Fax: (702) 385-2086

Address: 10080 W. Alta Dr., Suite 200,  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

Email: mwall@hutchlegal.com

1 Attorney: Esther C. Rodriguez  
2 Firm: Rodriguez Law Offices, P.C. Telephone: (702) 320-8400  
3 Address: 10161 Park Run Drive, Ste. 150 Fax: (702) 320-8401  
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Email: info@rodriguezlaw.com

5 Client(s): Appellants, A Cab, LLC and Creighton J. Nady

6 If this is a joint statement by multiple applicants, add the names and addresses of other counsel and the  
7 names of their clients on an additional sheet accompanied by a certification that they concur in the filing  
8 of this statement

9 **3. Attorney(s) representing respondent(s):**

10 Attorney: Leon Greenberg Telephone: (702) 383-6085  
11 Dana Sniegocki Fax: (702) 385-1827  
12 Firm: Leon Greenberg Professional Corp. Email: leongreenberg@overtimelaw.com  
13 Address: 2965 S. Jones Blvd., Ste. E3 dana@overtimelaw.com  
14 Las Vegas, NV 89146

15 Client(s): Respondents, Michael Murray and Michael Reno

16 **4. Nature of disposition below (check all that apply):**

17 Judgment after bench trial	Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief
18 Judgment after jury verdict	Grant/Denial of Injunction
19 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Judgment	Grant/Denial of declaratory relief
20 Default Judgment	Review of agency determination
21 Dismissal	Divorce Decree
22 Lack of Jurisdiction	Original Modification
23 Failure to State a Claim	Other disposition (specify):
24 Failure to Prosecute	
25 Other (specify):	

26 **5. Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following: NO**

27 Child custody(visitation rights only)  
28 Venue  
Termination of parental rights

29 **6. Pending and prior proceedings in this court.** List the case name and docket number  
30 of all appeals or original proceedings presently or previously pending before this court  
31 which are related to this appeal:

32 Docket No. 73326 (Petition for Writ of Mandamus; summarily denied).  
33 Docket No. 72691 (Appeal from injunction; reversed).  
34 Docket No. 75877 (Petition for Writ of Mandamus; denied as moot).

35 **7. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts.** List the case name, number and court  
36 of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal

(e.g., bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:

*Dubric v. A Cab LLC, et al.*, Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Case No. A-15-721063-C, District Judge Delaney, Department XXV.

*Dubric* is pending in district court before Judge Delaney. *Dubric* is related to this case because it involves the same defendants. In *Dubric*, defendants, as part of a settlement, have moved Judge Delaney to certify a class and approve a settlement. Judge Delaney has preliminarily granted the motion, but has not proceeded to final judgment, presumably because of the judgment in this matter, which defendants believe is not final. There is some overlapping of class plaintiffs. Judge Cory in this case previously enjoined defendants from proceeding in the matter before Judge Delaney, but this Court, *en banc.*, reversed and vacated the injunction.

8. **Nature of the action.** Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:

The underlying action is a class action suit against A-Cab for A-Cab's alleged failure to pay its employees a sufficient wage to satisfy the Minimum Wage Act of the Nevada Constitution. A competing MWA action against A-Cab is pending in a different department of the district court before Judge Delaney. A settlement was reached in the competing action, and Judge Delaney was considering a joint motion to approve settlement and whether or not to certify a class that may or may not overlap with the class certified in this case. Judge Cory issued an injunction against A-Cab enjoining it from defending itself in the competing action, enjoining it from settling in the competing action, and requiring it to withdraw its motion to approve settlement in the competing action. This Court, *en banc.*, reversed and vacated the injunction, and Judge Delaney moved forward, approving a class and the settlement, and setting a hearing for the purpose of finalizing the matter and entering judgment. Judge Cory, seeing that the *Dubric* matter would likely proceed to judgment before this case could be tried as scheduled, *sua sponte* granted summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs on some of their claims, although no motion for summary judgment was pending before the Court, and severed the remaining claims in order to create what he believes is a final judgment, solely to beat Judge Delaney to judgment and protect his class.

9. **Issues on appeal.** State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):

Whether the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over this case from the outset based on the fact that no plaintiff has a claim that individually satisfies the district court's jurisdictional threshold.

Whether the district court exceeded its jurisdiction in certifying a class.

Whether the class representatives have standing to pursue this action.

Whether the district court erred in tolling the statute of limitation which bars most of plaintiffs' claims.

Whether the district court erred in denying defendants' motions to dismiss on failure of proof issues.

Whether the district court erred in its application of NRS 608.115 regarding the keeping

- 1 of records, and further erred in shifting the burden of proof to defendants.
- 2 Whether the district court erred in countless discovery orders whereby the district court
- 3 attempted to require defendants to prove plaintiff's case for them.
- 4 Whether the district court erred in *sua sponte* granting summary judgment where no
- 5 motion for summary judgment was pending in order to beat Judge Delaney to final
- 6 judgment.
- 7 Whether the damages amounts in the judgment are supported by evidence, or are merely
- 8 conjecture.
- 9 Whether the district court's construction of the MWA in the constitution is incorrect,
- 10 and whether multiple actions taken by the district court to implement that false
- 11 construction were error.
- 12 Whether the district court erred in severing related claims in order to artificially create
- 13 finality.
- 14 Multiple other issues under investigation and consideration.
- 15
- 16 10. **Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues.** If you are
- 17 aware of any proceeding presently pending before this court which raises the same or
- 18 similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket number and identify
- 19 the same or similar issues raised:
- 20 None
- 21 11. **Constitutional issues.** If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and
- 22 the state, any state agency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this
- 23 appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance
- 24 with NRAP 44 and NRS 30.130?
- 25 N/A    ☒    Yes                      No
- 26 If not, explain
- 27
- 28 12. **Other issues.** Does this appeal involve any of the following:
- Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (on an attachment, identify the case(s))
- ☒ An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions
- A substantial issue of first-impression
- ☒ An issue of public policy
- An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this
- court's decisions
- A ballot question
- If so, explain
- It is an extraordinary act for one district judge to enjoin another in an attempt to
- engage in a road race to judgment, one which this Court declared illegal. After
- the injunction was lifted, Judge Cory continued his race to judgment, entering
- summary judgment *sua sponte* and without basis. Defendants believe this

exceeds the jurisdiction of the district judge, was the result of multiple errors of law, and constitutes manifest abuse of judicial authority.

13. **Assignment to the Court of appeals or retention in the Supreme Court.** Briefly set forth whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of appeals under NRAP 17, and cite the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls. If appellant believes that the Supreme Court should retain the case despite its presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals, identify the specific issue(s) or circumstances(s) that warrant retaining the case, and include an explanation of their importance or significance:

This case is arguably assigned to the Nevada Supreme Court pursuant to NRAP 17(a)(10), because it raises multiple issues under the MWA of the Nevada Constitution, and the district court's novel and frequently erroneous constructions and applications of that amendment present questions of first impression before this Court. Also, prior decisions in this same arena from the Nevada Supreme Court have been completely ignored and or rewritten by the district court in its charge to do justice under its view of the MWA. Also, the amount in controversy is substantial, and by negative implication of the money amounts cited as reasons for a case to be transferred to the Court of Appeals, the amount here justified Supreme Court consideration. This case should be retained by the Nevada Supreme Court.

14. **Trial.** If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last?

N/A

Was it a bench or jury trial?

15. **Judicial disqualification.** Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal. If so, which Justice? No

#### TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16. **Date of entry of written judgment or orders appealed from:**

Order Granting Summary Judgment, Severing Claims, and Directing Entry of Final Judgment was entered by the district court on August 21, 2018.

If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:

17. **Date written notice of entry of judgment or order served:** August 22, 2018.

(a) Was service by delivery \_\_\_\_\_ or by mail/electronic/fax ☒ X \_\_\_\_\_.

18. **If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(b), 52 (b), or 59,**

(a) Specify the type of motion, and the date and method of service of the motion, and date of filing.

NRCP 50(b) Date of filing \_\_\_\_\_  
NRCP 52(b) Date of filing \_\_\_\_\_  
NRCP 59 Date of filing 8-22-18 (plaintiffs' motion to amend)

9-10-18 (defendants' motion for reconsideration  
amend, for a new trial and to dismiss)

**Note: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll the time for filing a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev. \_\_\_\_, 245 P.3d 1190 (2010).**

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion: \_\_not yet resolved.\_\_\_\_

(c) Date of written notice of entry of order resolving motion served: \_\_N.A.\_\_\_\_

Was service by delivery \_\_\_\_\_ or by mail \_\_\_\_\_ (specify).

19. **Date notice of appeal was filed:** September 21, 2018.

If more than one party has appealed from the judgment or order, list date each notice of appeal was filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal: N/A

20. **Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other:**

NRAP 4(a)

### SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

21. **Specify the statute or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:**

☒ NRAP 3A(b)(1) NRS 38.205

NRAP 3(A)(b)(2) NRS 233B.150

NRAP 3A(b)(3) NRS 703.376

Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:

The district court has entered what is believes is a final judgment, and has severed other pending claims to create finality. Defendants believe the judgment is not final and is

not appealable, but have filed a notice of appeal to protect all appellate remedies.

22. List all parties involved in the action in the district court:

(a) Parties:

Michael Murray and Michael Reno  
(Class Representatives)

Plaintiffs

A Cab, LLC, and Creighton J. Nady

## Defendants

(b) If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal *e.g.*, formally dismissed, not served, or other:

23. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims or third-party claims, and the date of formal disposition of each claim.

This is a class action suit seeking damages for failure to pay minimum wages pursuant to the minimum wage act in the Nevada Constitution. The district court entered a judgment on the claims against A Cab, LLC, and severed the claims against Creighton J. Nady to artificially create finality, even though the claims are closely related and severance is not proper.

24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the parties to the action or consolidated actions below:

Yes                      No    X

25. If you answered “No” to question 24, complete the following:

(a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

All claims against Creighton J. Nady.

(b) Specify the parties remaining below:

Plaintiffs and Creighton J. Nady.

///

1 (c) Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final  
2 judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b):

3 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X\_\_\_\_\_

4 (d) Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that  
5 there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment:

6 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X\_\_\_\_\_

7 26. **If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking**  
8 **appellate review (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):**

9 Defendants believe the judgment of the district court is an interlocutory order, but it  
10 purports to be a final judgment, with the claims against Creighton J. Nady, which are  
11 derivative in nature, severed and stayed both to create finality and to defeat the five year  
12 rule of NRCP 41(e). Defendants believe the district court's order is inappropriate, but  
have been forced to file a notice of appeal to protect all appellate rights.

13 27. **Attach file-stamped copies of the following documents:**

- 14 ● The latest-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims
- 15 ● Any tolling motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s)
- 16 ● Orders of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims,  
17 cross-claims and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated  
18 action below, even if not at issue on appeal
- 19 ● Any other order challenged on appeal
- 20 ● Notices of entry for each attached order


### 21 VERIFICATION

22 I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the  
23 information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my  
24 knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this  
25 docketing statement.

26 Name of Appellant(s): A Cab, LLC and Creighton J. Nady

27 Name of counsel of record: Michael K. Wall

28 Date: 10-16-18

  
Signature of counsel of record

Clark County, Nevada  
State and county where signed

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28


~~1~~ by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada; and/or

[ ] to be hand-delivered;

Leon Greenberg, Esq.  
Leon Greenberg Professional Corporation  
2965 S. Jones Blvd., Ste. E3  
Las Vegas, NV 89146  
Telephone: (702) 383-6085  
Facsimile: (702) 385-1827  
leongreenberg@overtimelaw.com  
dana@overtimelaw.com

Stephen E. Haberfeld  
8224 Blackburn Ave., #100  
Los Angeles, CA 90048  
*Settlement Judge*

### *Attorneys for Respondents*

  
An employee of Hutchinson & Steffen, PLLC



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ACOM**  
2 LEON GREENBERG, ESQ., SBN 8094  
3 DANA SNIEGOCKI, ESQ., SBN 11715  
4 Leon Greenberg Professional Corporation  
5 2965 South Jones Blvd- Suite E4  
6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146  
7 (702) 383-6085  
8 (702) 385-1827(fax)  
9 leongreenberg@overtimelaw.com  
10 dana@overtimelaw.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

12 **DISTRICT COURT**  
13 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

14 MICHAEL MURRAY and MICHAEL  
15 RENO, Individually and on behalf of  
16 others similarly situated,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 vs.

19 A CAB TAXI SERVICE LLC, A CAB,  
20 LLC, and CREIGHTON J. NADY

21 Defendants.

Case No.: A-12-669926-C

Dept.: I

**SECOND AMENDED AND  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMPLAINT**

**ARBITRATION EXEMPTION  
CLAIMED BECAUSE THIS IS  
A CLASS ACTION CASE**

22 MICHAEL MURRAY and MICHAEL RENO, Individually and on behalf of  
23 others similarly situated, by and through their attorney, Leon Greenberg Professional  
24 Corporation, as and for a Complaint against the defendants, state and allege, as  
25 follows:

26 **JURISDICTION, PARTIES AND PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

27 1. The plaintiffs, MICHAEL MURRAY and MICHAEL RENO, (the  
28 "individual plaintiffs" or the "named plaintiffs") are residents of the State of Nevada  
and during all relevant times were residents of Clark County, Nevada, and all plaintiffs  
are current employees of the defendants.

1           2.     The defendants A CAB TAXI SERVICE LLC and A CAB, LLC,  
2 (hereinafter referred to as "A CAB" or "defendants" or "corporate defendants") are  
3 limited liability companies or corporations existing and established pursuant to the  
4 laws of the State of Nevada with their principal place of business in the County of  
5 Clark, State of Nevada and conduct business in Nevada.

6           3.     The defendant CREIGHTON J. NADY ("NADY") either directly, or  
7 through other entities that he controls and owns, is the sole owner of the corporate  
8 defendants.

9           4.     The defendant NADY exercises complete control over the activities of  
10 the corporate defendants, in that he is the highest level manager and decision maker of  
11 the corporate defendants and there are no other officers, directors, owners, members,  
12 managers, principals or other employees of the corporate defendants who can override  
13 or modify against his will any decision he makes in respect to the conduct of the  
14 corporate defendants.

15                                   **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

16           5.     The plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Nev. R. Civ.  
17 P. §23 on behalf of themselves and a class of all similarly situated persons employed  
18 by the defendants in the State of Nevada.

19           6.     The class of similarly situated persons consists of all persons employed  
20 by defendant in the State of Nevada during the applicable statute of limitations periods  
21 prior to the filing of this Complaint continuing until date of judgment, such persons  
22 being employed as Taxi Cab Drivers (hereinafter referred to as "cab drivers" or  
23 "drivers") such employment involving the driving of taxi cabs for the defendants in the  
24 State of Nevada.

25           7.     The common circumstance of the cab drivers giving rise to this suit is that  
26 while they were employed by defendants they were not paid the minimum wage  
27 required by Nevada's Constitution, Article 15, Section 16 for many or most of the days  
28 that they worked in that their hourly compensation, when calculated pursuant to the

1 requirements of said Nevada Constitutional Provision, did not equal at least the  
2 minimum hourly wage provided for therein.

3       8.     The named plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege  
4 that there are at least 200 putative class action members. The actual number of class  
5 members is readily ascertainable by a review of the defendants' records through  
6 appropriate discovery.

7       9.     There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and  
8 fact affecting the class as a whole.

9       10.    Proof of a common or single set of facts will establish the right of each  
10 member of the class to recover. These common questions of law and fact predominate  
11 over questions that affect only individual class members. The individual plaintiffs'  
12 claims are typical of those of the class.

13       11.    A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and  
14 efficient adjudication of the controversy. Due to the typicality of the class members'  
15 claims, the interests of judicial economy will be best served by adjudication of this  
16 lawsuit as a class action. This type of case is uniquely well-suited for class treatment  
17 since the employers' practices were uniform and the burden is on the employer to  
18 establish that its method for compensating the class members complies with the  
19 requirements of Nevada law.

20       12.    The individual plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests  
21 of the class and have no interests that conflict with or are antagonistic to the interests  
22 of the class and have retained to represent them competent counsel experienced in the  
23 prosecution of class action cases and will thus be able to appropriately prosecute this  
24 case on behalf of the class.

25       13.    The individual plaintiffs and their counsel are aware of their fiduciary  
26 responsibilities to the members of the proposed class and are determined to diligently  
27 discharge those duties by vigorously seeking the maximum possible recovery for all  
28 members of the proposed class.

14. There is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy other than by maintenance of this class action. The prosecution of individual remedies by members of the class will tend to establish inconsistent standards of conduct for the defendants and result in the impairment of class members' rights and the disposition of their interests through actions to which they were not parties. In addition, the class members' individual claims are small in amount and they have no substantial ability to vindicate their rights, and secure the assistance of competent counsel to do so, except by the prosecution of a class action case.

AS AND FOR A FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF ON BEHALF OF THE NAMED  
PLAINTIFFS AND ALL PERSONS SIMILARLY SITUATED PURSUANT TO  
NEVADA'S CONSTITUTION

15. The named plaintiffs repeat all of the allegations previously made and bring this First Claim for Relief pursuant to Article 15, Section 16, of the Nevada Constitution.

16. Pursuant to Article 15, Section 16, of the Nevada Constitution the named plaintiffs and the class members were entitled to an hourly minimum wage for every hour that they worked and the named plaintiffs and the class members were often not paid such required minimum wages.

17. The defendants' violation of Article 15, Section 16, of the Nevada Constitution involved malicious and/or fraudulent and/or oppressive conduct by the defendants sufficient to warrant an award of punitive damages for the following, amongst other reasons:

(a) Defendants despite having, and being aware of, an express obligation under Article 15, Section 16, of the Nevada Constitution, such obligation commencing no later than July 1, 2007, to advise the plaintiff and the class members, in writing, of their entitlement to the minimum hourly wage specified in such constitutional provision, failed to provide such written advisement;

1 (b) Defendants were aware that the highest law enforcement  
2 officer of the State of Nevada, the Nevada Attorney General, had  
3 issued a public opinion in 2005 that Article 15, Section 16, of the  
4 Nevada Constitution, upon its effective date, would require  
5 defendant and other employers of taxi cab drivers to compensate  
6 such employees with the minimum hourly wage specified in such  
7 constitutional provision. Defendants consciously elected to ignore  
8 that opinion and not pay the minimum wage required by Article  
9 15, Section 16, of the Nevada Constitution to its taxi driver  
10 employees in the hope that it would be successful, if legal action  
11 was brought against it, in avoiding paying some or all of such  
12 minimum wages;

13 (c) Defendants, to the extent they believed they had a colorable  
14 basis to legitimately contest the applicability of Article 15, Section  
15 16, of the Nevada Constitution to its taxi driver employees, made  
16 no effort to seek any judicial declaration of its obligation, or lack  
17 of obligation, under such constitutional provision and to pay into  
18 an escrow fund any amounts it disputed were so owed under that  
19 constitutional provision until such a final judicial determination  
20 was made;

21 (d) Defendants were the subject of an investigation by the United  
22 States Department of Labor in respect to defendants' compliance  
23 with the minimum wage requirements of the federal Fair Labor  
24 Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201-219 which investigation was  
25 concluded on April 30, 2009. Such investigation did not  
26 determine if any violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act were  
27 committed by the defendants, and no claim is made in this case  
28 against the defendants under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such

1 investigation resulted in defendants on April 30, 2009, being  
2 advised by the U.S. Department of Labor that they must keep a  
3 record of the actual hours worked by their taxi driver employees  
4 and that defendants must pay their taxi drivers the minimum  
5 hourly wage, defendants also being told such minimum hourly  
6 wage at that time under Nevada law was \$6.85 an hour. Rather  
7 than follow such advisement, defendants intentionally acted to not  
8 institute any system that would keep an express, confirmed, and  
9 accurate record of the hours worked by such taxi driver employees,  
10 such as a dedicated payroll time clock system. Defendants also  
11 acted to force their taxi driver employees to falsely record their  
12 activities on their daily taxi driver trip sheets so as to make it  
13 appear that the taxi drivers were taking many hours of breaks  
14 during their working days, which was not true and defendants  
15 knew was not true. Defendants fostered such inaccurate and  
16 untrue recording by their taxi drivers of their work activities by  
17 refusing to allow taxi drivers to submit accurate daily taxi driver  
18 trip sheets that did not have such excessive, and untrue, recordings  
19 of break time. Defendants enforced their "break time listings  
20 required" policy on their taxi drivers' trip sheets with the  
21 intentional goal of making it impossible for those taxi drivers to  
22 collect the minimum wages they were owed and to conceal  
23 defendants' violations of the Nevada Constitution. Such actions  
24 by the defendants included, among other things, actually reviewing  
25 the "fares booked" per shift on each taxi driver's trip sheet and  
26 requiring additional break time be listed for those shifts where the  
27 fare bookings were so low that minimum wages would be owed to  
28 the taxi driver if their break times, as listed on their trip sheets,

1                                were not inflated.

2                    18. Defendants engaged in the acts and/or omissions and/or fraudulently  
3 conduct detailed in paragraph 17 in an intentional scheme to maliciously, oppressively  
4 and fraudulently deprive its taxi driver employees of the hourly minimum wages that  
5 were guaranteed to those employees by Article 15, Section 16, of the Nevada  
6 Constitution. Defendants so acted in the hope that by the passage of time whatever  
7 rights such taxi driver employees had to such minimum hourly wages owed to them by  
8 the defendants would expire, in whole or in part, by operation of law. Defendant so  
9 acted consciously, willfully, and intentionally to deprive such taxi driver employees of  
10 any knowledge that they might be entitled to such minimum hourly wages, despite the  
11 defendant's obligation under Article 15, Section 16, of the Nevada Constitution to  
12 advise such taxi driver employees of their right to those minimum hourly wages.  
13 Defendants' malicious, oppressive and fraudulent conduct is also demonstrated by its  
14 failure to make any allowance to pay such minimum hourly wages if they were found  
15 to be due, such as through an escrow account, while seeking any judicial determination  
16 of its obligation to make those payments.

17                    19. The rights secured to the plaintiffs and the class members under Nevada's  
18 Constitution, Article 15, Section 16, for a minimum level of remuneration for their  
19 labor as defendants' employees, constitute property rights, in that such level of  
20 remuneration constitutes property of the plaintiffs and the class members, to wit, a sum  
21 of money that they have a right to possess for the inalienable value of their labor,  
22 which labor the defendants obtained from them as employers. Defendants have  
23 obtained such property, the minimum wages properly the property of the plaintiffs and  
24 the class members, illegally and defendants still possess the same, the defendants  
25 having also committed a conversion of such property. As a result defendants should  
26 be, and are, subject to all forms of equitable relief and legal sanctions necessary to  
27 return such property to the plaintiffs and the class members and/or make them whole,  
28 including, without limitation, a suitable Court Order directing that the defendants

1 make restitution to the plaintiffs and the class members for the full value of all such  
2 property taken and held by the defendants, with interest and an award of all proper  
3 incidental, consequential and/or punitive damages available under the law or in equity  
4 appropriate to remedy such violations of the plaintiffs' and the class members' rights  
5 under Nevada's Constitution, Article 15, Section 16.

6 20. The named plaintiffs seek all relief available to them and the alleged class  
7 under Nevada's Constitution, Article 15, Section 16 including appropriate injunctive  
8 and equitable relief to make the defendants cease their violations of Nevada's  
9 Constitution and a suitable award of punitive damages.

10 21. The named plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the proposed plaintiff  
11 class members, seek, on this First Claim for Relief, a judgment against the corporate  
12 defendants for minimum wages and restitution, such sums to be determined based  
13 upon an accounting of the hours worked by, and wages actually paid to, the plaintiffs  
14 and the class members, a suitable injunction and other equitable relief barring the  
15 corporate defendants from continuing to violate Nevada's Constitution, a suitable  
16 award of punitive damages against the corporate defendants, and an award of  
17 attorney's fees, interest and costs, as provided for by Nevada's Constitution and other  
18 applicable laws against the corporate defendants.

19 **AS AND FOR A SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF PURSUANT TO NEVADA**  
20 **REVISED STATUTES § 608.040 ON BEHALF OF THE NAMED PLAINTIFFS**  
**AND THE PUTATIVE CLASS**

21 22. Plaintiffs repeat and reiterate each and every allegation previously made  
22 herein.

23 23. The named plaintiffs bring this Second Claim for Relief against the  
24 corporate defendants pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes § 608.040 on behalf of  
25 themselves and those members of the alleged class of all similarly situated employees  
26 of the defendants who have terminated their employment with the defendants.

27 24. The named plaintiffs have been separated from their employment with the  
28

1 defendants and at the time of such separation were owed unpaid wages by the  
2 defendants.

3 25. The defendants have failed and refused to pay the named plaintiffs and  
4 numerous members of the putative plaintiff class who are the defendants' former  
5 employees their earned but unpaid wages, such conduct by such defendants  
6 constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes § 608.020, or § 608.030 and  
7 giving such named plaintiffs and similarly situated members of the putative class of  
8 plaintiffs a claim against the defendants for a continuation after the termination of their  
9 employment with the defendants of the normal daily wages defendants would pay  
10 them, until such earned but unpaid wages are actually paid or for 30 days, whichever is  
11 less, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes § 608.040.

12 26. As a result of the foregoing, the named plaintiffs seek on behalf of  
13 themselves and the similarly situated putative plaintiff class members a judgment  
14 against the corporate defendants for the wages owed to them and such class members  
15 as prescribed by Nevada Revised Statutes § 608.040, to wit, for a sum equal to up to  
16 thirty days wages, along with interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

17 **AS AND FOR A THIRD CLAIM AGAINST DEFENDANT**  
18 **NADY FOR CIVIL CONSPIRACY, AIDING AND ABETTING,**  
19 **CONCERT OF ACTION AND AS THE ALTER EGO**  
**OF THE CORPORATE DEFENDANTS**

20 27. Plaintiffs repeat and reiterate each and every allegation previously made  
21 herein.

22 28. The named plaintiffs bring this Third Claim for Relief against the  
23 defendant NADY for civil conspiracy, concert of action, aiding or abetting the actions  
24 of the corporate defendants, and/or as the alter ego of the corporate defendants, on  
25 behalf of themselves and the members of the alleged class of all similarly situated  
26 employees of the corporate defendants.

27 29. The corporate defendants, as the employers of the class members, had a  
28 legal duty to abide by all laws imposed upon the corporate defendants by the State of

1 Nevada in respect to their treatment of the class members as such persons' employers,  
2 including abiding by the provisions of Nevada's Constitution, Article 15, Section 16  
3 and paying such persons the minimum wages required therein.

4 30. Defendant NADY exercised his complete control of the corporate  
5 defendants to purposefully direct and have the corporate defendants violate Article 15,  
6 Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution and not pay the class members the minimum  
7 wages they were entitled to receive as employees from the corporate defendants,  
8 NADY commanding such action by the corporate defendants despite knowing that  
9 such actions were illegal and in violation of Nevada's Constitution.

10 31. The corporate defendants, although established as legal entities, had no  
11 ability to resist NADY's directive to them to violate the provisions of Nevada's  
12 Constitution, Article 15, Section 16 and not pay the class members the minimum  
13 wages they were entitled to thereunder, as NADY completely controlled the corporate  
14 defendants which control he could, and did, use to direct such non-payment of  
15 minimum wages by the corporate defendants.

16 32. Defendant NADY intentionally and knowingly directed the aforesaid  
17 violations of Article 15, Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution by the corporate  
18 defendant and by doing so caused injury to the class members who did not receive  
19 their earned and unpaid minimum wages. NADY directed the corporate defendants  
20 commit those violations for the express purpose of enriching NADY, personally, and  
21 not as part of any legitimate duty he had as an agent or officer of the corporate  
22 defendants. NADY was enriched by those violations as he intended because he  
23 received additional distributions, dividends, salary or other earnings and profits from  
24 the corporate defendants that he would not have received, and could not have received,  
25 except for such violations of Article 15, Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution that he  
26 had the corporate defendants commit.

27 33. While it is alleged in this claim for relief that NADY is personally liable  
28 for all unpaid minimum wages owed by the corporate defendants pursuant to Article

1 15, Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution to the class members, it is also alleged that  
2 NADY is liable for those minimum wages so owed for work performed by the class  
3 members after January 17, 2013 because of certain additional circumstances. The  
4 additional circumstances requiring that NADY be held personally liable for those post  
5 January 17, 2013 earned, but unpaid, minimum wages are the following:

- 6
- 7 (a) On January 17, 2013 the Court in this action held that the class  
8 members were entitled to be paid by the corporate defendants the  
9 minimum wages specified in Article 15, Section 16 of Nevada's  
10 Constitution, which removed any uncertainty that NADY may have  
11 had prior to that date as to whether the corporate defendants were  
12 required to pay the class members such minimum wages;
- 13
- 14 (b) Despite such ruling on such date, and NADY's prompt advisement  
15 of the same, NADY directed the corporate defendants to continue  
16 for over one year to not pay the minimum wages specified in  
17 Article 15, Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution to the class  
18 members, and by doing so continued to enrich himself after January  
19 17, 2013 with additional distributions, dividends, salary or other  
20 earnings and profits from the corporate defendants that he would  
21 not have received, and could not have received, except for such  
22 violations of Article 15, Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution that  
23 he had the corporate defendants continue to commit;
- 24
- 25 (c) To the extent NADY believed or hoped that the Court's ruling on  
26 January 17, 2013, would be overturned or reversed, and the  
27 corporate defendants subsequently found to not be legally obligated  
28 to pay the class members the minimum wages specified by Article

1 15, Section 16 of Nevada's Constitution, he purposefully took no  
2 steps to have the corporate defendants comply with that January 17,  
3 2013 ruling in the interim. Such steps would have been if not to  
4 pay such minimum wages to the class members to at least make  
5 arrangements, subject to this Court's approval, for those minimum  
6 wage amounts to be paid into an escrow fund and kept secure, and  
7 available for the class members' ultimate benefit, until it was  
8 determined whether the January 17, 2013 ruling would be  
9 overturned or reversed. NADY intentionally failed to take any  
10 such steps and directed the corporate defendants to violate this  
11 Court's ruling so that NADY could enrich himself with additional  
12 distributions, dividends, salary or other earnings and profits from  
13 the corporate defendants that he would not have received, and  
14 could not have received, if the corporate defendants had taken such  
15 proper steps to comply with the Court's January 17, 2013 ruling;  
16

17 (d) NADY by personally enriching himself with additional  
18 distributions, dividends, salary or other earnings and profits from  
19 the corporate defendants that he would not have received, and  
20 could not have received, if the corporate defendants had taken  
21 proper steps to comply with the Court's January 17, 2013 ruling has  
22 rendered the corporate defendants financially insolvent and unable  
23 to pay the minimum wages owed to the class members for their  
24 work performed after January 17, 2013.  
25

26 34. Defendant NADY has used the corporate defendants as his "alter ego"  
27 and is personally liable for the claims made in this case, at least to the extent he has  
28 personally enriched himself from the violations of the Nevada Constitution alleged

1 herein that he has commanded and directed the corporate defendants to commit. Such  
2 "alter ego" liability is properly imposed upon him, and the separate legal existence of  
3 the corporate defendants as the class members' employer ignored for the purpose of  
4 such liability, because (a) NADY has completely influenced and governed the  
5 corporate defendants and compelled them to violate the Nevada Constitution and deny  
6 the class members the minimum wages they are owed so that NADY could be  
7 personally enriched in a commensurate amount, NADY using the corporate defendants  
8 as tools for NADY to accomplish such illegal and unconstitutional goals, NADY also  
9 expressly directing, planning and causing such illegal conduct that took place  
10 including the intentional conduct by the defendants alleged in paragraph 17; (b) There  
11 is no actual or effective separation of interests between NADY and the corporate  
12 defendants as NADY completely owns and controls the corporate defendants; and (c)  
13 The continued adherence to the fiction that NADY and the corporate defendants are  
14 separate legal parties, with separate and different liabilities to the class members under  
15 Nevada's Constitution, would promote a fraud and an injustice, at least to the extent  
16 that NADY has personally enriched himself from the violations of the Nevada  
17 Constitution alleged in this complaint and the corporate defendants are otherwise  
18 insolvent and unable to make sufficient restitution to the class members to remedy  
19 such violations.

20 35. Defendant NADY has conspired with the corporate defendants to  
21 personally enrich himself from the violations of the Nevada Constitution alleged  
22 herein that he has commanded the corporate defendants to perform. Such civil  
23 conspiracy by NADY occurred, and results in liability by NADY to the class members  
24 for such violations, because NADY acted with the corporate defendants to have such  
25 violations performed and personally took affirmative steps to have them so performed;  
26 NADY intended for such activities to violate Nevada's Constitution, they did in fact  
27 violate Nevada's Constitution, and NADY intended for the class members to be  
28 deprived of the minimum wages guaranteed to them under Nevada's Constitution and

1 the class members were so deprived and damaged by their denial of those minimum  
2 wages; and NADY performed such actions not as an agent or officer of the corporate  
3 defendants or in the furtherance of any duty or lawful goal in his official capacity on  
4 behalf of the corporate defendants but solely for his own personal individual  
5 advantage and enrichment as alleged herein.

6 36. That NADY has acted in concert with or aided and abetted the conduct  
7 of the corporate defendants in that he acted in concert with the corporate defendants to  
8 have them violate their duties to the class members as employers under Nevada's  
9 Constitution and NADY knew such actions that he aided and abetted by the corporate  
10 defendants were breaches of those duties. NADY has also personally enriched himself  
11 from the violations of the Nevada Constitution alleged in this complaint that he aided  
12 and abetted the corporate defendants in performing and acted in concert with them to  
13 perform and as a result is personally liable to the class members for the damages  
14 caused to the class members from such violations, to the extent the corporate  
15 defendants are otherwise insolvent and unable to make sufficient restitution to the  
16 class members to remedy such violations.

17 37. That NADY engaged in the forgoing alleged course of conduct with the  
18 express intent of leaving the corporate defendants insolvent, bereft of assets, and  
19 unable to pay the class members the minimum wages they are owed by the corporate  
20 defendants and to enrich NADY, personally, by an equal amount.

21 38. The named plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the proposed plaintiff  
22 class members, seek, on this Third Claim for Relief, a judgment against the defendant  
23 NADY for minimum wages and restitution, such sums to be determined based upon an  
24 accounting of the hours worked by, and wages actually paid to, the plaintiffs and the  
25 class members, at least to the extent the corporate defendants are unable to pay such  
26 sums to the class members, along with other suitable equitable relief, a suitable award  
27 of punitive damages, and an award of attorney's fees, interest and costs, as provided  
28 for by Nevada's Constitution and other applicable laws.

**AS AND FOR A FOURTH CLAIM AGAINST  
DEFENDANT NADY FOR UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

39. Plaintiffs repeat and reiterate each and every allegation previously made herein.

40. The minimum wages that were owed to the class members by the corporate defendants, as alleged herein and in paragraph 19, were the property of the class members and the corporate defendants owed such property, which were sums of money, to the class members when those minimum wages were earned; the corporate defendants actually possessed money sufficient to pay those minimum wages to the class members and could have paid those wages to the class members when they were earned by and due to the class members; and the corporate defendants had no legal right to refuse to pay those minimum wages to the class members when they were earned or pay sums of money equal to those minimum wages to someone else besides the class members who were owed those minimum wages without also paying the class members, at that time, those earned and owed minimum wages.

41. The defendant NADY received sums of money from the corporate defendants that were equal to the minimum wages owed by the corporate defendants to the class members but not paid to the class members by the corporate defendants, NADY receiving those sums of money from the corporate defendants only because he used his complete control over the corporate defendants to have such sums of money paid to him, and not the class members, by the corporate defendants.

42. The aforesaid sums of money in paragraph 41 received by NADY should not have been paid to him but used by the corporate defendants to meet their legal obligation under Nevada's Constitution to pay the class members the minimum wages they were owed and NADY would not have received those monies from the corporate defendants if he had not commanded the corporate defendants to pay those monies to him and if the corporate defendants had acted properly and used those monies to pay the class members such owed, but unpaid, minimum wages.

1           43. Although plaintiffs do not allege it was necessary for NADY to have such  
2 knowledge for them to be granted the relief sought in this fourth claim for relief, they  
3 expressly allege, if the Court finds such knowledge must be established for such relief  
4 to be granted, that NADY commanded the payment by the corporate defendants to him  
5 of the monies discussed in paragraphs 41 and 42 with full knowledge that the  
6 corporate defendants only had such funds available to pay him because the class  
7 members had not been paid an equal amount of minimum wages they were owed by  
8 the corporate defendants.

9           44. NADY'S retention of the monies he received from the corporate  
10 defendants as alleged in paragraphs 41 and 42, such monies that should have been  
11 properly used by the corporate defendants to pay the class members their owed, but  
12 unpaid, minimum wages, such monies also being the *de facto* property of the class  
13 members, would be against fundamental principles of equity, justice and good  
14 conscience, to the extent the corporate defendants, owing to their payment of such  
15 monies to NADY, are now insolvent and unable to pay the class members the  
16 minimum wages they are owed.

17           45. The named plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the proposed plaintiff  
18 class members, seek, on this Fourth Claim for Relief, a judgment against the defendant  
19 NADY for restitution to the class of the amount of NADY'S unjust enrichment, such  
20 amount to be determined based upon how much the corporate defendants are found to  
21 owe the class members for unpaid minimum wages that the corporate defendants are  
22 unable to pay the class members (the "deficiency amount") and how much NADY has  
23 been unjustly enriched as alleged in this claim for relief up to, but not in excess of, that  
24 deficiency amount, along with other suitable equitable relief and an award of  
25 attorney's fees, interest and costs, as provided for by Nevada's Constitution and other  
26 applicable laws.

27  
28           WHEREFORE, plaintiffs demand the relief on each cause of action as alleged

1 aforesaid.

2 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

3

4 Dated this 22nd day of June, 2015.

5

6 Leon Greenberg Professional Corporation

7

8 By: /s/ Leon Greenberg

9

10

LEON GREENBERG, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No.: 8094  
2965 South Jones Blvd- Suite E4  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146  
(702) 383-6085  
Attorney for Plaintiff

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned certifies that on August 19, 2015, she served the within:

**SECOND AMENDED AND SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

by court electronic service to:

TO:

Esther C. Rodriguez, Esq.  
RODRIGUEZ LAW OFFICES, P.C.  
10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, NV 89145

*/s/ Dana Sniegocki*

---

Dana Sniegocki



1 LEON GREENBERG, ESQ., SBN 8094  
2 DANA SNIEGOCKI, ESQ., SBN 11715  
3 Leon Greenberg Professional Corporation  
4 2965 South Jones Blvd- Suite E3  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146  
6 (702) 383-6085  
7 (702) 385-1827(fax)  
8 leongreenberg@overtimelaw.com  
9 dana@overtimelaw.com  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DISTRICT COURT**  
**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MICHAEL MURRAY, and MICHAEL  
RENO, Individually and on behalf of  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

A CAB TAXI SERVICE LLC, and A  
CAB, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No.: A-12-669926-C

Dept.: I

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Court entered the attached Order Granting  
Summary Judgment, Severing Claims, and Directing Entry of Final Judgment on  
August 21, 2018.

Dated: August 22, 2018

LEON GREENBERG PROFESSIONAL CORP.

/s/ Leon Greenberg

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leon Greenberg, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 8094  
2965 S. Jones Boulevard - Ste. E-3  
Las Vegas, NV 89146  
Tel (702) 383-6085  
Attorney for the Plaintiffs

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2  
3 The undersigned certifies that on August 22, 2018, she served the within:

4  
5 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

6 by court electronic service to:

7 TO:

8 Esther C. Rodriguez, Esq.  
9 RODRIGUEZ LAW OFFICES, P.C.  
10 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150  
11 Las Vegas, NV 89145

12  
13 /s/ *Dana Sniegocki*

14 Dana Sniegocki

*Steven D. Grierson*

1 ORDR  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MICHAEL MURRAY and  
MICHAEL RENO, individually and  
on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

A CAB TAXI SERVICE LLC, A  
CAB, LLC, and CREIGHTON J.  
NADY,

Defendants.

**Case No.: A-12-669926-C**

**DEPT.: I**

**ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT, SEVERING CLAIMS,  
AND DIRECTING ENTRY OF FINAL  
JUDGMENT**

**Hearing Date: June 5, 2018  
Hearing Time: 3:00 p.m.**

On June 5, 2018, with all the parties appearing before the Court by their respective counsel as noted in the record, the Court heard argument on plaintiffs' motion filed on April 17, 2018 on an Order Shortening Time seeking various relief ("Plaintiffs' Motion"), including the holding of defendants in contempt for their violation of the Court's prior Orders appointing a Special Master; granting partial summary judgment to the plaintiffs pursuant to their motion filed on November 2, 2017; striking defendants' answer, granting a default judgment, and directing a prove

<input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary Dismissal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Involuntary Dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/> Stipulated Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Stipulated Dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/> Default Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Motion to Dismiss by Deft(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Judgment of Arbitration

1 up hearing. Certain portions of Plaintiffs' Motion, not further discussed in this Order,  
2 were resolved pursuant to other Orders issued by the Court and at a hearing held on  
3 May 23, 2018. The Court grants plaintiffs' motion, to the extent indicated in this  
4 Order; it Orders a severance of the previously bifurcated claims against defendant  
5 Creighton J. Nady ("Nady"); and it Orders entry of final judgment against defendants  
6 A Cab Taxi Service LLC and A Cab, LLC (collectively "A Cab") and other relief as  
7 indicated herein.  
8

### 9 **RELEVANT PRIOR HISTORY - CLASS CERTIFICATION**

10  
11 On February 10, 2016 the Court initially granted class action certification under  
12 NRCP Rule 23(b)(2) and (b)(3) of claims made in this case pursuant to Article 15,  
13 Section 16 of the Nevada Constitution, the Minimum Wage Amendment (the  
14 "MWA") and for penalties under NRS 608.040 alleged to have arisen in favor of  
15 certain class members as a result of such MWA violations. The class so certified in  
16 that Order was, for purposes of damages under NRCP Rule 23(b)(3), composed of  
17 current and former taxi driver employees of defendant A-Cab from July 1, 2007  
18 through December 31, 2015, and for appropriate equitable or injunctive relief under  
19 NRCP Rule 23(b)(2) from July 1, 2007 to the present and continuing into the future.  
20 Via subsequent Orders the Court modified and amended that initial class certification  
21 order pursuant to NRCP Rule 23(c)(1). Via its Order entered on November 21, 2016,  
22 it granted class certification under NRCP Rule 23 of the third and fourth claims for  
23 relief, first made in the Second Amended and Supplemental Complaint filed on  
24 August 19, 2016 and made solely against defendant Nady based upon "alter ego" and  
25 similar allegations. Via its Order entered on June 7, 2017, it limited the membership  
26 in the class for the period of July 1, 2007 through October 8, 2010 and dismissed  
27 certain class members and claims under the MWA accruing during that time period. It  
28 did so consistent with the Nevada Supreme Court's ruling in *Perry v. Terrible Herbst*,

1 *Inc.*, 383 P.3d 257 (Nev. Sup. Ct. 2016) on the MWA's applicable statute of  
2 limitations and what the Court found was the proper granting of an equitable toll of  
3 the statute of limitations under the MWA for certain class members.  
4

5 **FINDINGS SUPPORTING RELIEF GRANTED BY THE COURT**  
6

7 The Court makes the following findings of fact and law supporting the relief  
8 granted by this Order. The recited findings are not necessarily all of the findings that  
9 would appropriately support the relief granted based upon the extensive record  
10 presented, but they are the ones of fact and law that the Court believes provide at least  
11 minimally sufficient support for its decision to grant the relief set forth in this Order:  
12

- 13 1. A Cab was an employer of the class members during the time period at  
14 issue and was required to pay the class members the minimum wage  
15 specified by the MWA.  
16
- 17 2. A Cab used Quickbooks computer software to prepare the paychecks  
18 issued to the class members during the class period. A record of the  
19 gross wages paid by A Cab to every class member during every pay  
20 period exists in the Quickbooks computer files maintained by A Cab.  
21 The Court Ordered A Cab to produce those records to the plaintiffs'  
22 counsel and A Cab provided certain Excel files to the plaintiffs' counsel  
23 in compliance with that Order.  
24
- 25 3. A Cab used a computer software system called Cab Manager in which it  
26 recorded the activities of its taxi cabs and the class members. The Cab  
27 Manager software created a computer data file record indicating that a  
28

1 particular class member worked, meaning they drove a taxi cab, on a  
2 particular date. The Court Ordered A Cab to produce its Cab Manager  
3 computer data file records to the plaintiffs' counsel and A Cab provided  
4 those computer data files to the plaintiffs' counsel in compliance with that  
5 Order.  
6

- 7
- 8 4. Pursuant to NRS 608.115(1)(d), A Cab was required to maintain a record  
9 of the total hours worked by each class member for both each day they  
10 worked and for each pay period. NRS 608.115(2) required A Cab to  
11 furnish to each employee the information required by that section within  
12 10 days after the employee submits a request. A Cab had this obligation  
13 throughout the entire period of July 1, 2007 through December 31, 2015  
14 during which the class members' damages under the MWA are at issue  
15 (the "Class Period").  
16
- 17 5. Except for the period between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2015, A  
18 Cab has not produced any record of hours worked by the class members  
19 that it can properly claim complies with any of the requirements of NRS  
20 608.115(1)(d).  
21
- 22 6. For the period between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2015, the  
23 Excel files produced by A Cab and discussed in ¶ 2 set forth an amount of  
24 hours worked by each class member during each pay period. A Cab gave  
25 testimony at an NRCP Rule 30(b)(6) deposition, the relevant excerpts  
26 being placed in the record, that its Quickbooks records for that time  
27 period contained an accurate statement of the total hours worked by each  
28 class member during each pay period. Plaintiffs do not agree that such

1 Quickbooks hours of work are fully accurate, but insist A Cab should be  
2 bound by its testimony that such hours of work are accurately set forth in  
3 those Quickbooks records. The Court agrees and finds A Cab cannot  
4 dispute that the Quickbooks records it produced for the period between  
5 January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2015 contain an accurate statement of  
6 the hours worked during each pay period by each class member.  
7

8 7. Except for the Quickbooks records discussed in ¶ 6, the only information  
9 that A Cab admits possessing on the hours worked by the class members  
10 during the Class Period is information in paper "trip sheets" that its taxi  
11 drivers are required to complete each work shift. Those trip sheets, when  
12 properly completed and legible, will be time stamped with the taxi  
13 driver's shift start time and shift end time for a workday and will also  
14 indicate periods of time that the taxi driver recorded themselves as being  
15 on a break and not working during that workday. A Cab has repeatedly  
16 asserted that those trip sheets contain an accurate record of the hours  
17 worked by every class member and can, and should, be relied upon to  
18 determine their hours of work.  
19

20 8. The trip sheets in the possession of A Cab, to the extent they contain  
21 accurate information, do not meet the requirements of NRS 608.115(1)(d)  
22 or NRS 608.115(2). They are not a record of a total amount of hours or  
23 fractions thereof worked in a pay period or in a workday by an individual  
24 taxi driver. They are, at most, a record from which such information  
25 could be obtained by further examination and calculation, however such  
26 examination and calculation could not, and was not, furnished within 10  
27 days as required by NRS 608.115(2). Assuming a trip sheet is accurate,  
28

1 by examining the start time and end time of each trip sheet and  
2 calculating the interval between those two times a workday length could  
3 be ascertained. After deducting any non-working break time recorded on  
4 the trip sheet from that workday length, the total amount of time worked  
5 by the taxi driver for that workday could be determined.  
6

7 9. The requirements of NRS 608.115(1)(d) are mandatory for employers and  
8 compliance with those requirements are of critical importance to the  
9 MWA.<sup>1</sup> Whether an employer has paid the minimum wage required by  
10 the MWA during a particular pay period requires an examination of both  
11 the wages paid to the employee and the hours they worked during the pay  
12 period.<sup>2</sup> A Cab's failure to maintain the records required by NRS  
13 608.115(1)(d) prior to 2013, unless remedied, would render a pay period  
14 by pay period accounting of its MWA compliance, based upon an exact  
15 record of the hours worked by and wages paid to each individual class  
16 member, impossible for the period prior to 2013.  
17

18 10. The MWA, being a provision of the Nevada Constitution, commands and  
19 requires vigorous enforcement by this Court. By its express language it  
20 confers upon employees a right to "....be entitled to all remedies available  
21

---

22  
23 <sup>1</sup> A Cab was also advised on April 30, 2009 by an investigator for the United States  
24 Department of Labor that it "must keep a record of actual hours worked" of the class  
25 members. *See*, Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification filed May 19, 2015, Ex. "B."  
26 While the absence of such an advisement would not relieve A Cab of its duty to keep  
the records required by NRS 608.115(1)(d), such history would support a conclusion  
that A Cab's failure to maintain those records was intentional and designed to render  
any future minimum wage law enforcement less effective.

27 <sup>2</sup> An exception exists if the wages paid are large enough to render an MWA violation  
28 impossible. A week only contains 168 hours and a weekly wage of \$1,218 would  
establish minimum wage compliance at \$7.25 an hour (168 x 7.25 = \$1,218).

1 under the law or in equity appropriate to remedy any violation..."<sup>3</sup> of its  
2 provisions. As a result, A Cab's failure to maintain the records required  
3 by NRS 608.115(1)(d) can be neither minimized nor tolerated and cannot  
4 be allowed to frustrate the enforcement of the class members' rights  
5 secured by the MWA.  
6

- 7  
8 11. The Court, in response to its foregoing findings, and in furtherance of its  
9 obligation under the MWA, via Orders entered on February 7, 2018 and  
10 February 13, 2018, appointed a Special Master in this case who was  
11 tasked with reviewing the trip sheets in the possession of A Cab and  
12 creating the record of hours worked per pay period for each class member  
13 required by NRS 608.115(1)(d). The Court directed that A Cab pay for  
14 such Special Master because of A Cab's failure to maintain proper  
15 records under NRS 608.115, and to deposit \$25,000 with the Special  
16 Master as a payment towards the cost of their work. At that stage in  
17 litigation, it would not have been equitable nor justified to require  
18 Plaintiffs to pay for work performed by the Special Master when it was  
19 Defendant A Cab's failure to comply with NRS.608.115. A Cab failed to  
20 make such payment within the time period specified by the Court. As a  
21 result, the Special Master advised the Court that they have incurred  
22 \$41,000 in costs towards their completion of their assignment and will  
23 not proceed further with that assignment until they are in receipt of  
24 sufficient assurances that they will be paid for their work. The Special  
25 Master has budgeted \$180,000 as the projected total cost to complete  
26 their assignment.

---

27 <sup>3</sup> Nevada Constitution, Article 15, Section 16 (B).  
28 7.

1  
2  
3 12. In assessing the character of A Cab's conduct, it is instructive to note that  
4 A Cab did not make, or offer to make, an *admissible* showing of its  
5 financial position in order to evidence that it was unable to make such  
6 payment. Rather, it relied solely on its strenuous protests and summary  
7 balance sheet buttressed only by the self-serving affidavit of Defendant  
8 Nady.

9  
10 13. The Court, in a minute Order issued on March 6, 2018, noted its  
11 awareness of A Cab's failure to pay the then overdue \$25,000 deposit to  
12 the Special Master and A Cab's communication with the Court advising it  
13 was experiencing financial difficulties and claiming it did not currently  
14 possess the funds to make that payment. For unrelated reasons the Court  
15 in that Order stayed this case, suspended the Special Master's work, and  
16 granted A Cab additional time to raise the funds needed to pay the Special  
17 Master during the pendency of that stay. Via a minute Order on May 22,  
18 2018 the Court lifted that stay.

19  
20 14. On May 23, 2018, June 2, 2018, and June 5, 2018 the Court conducted  
21 hearings in connection with Plaintiffs' Motion and also received various  
22 written submissions from A Cab and plaintiffs' counsel regarding A Cab's  
23 failure to pay the Special Master. The result of those hearings and  
24 submissions, in respect to the status of the Special Master and A Cab's  
25 payment to him for the completion of his work, was that A Cab either will  
26 not or cannot make any payment to the Special Master. Except for  
27 urging this Court to stay this case, and await the conclusion of certain  
28 other proceedings that A Cab asserts will narrow the class claims in this

1 case, A Cab proposed no cure for its violation of the Court's Orders  
2 appointing the Special Master. It did not state when, if ever, it intended  
3 to comply with those Orders or propose any other method for the Court to  
4 properly, promptly and appropriately bring this case to conclusion.  
5

- 6 15. The conduct of A Cab in violating the Court's Orders appointing a Special  
7 Master is not the first instance of A Cab violating the Court's Orders or  
8 engaging in documented litigation misconduct in this case. On March 4,  
9 2016 the Court, over A Cab's objections, entered an Order adopting the  
10 Report and Recommendation of the Discovery Commissioner sanctioning  
11 A Cab \$3,238.95 for obstructing discovery. The Court made specific and  
12 detailed findings in that Order in respect to A Cab's failure to produce the  
13 Quickbooks and Cab Manager computer data files; A Cab's delay in  
14 producing such materials during the eight months plaintiffs' motion to  
15 compel their production had been pending; A Cab's compelling of the  
16 unnecessary deposition of a non-party witness in respect to the production  
17 of the Cab Manager records; and the abusive and inexcusable conduct of  
18 defendant Nady as an NRCP Rule 30(b)(6) deposition witness. As  
19 reflected at pages 2 and 3 in the transcript of the hearing held on  
20 November 18, 2015 by the Discovery Commissioner that resulted in such  
21 Order, the Discovery Commissioner's review of that deposition transcript  
22 raised extremely serious concerns about the defendants' inexcusable  
23 conduct.<sup>4</sup>  
24

---

25 <sup>4</sup> The Discovery Commissioner advised defendants of her concern at that time that  
26 defendant's conduct, if it continued, might result in some form of default judgment:  
27 "It was inexcusable, what your client called Plaintiffs' counsel during the deposition,  
28 which I will not repeat in open court. Inexcusable, almost to the point where I'm not  
sure he should be allowed to be a Defendant in the 8th Judicial District Court-- that's  
how serious this is-- because I have no confidence in what he's-- how he's answering  
questions."  
9.

1  
2  
3 16. The Court has made every effort to fashion a method for the fair, just, and  
4 most precise disposition of the MWA claims in this case in light of A  
5 Cab's failure to maintain a record of the hours worked per pay period of  
6 each class members as required by NRS 608.115(1)(d). It is not disputed  
7 that an accurate record exists in A Cab's Quickbooks computer files of the  
8 amount of wages paid every pay period to every class member. If the  
9 records required by NRS 608.115(1)(d) had been maintained, disposition  
10 of the "lower tier" (currently \$7.25 an hour) MWA claims in this case  
11 would be a matter of simple arithmetic. In response to A Cab's  
12 insistence that the hours of work information required by NRS  
13 608.115(1)(d) can be accurately ascertained by examining and performing  
14 calculations on the trip sheets, albeit not within 10 days as required by  
15 NRS 608.115(2), the Court appointed a Special Master. Yet A Cab's  
16 failure to pay the Special Master, or propose any other process, such as  
17 the application of statistical sample or other reasonable methodology as a  
18 substitute would, unless other measures were taken by the Court, render a  
19 recovery for the class members on their MWA claims impossible. That  
20 would appear to be precisely what A Cab's conduct is designed to  
21 achieve.

22 17. A Cab's argument that the only way to determine the class members'  
23 hours of work is to examine every one of their trip sheets, and that it  
24 should be the burden of the plaintiffs' themselves (or more properly their  
25 appointed class counsel) to bear the expense of doing so, cannot be  
26 adopted by the Court, and is inapposite under the guidance provided by  
27 *Anderson v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S. 680, 687 (1946),  
28

1 superseded by statute on other grounds, 29 U.S.C. § 254(a) ("When the  
2 employer has kept proper and accurate records the employee may easily  
3 discharge his burden by securing the production of those records. But  
4 where the employer's records are inaccurate or inadequate and the  
5 employee cannot offer convincing substitutes a more difficult problem  
6 arises. The solution, however, is not to penalize the employee by denying  
7 him any recovery on the ground that he is unable to prove the precise  
8 extent of uncompensated work. Such a result would place a premium on  
9 an employer's failure to keep proper records in conformity with his  
10 statutory duty; it would allow the employer to keep the benefits of an  
11 employee's labors without paying due compensation"). Doing so would  
12 serve to reward A Cab for its violation of NRS 608.115(1)(d) by shifting  
13 the now considerable burden and cost of ascertaining the class members'  
14 hours of work onto the plaintiffs' themselves. It is A Cab that should  
15 properly bear that burden and expense and it was directed to do so  
16 through the offices of the Special Master that it has failed to pay.  
17

- 18 18. In resolving MWA claims where no record of the total hours of work of  
19 the employees per pay period exists as required by NRS 608.115(1)(d), or  
20 such an amount cannot be precisely calculated in every instance (in this  
21 case as a result of A Cab's failure to pay the Special Master), the Court  
22 must adopt a reasonable approximation of those hours of work and  
23 fashion an award of unpaid minimum wages based upon that  
24 approximation even though the amount so awarded is not exact. *See,*  
25 *Anderson v. Mt. Clemons Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S. 680, 685-88 (1946) ("The  
26 employer cannot be heard to complain that the damages lack the  
27 exactness of measurement that would be possible had he kept records....")  
28

1 *Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exchange*, 115 Cal. App. 4th 715, 750 (Cal. Ct. App.,  
2 1st Dist. 2004) and other cases. Applying any approach other than the  
3 one adopted by *Mt. Clemons* would frustrate the purposes of the MWA  
4 and make effective enforcement of the Nevada Constitution's right to a  
5 minimum wage impossible.  
6

7  
8 19. In support of their motion for partial summary judgment ("plaintiffs'  
9 MPSJ"), filed on November 2, 2017, the plaintiffs rely on portions of an  
10 Excel file that contain information for the time period of January 1, 2013  
11 through December 31, 2015, such information for that time period being  
12 compiled from the Quickbooks records produced by defendants. That  
13 Excel file, "ACAB-ALL," was created by Charles Bass whose work  
14 doing so was reviewed by Terrence Clauretie Ph.D. and the subject of his  
15 report, at Ex. "B" of plaintiffs' MPSJ, which was furnished to A Cab  
16 along with the "ACAB-ALL" Excel file. Both Dr. Clauretie and Charles  
17 Bass were designated as expert witnesses by the plaintiffs and deposed by  
18 the defendants in that capacity.

19  
20 20. The "A CAB ALL" Excel file created by plaintiffs contains various types  
21 of information taken from the Quickbooks and Cab Manager computer  
22 data files produced by A Cab to plaintiffs. As germane to this Order, it  
23 summarizes that information for the period October 8, 2010 through  
24 December 31, 2015 and makes calculations on that information, in  
25 respect to the following:

- 26 (a) In respect to every pay period, it sets forth the amount of  
27 wages paid by A Cab to the class member as recorded in A  
28

1 Cab's Quickbooks records and the number of shifts they  
2 worked during the pay period as recorded in A Cab's Cab  
3 Manager records (the "shifts worked");  
4

5 (b) For the period January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2015,  
6 it sets forth the amount of hours worked by the class member  
7 for each pay period as recorded by A Cab's Quickbooks  
8 records (the "payroll hours");  
9

10 (c) By dividing the class member's wages paid per pay period by  
11 the recorded payroll hours worked per pay, for the period  
12 January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2015, it calculates the  
13 amount, if any, that the class member's wages were below  
14 the \$7.25 an hour requirement for each pay period;  
15

16 (d) It allows the user of the Excel file to enter a "shift length"  
17 amount that it applies as a uniform length to every shift  
18 worked during every pay period from October 8, 2010  
19 through December 31, 2012. It then, based upon that  
20 selected shift length, calculates the amount, if any, that the  
21 class members' wages were below the \$7.25 an hour  
22 requirement for each pay period.  
23

24 21. A Cab argues that the "A CAB ALL" Excel file is inaccurate and  
25 the calculations it makes cannot be relied upon but it cites no error  
26 in any calculation it purports to perform. That Excel file was  
27 furnished to defendants and examined by their own expert, Scott  
28

1 Leslie, who testified at his deposition, the relevant excerpts being  
2 presented to the Court, that he concurred with Dr. Clauretie's  
3 finding that the calculations it made were arithmetically correct. A  
4 Cab also argues it cannot be sure the information contained in the  
5 "A CAB ALL" Excel file and upon which its calculations rely (the  
6 payroll hours worked recorded in the Quickbooks records from  
7 January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2015, the wages paid, and  
8 the shifts worked, during each pay period for each class member) is  
9 accurately taken from A Cab's Quickbooks and Cab Manager  
10 records. Yet it has not provided to the Court a single instance  
11 where its records contain information that conflicts with the per  
12 pay period information set forth in the "A CAB ALL" Excel file.  
13

- 14 22. Plaintiffs assert the "ACAB ALL" Excel file, and the work of  
15 Charles Bass in placing information from A Cab's Quickbooks and  
16 Cab Manager files in that Excel file and performing calculations on  
17 that information, is a "summary or calculation" of A Cab's  
18 voluminous records pursuant to NRS 52.275 though Charles Bass  
19 is also designated as an expert witness. It asserts the calculations  
20 made by the "ACAB ALL" Excel file are properly considered on  
21 that basis. A Cab asserts that the "ACAB ALL" Excel file's  
22 calculations are not properly considered under NRS 52.275 or on  
23 any other basis and that neither Charles Bass nor Dr. Clauretie are  
24 properly qualified as expert witnesses. The calculations made by  
25 the "ACAB ALL" Excel file are not the product of any expert  
26 "opinion." They involve simple arithmetic, dividing an amount  
27 paid per pay period by a number of hours worked per pay period  
28

1 and calculating the amount, if any, that such resulting number is  
2 less than \$7.25 an hour. The plaintiffs, based upon Dr. Clauretie's  
3 report of the detailed review he conducted of how Charles Bass  
4 assembled the "ACAB ALL" Excel file, and the declaration of  
5 Charles Bass, have met their *prima facie* burden of showing that  
6 such Excel file contains information properly assembled from the  
7 Quickbooks and Cab Manager computer files produced by A Cab  
8 pursuant to the Court's Order. A Cab has provided no contrary  
9 evidence identifying even a single instance in the many thousands  
10 of pay periods set forth in the "ACAB ALL" Excel file where it  
11 contains either inaccurate information that does not match A Cab's  
12 records or incorrect arithmetic calculations. Accordingly, the  
13 Court finds that the calculations made by the "ACAB ALL" Excel  
14 file are properly relied upon and constitute facts which are  
15 undisputed by any evidence to the contrary and may be properly  
16 relied upon by the Court, both to establish liability and to establish  
17 the amount of damages..  
18

- 19 23. Plaintiffs have also furnished to defendants on September 29, 2017  
20 an Excel File "Damages 2007-2010" with the Supplemental Expert  
21 Report (Declaration) of Charles Bass of September 27, 2017.<sup>5</sup>  
22 That "Damages 2007-2010" Excel file, as discussed in the  
23 September 27, 2017 declaration of Charles Bass, performs  
24 calculations in a fashion identical to the "A CAB ALL" file by  
25 allowing the assignment of a uniform "shift length" to every shift  
26

---

27 <sup>5</sup> This document, but not the Excel file, is introduced into the record at Ex. "A" of the  
28 declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.

1 worked by a class member during a pay period. It also contains the  
2 same information in respect to wages paid and shifts worked for  
3 that time period for each pay period for each class member, as  
4 taken from A Cab's Quickbooks and Cab Manager computer files.  
5 It was assembled using the same process reviewed by Dr. Clauretie  
6 and discussed in his report in respect to the "A CAB ALL" file. A  
7 Cab has not disputed the accuracy of any calculations made in, or  
8 information contained in, the "Damages 2007-2010" Excel file.  
9 For the reasons discussed in ¶ 22, the Court finds that the  
10 calculations made by the "Damages 2007-2010" Excel file are  
11 properly relied upon and constitute facts undisputed by any  
12 counter evidence from A Cab.  
13

- 14 24. The "ACAB ALL" Excel file, for the 14,200 pay periods it  
15 examines for the time period January 1, 2013 through December  
16 31, 2015, calculates that the class members' average shift length  
17 (average working time per shift) was 9.21 hours. It arrived at that  
18 figure based upon A Cab's payroll hours worked Quickbooks  
19 records and the total number of shifts class members were recorded  
20 as working by A Cab's Cab Manager records. A Cab does not  
21 dispute that is an accurate figure and Dr. Clauretie, in his report,  
22 verifies its accuracy. A Cab's expert, Scott Leslie, in connection  
23 with his rebuttal expert report,<sup>6</sup> for which he was paid \$47,203,<sup>7</sup>  
24

25 <sup>6</sup> This report is introduced into the record at Ex. "B" of the declaration of class  
26 counsel filed on June 20, 2018 who, in that declaration, also states the particulars  
27 contained in the report regarding the average shift length shown by the trip sheet  
28 review conducted by Mr. Leslie.

<sup>7</sup> Ex. "B" of the declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.

1 undertook to examine the actual trip sheets of class members for 56  
2 pay periods between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2015 and  
3 concluded that, on average, each shift worked by each class  
4 member during those 56 pay periods consisted of 9.5 hours of  
5 working time. He also undertook an examination of the actual trip  
6 sheets of class members for 38 pay periods between October 8,  
7 2010 and December 31, 2012 and concluded that, on average, each  
8 shift worked by each class member during those 38 pay periods  
9 consisted of 9.8 hours of working time. He concluded that the  
10 average shift length was 9.7 hours of working time for all of the  
11 trip sheets he examined for 123 pay periods. Plaintiffs submitted  
12 declarations from three class members indicating that class  
13 members were, in most instances, assigned to work 12 hour shifts;  
14 they typically worked shifts of 11 hours or longer in length after  
15 deducting their break time; that class members took few breaks  
16 during their shifts or averaged breaks of less than one hour in  
17 length during a shift; and unless a taxi broke down a shift was at  
18 least 10 hours long. *See*, Ex "F" and "O" plaintiffs' motion for  
19 class certification filed May 19, 2015, Ex. "B" of opposition to  
20 defendants' motion for summary judgment filed December 14,  
21 2017. A Cab, through Nady, pursuant to an NRCP Rule 30(b)(6)  
22 deposition notice directed to the topic, testified it could only  
23 provide a "guess" as to the average amount of time worked by the  
24 class members each shift. *See*, plaintiffs' motion in limine filed  
25 December 22, 2017 at Ex. "J" and "K."

26  
27 25. Plaintiffs' MPSJ includes the calculations made by the "ACAB  
28

1 ALL" Excel file using A Cab's Quickbooks payroll hours for the  
2 2013-2015 time period in respect to unpaid minimum wages owed  
3 at the \$7.25 an hour "lower tier" minimum wage rate (Column "K"  
4 to Ex. "D" to that motion, showing its examination of each of  
5 14,200 pay period and consisting of 375 pages). It also includes a  
6 consolidated statement of the amount, if any, of unpaid minimum  
7 wages owed to each class member at \$7.25 an hour (Column "D" to  
8 Ex. "E" listing 548 class members stretching over 19 pages).

9  
10 26. Plaintiffs have introduced into the record the following:

11  
12 (a) The amounts owed at \$7.25 an hour, if any, using the  
13 "ACAB ALL" Excel file for the period October 8, 2010  
14 through December 31, 2012 for each of 9,759 pay periods  
15 and to each of 527 class members when a constant shift  
16 length of 9.21 hours per shift is used to make those  
17 calculations;<sup>8</sup>

18  
19 (b) The amounts owed at \$7.25 an hour, and prior to July 1,  
20 2010 at the applicable "lower tier" minimum wage which  
21 was less than \$7.25 an hour, if any, using the "Damages  
22 2007-2010" Excel file for the period July 1, 2007 through  
23 October 7, 2010 for each of 13,948 pay periods and to each  
24 of 378 class members when a constant shift length of 9.21  
25

26  
27 <sup>8</sup> These are introduced into the record at Ex. "3" and Ex. "4" to Ex. "C" of the  
28 declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.

hours per shift is used to make those calculations;<sup>9</sup>

- (c) A consolidated chart listing the amounts owed to each class member when the amounts detailed in ¶ 25 and ¶ 26(a) and ¶ 26(b) are combined.<sup>10</sup>

27. On November 5, 2014, A Cab and Nady entered into a consent judgment in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada with the United States Department of Labor that provided for the payment by A Cab of \$139,988.80 to resolve certain claims for unpaid minimum wages owed under the Fair Labor Standards Act for the time period October 1, 2010 through October 1, 2012. *See*, Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification filed May 19, 2015, Ex. "A." That consent judgment included a list of persons, A Cab employees who are also class members in this case, who were subject to that consent judgment and were to receive portions of such \$139,988.80 payment in amounts determined by the United States Secretary of Labor. *Id.* Such consent judgment does not, by its terms, or by operation of law, either preempt or resolve the MWA claims made in this case. A Cab, in its Answers filed with the Court, has raised a Twenty-Third Affirmative defense of accord and satisfaction. Plaintiffs served an interrogatory request seeking details of that defense, including the amounts paid to the class

---

<sup>9</sup> These are introduced into the record at Ex. "1" and Ex. "2" to Ex. "C" of the declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.

<sup>10</sup> These are introduced into the record at Ex. "5" to Ex. "C" of the declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.

1 members alleged by A Cab to support such defense.<sup>11</sup> A Cab  
2 referenced the consent judgment case in its interrogatory answer,  
3 but provided no information on the amounts so paid under the same  
4 to any particular class members. It also referred to its production  
5 of documents that it implied may contain such information.  
6 Plaintiffs' counsel asserts it has not been provided with  
7 documentation from A Cab of the amounts so paid, in respect to  
8 the exact amount paid to each individual involved class member  
9 and not the entire \$139,988.80, though it does believe some such  
10 amounts were paid.<sup>12</sup>  
11

12 28. In response to plaintiffs' counsel's assertions regarding the United  
13 States Department of Labor ("USDOL") settlement, A Cab, in its  
14 "Supplemental Authority In Response to Declaration of June 20,  
15 2018," filed on July 10, 2018, asserts it provided relevant  
16 documentation regarding that settlement at Response 7 to  
17 plaintiffs' Fifth Set of Interrogatories. That response to plaintiffs'  
18 request that A Cab specify the amounts paid to each involved class  
19 member under the USDOL settlement consists of three words:  
20 "Please see attached." A Cab provides "attached" to that  
21 interrogatory response seven pages of documents with the names of  
22 various persons, and associated amounts that, facially, would seem  
23 to indicate a record of payments made to those persons. It offers no  
24 explanation, in its interrogatory response, of what those documents  
25

---

26 <sup>11</sup> That interrogatory and defendants' response, No. 26, is introduced into the record at  
27 Ex. "D" of the declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.

28 <sup>12</sup> This is set forth at ¶ 5 of the declaration of class counsel filed on June 20, 2018.  
20.

1 are. Nor in its July 10, 2018 filing did A Cab include any  
2 declaration corroborating and authenticating those seven pages of  
3 documents that, facially, seem to indicate payments of itemized  
4 amounts to certain class members from the USDOL settlement. In  
5 a further supplement filed by plaintiffs' counsel on July 13, 2018  
6 plaintiffs' counsel noted that A Cab's supplement filed on July 10,  
7 2018 lacked any proper corroboration or authentication of the  
8 facially relevant documents. Plaintiffs' counsel also noted that  
9 those documents only itemized payments totaling \$77,178.87 of the  
10 total \$139,988.80 paid under the USDOL settlement, meaning A  
11 Cab could not, from those documents, corroborate which class  
12 members may have received an additional \$62,800.43 from that  
13 settlement. In a further supplement filed on July 18, 2018 A Cab's  
14 counsel furnished their declaration (Ex. "F" thereto) purporting to  
15 authenticate the previously provided documents from the USDOL  
16 and certain additional, and not previously furnished, USDOL  
17 documents provided with that supplement.  
18

- 19 29. Plaintiffs, upon review of the July 18, 2018 supplement filed by A  
20 Cab, filed a further supplement with the Court on August 3, 2018.  
21 In that August 3, 2018 Supplement and the Ex. "A" declaration of  
22 plaintiffs' counsel thereto, plaintiffs have established to the Court's  
23 satisfaction that A Cab has demonstrated the disposition of  
24 \$81,852.19 from the USDOL settlement. The Court is further  
25 satisfied that Ex. "B" of such supplement, based upon that  
26 \$81,852.19 from the USDOL settlement, properly applies a set off  
27 in A Cab's favor of the judgment amounts owed to the class  
28

1 members previously submitted to the Court and discussed at ¶ 26.  
2 As further detailed by that supplement, \$58,136.61 of the  
3 \$139,988.80 USDOL settlement paid by A Cab remains  
4 unaccounted for. That \$58,136.61 is potentially, in whole or in  
5 part, an additional amount that A Cab can set off against the  
6 judgments to be awarded by the Court to the class members if A  
7 Cab can itemize the amounts of that \$58,136.61 paid to the  
8 involved class members.  
9

## 10 DISCUSSION OF RELIEF GRANTED

### 11 Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment

12  
13  
14 The Court notes we are dealing with important rights, important because the  
15 people of Nevada have said so by virtue of inserting what would have otherwise been  
16 a statutory provision into the Constitution of the State of Nevada. The Court has great  
17 respect for the constitutions and constitutional law. The Court believes that they form  
18 the basic backbone of the laws and government enumerated therein, both for the  
19 United States of America and for the State of Nevada. If the people of this state have  
20 said that there is a minimum wage act which entitles employees to be paid a certain  
21 amount, in conformity therewith, it is incumbent upon the Court to assure that at the  
22 end of the day justice is done, even though the justice that is done turns out to be of a  
23 somewhat imprecise nature.

24 Plaintiffs filed three (3) versions of their motion for partial summary judgment  
25 (filed on January 11, 2017, November 2, 2017, and April 17, 2018) each of which was  
26 opposed by defendants, fully briefed and argued through several hours of oral  
27 argument. Although fashioned as a motion for partial summary judgment, by the time  
28

1 Plaintiffs reached oral argument on the present motion it became clear that application  
2 of their arguments regarding the Quickbooks records and the *Mt. Clemens* rationale  
3 effectively resolved not only the period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2015, but  
4 also July 1, 2007 to January 1, 2013, effectively resolving all issues in the case and  
5 that therefore final summary judgment is warranted.<sup>13</sup> The Court finds that because  
6 the Defendants could not or would not pay for the special master then pursuant to *Mt.*  
7 *Clemens* the burden of proof shifted to the defense. The Court is satisfied that the  
8 rationale of the *Mt. Clemens* case not only provides ample authority and justification  
9 for this result, but also provides an avenue for this Court to do essential justice to the  
10 parties.

11 Even under *Wood v. Safeway, Inc.*, 121 P.3d 1026, 1031 (Nev. 2005), the  
12 Defendants, as the nonmoving party, had the burden to “do more than simply show  
13 that there is some metaphysical doubt’ as to the operative facts in order to avoid  
14 summary judgment being entered in the moving party’s favor.” *Id* quoting *Matsushita*  
15 *Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986). The Court  
16 finds there is an absence of evidence to support the Defendants’ arguments and to  
17 demonstrate a triable issue of fact. Defendants failed to transcend the pleadings by  
18 putting forth admissible evidence to show a genuine issue of material fact exists given  
19 the aforementioned posture of the case. *See Cuzze v. U. and Community College*  
20 *System of Nevada*, 172 P.3d 131, 134 (Nev. 2007).

21 Furthermore, under *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S. 680, 687–88 (1946) “the  
22 burden then shifts to the employer to come forward with evidence of the precise  
23 amount of work performed or with evidence to negative the reasonableness of the  
24

---

25 <sup>13</sup> On June 5, 2018, during the hours-long oral argument regarding A Cab’s failure to  
26 comply with the Court’s Orders and Plaintiffs’ basis for their calculations, Plaintiffs’  
27 counsel moved the Court for summary judgment on the entire case applying an  
28 approximation to the time period July 1, 2007, to January 1, 2013, based on A Cab’s  
Quickbooks records.

1 inference to be drawn from the employee's evidence. If the employer fails to produce  
2 such evidence, the court may then award damages to the employee, even though the  
3 result be only approximate.”

4       Upon the filing of plaintiffs’ first motion for partial summary judgment, and its  
5 attendant evidence showing the class members performed work for which they were  
6 improperly compensated, filed on January 11, 2017, defendants had the burden to  
7 either put forth evidence of the precise amount of work performed, or negate the  
8 reasonableness of the inference to be drawn by plaintiffs’ evidence in order to create a  
9 genuine issue of material fact. *See Anderson v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S.  
10 680, 688 (1946); *see also Wood v. Safeway, Inc.*, 121 P.3d 1026, 1031 (Nev. 2005).  
11 However, the defendants have failed to do so. Thus, to ensure a both equitable and just  
12 determination of the calculation of damages, the Court appointed a Special Master to  
13 review the tripsheets in order to determine the precise amount of damages. However,  
14 the defendants failed to comply with the Court’s orders and failed to pay for the  
15 special master. Therefore, the Court finds that summary judgment is appropriate as “it  
16 would be a perversion of fundamental principles of justice to deny all relief to the  
17 injured person[s], and thereby relieve the wrongdoer from making any amend for his  
18 acts.” *Anderson v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S. 680, 688 (1946) quoting *Story*  
19 *Parchment Co. v. Paterson Parchment Co.*, 282 U.S. 555, 563, 51 S.Ct. 248, 250, 75  
20 L.Ed. 544. Plaintiffs have put forth enough evidence to prove that the class members  
21 have performed work and have not been paid in accordance with the MWA; the  
22 uncertainty lies only in the amount of damages arising from the Defendants’  
23 violations. *See Id.* It is enough for this Court to follow *Mt. Clemens* in that it is enough  
24 under these circumstances for this Court to find a reasonable inference as to the extent  
25 of the damages and grants summary judgment accordingly as set forth in this order.  
26 *See Id.*

27       The Court made effort to provide fair, equitable, and precise justice to the  
28

1 drivers and to the defendant business. However, it was the Defendants, through a  
2 claimed but unproven inability to pay for the special master, whom continued to  
3 frustrate the Court's intent to provide precise justice, thereby requiring the Court to  
4 deviate from an exact calculation and instead rely upon an approximation as set forth  
5 by *Mt. Clemens*.

6 No disputed triable issues of material fact are presented by A Cab warranting a  
7 denial of the plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment. The motions involve a  
8 review of every pay period, 14,200 in total, contained in A Cab's Quickbooks records  
9 for the time period from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2015. The question  
10 presented by the motions, is whether A Cab during those 14,200 pay periods  
11 complied with the MWA during the period in question. The Court is satisfied that  
12 information, furnished by A Cab, was accurately placed in the "ACAB ALL" Excel  
13 file upon which plaintiffs' rely. The Court is also satisfied that the "ACAB ALL"  
14 Excel file performs the correct arithmetical calculation to determine the underpaid  
15 minimum wage amount, if any, at \$7.25 an hour, for each of the 14,200 pay periods.  
16 The Court is also satisfied it provides an accurate resulting statement of the total  
17 amount, if any, owed for that reason to each class member.

18 A Cab's assertions that the amounts calculated and presented by plaintiffs' are  
19 unreliable is speculative. A Cab does not set forth even a single instance where the  
20 calculations presented in those Exhibits is performed upon information that is not set  
21 forth in A Cab's Quickbooks records or that involves erroneous arithmetic. Its  
22 opposition to the plaintiffs' MPSJ is based upon pure speculation (or an assertion it  
23 should be relieved of its admissions that the Quickbooks records contained accurate  
24 information) and the MPSJ is granted.

25 The primary principle upon which the Court relies in entering the judgment  
26 specified, *infra*, is derived from *Mt. Clemons*. A Cab cannot successfully oppose the  
27 entry of such a judgment in the summary judgment context under the principles set  
28

1 forth in *Mt. Clemons*. There is no other practical means by which the Court can  
2 resolve the MWA claims in this case, except by applying a reasonable approximation  
3 of hours worked to render substantial, though inexact, justice as in *Mt. Clemons*. As  
4 discussed in ¶ 24, the Court's application of an average shift length of 9.21 hours to  
5 fashion a judgment for the class members under the MWA for the time period prior to  
6 January 1, 2013 is a proper, albeit perhaps too favorable to A Cab, application of the  
7 *Mt. Clemons* principles. That 9.21 hours long average shift length is taken from the  
8 very records (the 2013-2015 Quickbooks records) that defendant Nady swore under  
9 oath were *more* accurate than the trip sheets. The class members assert their hours of  
10 work per shift were, on average, considerably longer. Defendants' own expert came  
11 up with *longer* average shift lengths (9.5 and 9.8 hours) based upon his review of 56  
12 and 38 trips sheets for two periods and a 9.7 hours long average shift length for 123  
13 pay periods that he studied. A Cab is bound by its NRCP Rule 30(b)(6) testimony  
14 that it can only "guess" at the proper average shift length of the class members.  
15 Accordingly, it has no competent evidence it can present as to the proper average shift  
16 length prior to January 1, 2013 that should be adopted by the Court and applied under  
17 *Mt. Clemons*. As a result, plaintiffs' request that the Court, as discussed at the June 5,  
18 2018 hearing, enter a final judgment in this matter applying the *Mt. Clemons*  
19 principals, and using an average shift length of 9.21 hours for the class members'  
20 claims accruing prior to January 1, 2013, is properly adopted by the Court and it is  
21 granting a judgment accordingly. Such judgment shall also include interest on each  
22 amount as calculated from January 1, 2016 given the difficulty of applying NRS  
23 17.130 to all of the class members' MWA claims, some of which did not arise until  
24 after the service of the summons and complaint.<sup>14</sup> there is no material issue of fact  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>14</sup> The judgment amounts, with interest, so calculated for each class member are at  
28 Column "G" of Ex. "5" to Ex. "C" of class counsel's declaration of June 20, 2018, that  
chart being annexed hereto as Ex. "A." 26.

1 that A Cab can dispute in respect to the Court's entry of judgment using the *Mt.*  
2 *Clemons* principles given A Cab's inability to proffer any competent evidence on the  
3 class members' average shift length prior to January 1, 2013.

4 A Cab's assertion, made in its affirmative defense and interrogatory response,  
5 that it is entitled to some measure of satisfaction of the class members' MWA claims  
6 based upon the payments it made under the U.S. Department of Labor's consent  
7 judgment (§ 27) would be properly ignored as a sanction. Such action by the Court  
8 would be justified and appropriate in light of A Cab's documented litigation abuses in  
9 this case and its failure to properly respond to plaintiffs' interrogatory seeking such  
10 information. Such action by the Court would also be justified in light of its need to  
11 enter a judgment under the *Mt. Clemons* principles in response to A Cab's conduct, a  
12 judgment that does not afford the class members the full, and precise, measure of  
13 justice they would be entitled to, and receive, if A Cab had complied with NRS  
14 608.115(1)(d). In the exercise of discretion, the Court will, nonetheless, afford A Cab  
15 an opportunity to proffer proof of such payments post judgment and receive  
16 appropriate satisfactions of the judgment amounts entered by this Order for the  
17 involved class members. The Court will not delay entry of final judgment over this  
18 issue, involving a potential offset to A Cab of less than 20% of the amount it is  
19 awarding to the class, and only involving claims accruing to certain identified class  
20 members during the period October 1, 2010 to October 1, 2012. But it has fashioned,  
21 *infra*, provisions that afford A Cab a very fair opportunity to receive the offset it  
22 claims from the consent judgment.

23 In connection with the MPSJ the plaintiffs have asked that the Court forego  
24 entering judgment in favor of any class member when the amount so indicated by Ex.  
25 "E" to the MPSJ is less than \$10.00, on the basis that amounts of under \$10.00 are *de*  
26 *minimis*. Accordingly, the final judgment to be entered in this case for the amount of  
27 unpaid minimum wages owed to the class members for the period January 1, 2013  
28

1 through December 31, 2015 shall be the amounts calculated to be owed to every class  
2 member in Column "D" of Ex. "E" of the MPSJ if such amount is at least \$10.00. As  
3 discussed at ¶ 25 and ¶ 26 plaintiffs have introduced into the record calculations  
4 showing the total amount (if any) owed to each A Cab taxi driver in unpaid minimum  
5 wages for the January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2015 time period, based upon  
6 the Quickbooks time worked records as sought in the MPSJ, and for the period of time  
7 from July 1, 2007 through January 1, 2013 based upon the application of *Mt. Clemons*  
8 principles as discussed further *infra*. The Court has found those calculations to be  
9 accurate as discussed at ¶ ¶ 19-24. Accordingly, attached to this Order as Ex. "A," as  
10 discussed further, *infra*, are the total amounts the Clerk of the Court shall enter as  
11 Judgment amounts for each class member.<sup>15</sup> Those total owed amounts are based  
12 upon the reasoning of the MPSJ which is adopted by the Court to grant judgment to  
13 the class members for the period January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2015 and the  
14 application of the *Mt. Clemons* principles for the time period prior to January 1, 2013.  
15

16 **Plaintiffs' Motion to Hold Defendants in Contempt for Their Violation**  
17 **of the Court's Prior Orders Appointing a Special Master and Striking**  
18 **Defendants' Answer and Directing a Prove Up Hearing.**

19 Alternatively, given the deference this Court must give in enforcing the  
20 Constitution of the State of Nevada, the Court finds that Defendants' persistent failure  
21 to comply with Court orders, and for reasons stated herein, warrants holding  
22 defendants in contempt and striking their answer. Plaintiffs have argued strenuously  
23 for the Court to strike Defendants' answer and award judgment accordingly. While  
24 this Court has been at pains to resolve important issues without resort to sanctions, the  
25 Court cannot avoid the conclusion that if other, less drastic bases were not available, it  
26

---

27 <sup>15</sup> These amounts are the same amounts as Ex. "5" to Ex. "C" of the declaration of class  
28 counsel filed on June 20, 2018 28.

1 would proceed by way of sanction, strike the answer, and award judgment to  
2 Plaintiffs.<sup>16</sup>

3  
4 Accordingly, the following alternative basis is offered.

5  
6 While Plaintiffs' Motion uses the term contempt it does not seek an arrest for  
7 civil contempt but an appropriate remedy, sanction, against A Cab for its failure to  
8 comply with the Court's Orders appointing a Special Master. If those Orders had been  
9 complied with, the Special Master's work would now be complete. The Court would  
10 be proceeding to fashion an appropriate final judgment for the class members based  
11 upon that report and the precise findings, in respect to the hours of work, wages paid,  
12 and minimum wage amounts owed to the class members, it would have contained. A  
13 Cab's failure to comply with those Orders has prevented that result. Plaintiffs do not  
14 propose an order of civil contempt and imprisonment against defendant Nady, A Cab's  
15 principal, as a remedy for that failure. Nor does the Court believe such an Order,  
16 while within the Court's power, is sensible or will serve the interests of justice. As the  
17 Plaintiffs' Motion requests, the Court should fashion some sort of alternative relief,  
18 and judgment, that will resolve this litigation and render substantial justice, albeit not  
19 in the precise form that would have been arrived at if A Cab had complied with the  
20 Court's Orders appointing the Special Master.

21 The Court has inherent power to appropriately sanction, and tailor remedies for,  
22

---

23 <sup>16</sup> The Court finds no prove up hearing is necessary under NRCP Rule 55(b)(2) as A  
24 Cab admits it has no evidence to present on the proper average shift length to be used  
25 by the Court in fashioning a judgment. The Court also finds A Cab is properly  
26 prohibited from presenting further evidence on the proper amount of a default  
27 judgment even if it possessed any germane evidence on that issue as a sanction under  
28 *Young* for the reasons already stated. See, *Blanco v. Blanco*, 311 P.3d 1170, 1176  
(Nev. Sup. Ct. 2013) citing *Foster v. Dingwall*, 227 P.3d 1042, 1050 (Nev. Sup. Ct.  
2010) (Recognizing such a sanction is proper under *Young*).

1 violations of its Orders and in response to a party's improper conduct. *See, Young v.*  
2 *Johnny Ribeiro* 787 P.2d 777, 779 (Nev. Sup. Ct. 1990) ("Litigants and attorneys alike  
3 should be aware that these [inherent] powers may permit sanctions for discovery and  
4 other litigation abuses not specifically proscribed by statute.") As discussed in *Young*  
5 and the subsequent cases from the Nevada Supreme Court that follow *Young*, this  
6 Court should make appropriately detailed and thoughtful written findings when  
7 imposing such sanctions, which can include the striking of an answer and the granting  
8 of a default judgment. Some of the factors the Supreme Court has said may be  
9 considered in determining whether to impose such sanctions are the degree of  
10 willfulness of the offending party, the feasibility and fairness of lesser sanctions, and  
11 the prejudice sustained by the non-offending party. *Id.*, 787 P.2d at 780. It is also  
12 apparent from *Bahena v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, 235 P.3d 592, 599 (Nev. Sup.  
13 Ct. 2010) citing and quoting *Foster v. Dingwall*, 227 P.3d 1042, 1047, 1048 (Nev.  
14 Sup. Ct. 2010) that a demonstrated course of "repetitive, abusive and recalcitrant"  
15 conduct by a party can justify the imposition of such sanctions. *Bahena*, further  
16 discussing *Foster* and approving of its holding, also stated: "[w]e further concluded  
17 [in *Forster*] that entries of complete default are proper where "litigants are  
18 unresponsive and engaged in abusive litigation practices that cause interminable  
19 delays." *Id.*

20 The Court concludes that the record in this case is sufficient under *Young* and  
21 the other controlling precedents to warrant an award of relief in the form requested by  
22 plaintiffs, a striking of defendant A Cab's answer and the entry of a default judgment.  
23 A Cab's improper conduct in violating the Court's Orders appointing a Special Master  
24 is not an isolated incident but "repetitive." Its prior history of improper conduct is  
25 discussed in ¶ 15. That improper conduct has also caused "interminable delays" in the  
26 production of A Cab's critically important Cab Manager and Quickbooks records,  
27 delays A Cab may well have intended to foster in pursuit of an NRCP Rule 41(e)  
28

1 dismissal. The willfulness of A Cab in disregarding the Court's Orders appointing a  
2 Special Master is apparent and A Cab's assertion its failure to comply with those  
3 Orders is a result of a financial inability to pay the Special Master cannot be properly  
4 considered and its evidence to establish same is deficient. If A Cab truly lacks the  
5 financial resources to comply with those Orders it has a remedy under the United  
6 States Bankruptcy Code to seek the protection of the Bankruptcy Court which is  
7 empowered to relieve it from those Orders and oversee the proper disposition of  
8 whatever financial resources it does possess. It has declined to do so and continues to  
9 do business and defend this case in this Court. Having elected to do so, it must  
10 comply with this Court's Orders or face the consequences of its failure to do so.

11 If the Court did not grant summary judgment pursuant to the burden shifting  
12 under Mt. Clemens, the Court would find there are no feasible or fair lesser sanctions  
13 that it can properly impose in lieu of the judgment it is granting *infra*, and the  
14 prejudice sustained by the non-offending party in this case, the class members, would  
15 be too great if it failed to grant that judgment. A Cab has violated its obligations  
16 under NRS 608.115(1)(d), obligations which, if met, would allow the Court to render  
17 full, complete, and precise justice in this matter on the class members' MWA claims.  
18 In response to that violation, the Court directed A Cab to pay a Special Master to  
19 correct such deficiencies in its NRS 608.115(1)(d) compliance. It has failed to do so  
20 and proposed no alternative approach to bring this case to a proper conclusion. The  
21 Court cannot envision any sanction or any other feasible means to justly and properly  
22 redress constitutional grievances, and resolve this case under the circumstances  
23 presented, except through directing entry of the judgment specified, *infra*.

24 The prejudice that would inure to the class members if the Court failed to enter  
25 the judgment specified, *infra*, is manifest and extreme. A Cab's proposal that the  
26 Court await the outcome of other proceedings that may or may not impact some  
27 amount of the class members' claims seeks to have the Court abdicate its  
28

1 responsibility to hear and resolve the claims before it, something it cannot do.  
2 Alternatively, A Cab postures it is entitled to rely on its failure to create the records  
3 required by NRS 608.115(1)(d) and place upon the plaintiffs the burden, which they  
4 should not have to meet and clearly cannot meet, to specify from their trip sheets their  
5 precise hours of work for each pay period. Indeed, A Cab paid its expert in excess of  
6 \$47,000 to produce a report asserting that position in its defense.

7 Despite plaintiffs' warranted request to hold defendants in contempt and strike  
8 their answer, the Court has not viewed this as warranted to remedy this point, and  
9 therefore has declined to do so. As an alternative ruling, the Court is prepared to do so  
10 now.

## 11 **THE COURT'S JUDGMENT AND THE RELIEF ORDERED**

12  
13 For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby Orders the following relief and  
14 enters a Final Judgment in this case in the following form:

- 15  
16  
17 A. The Court, pursuant to NRCP Rule 23(c)(1) amends the class claims  
18 certified for disposition pursuant to NRCP Rule 23(b)(3). Those claims,  
19 in respect to defendant A Cab, are now limited to the claims of the  
20 previously identified class members arising under the MWA against A  
21 Cab prior to January 1, 2016 but only to the extent A Cab failed to pay  
22 such class members the "lower tier" (health benefits provided) minimum  
23 wage required by the MWA; only in the amounts specified and arrived at  
24 in this Order based upon the hours of work used by the Court to  
25 determine such amounts; and only for interest owed on those claims on  
26 and after January 1, 2016. Individual class members who seek to collect  
27 "higher tier" minimum wage payments under the MWA; or amounts  
28

1           owed under the MWA based upon them having actually worked more  
2           hours in a pay period than the Court used in making the award to them in  
3           this Order; or to collect the penalties proscribed by NRS 608.040; or for  
4           additional amounts in interest that may be owed to them on their MWA  
5           claims from A Cab may pursue those claims individually. Such claims  
6           are dismissed from this case for all class members without prejudice;  
7

8           B.    All claims made against the defendant Nady are severed from the claims  
9           against A Cab pursuant to NRCP Rule 21;  
10

11           C.    The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment for each individual class  
12           member in the amount specified in Column "F" in Ex. "A" as annexed  
13           hereto against defendants A CAB TAXI SERVICE LLC and A CAB,  
14           LLC. Such judgment shall conclude the class claims for damages  
15           certified for disposition pursuant to NRCP Rule 23(b)(3) and constitute a  
16           final judgment on such claims;  
17

18           D.    The Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the class claims it has  
19           certified for disposition pursuant to NRCP Rule 23(b)(2), and for  
20           enforcement of the monetary judgments it has rendered in favor of the  
21           class members, and appoints class counsel, Leon Greenberg, Dana  
22           Sniegocki, Christian Gabroy and Kaine Messer, as counsel for the class  
23           member judgment creditors listed on Exhibit "A" and for whom the Court  
24           is directing entry of judgment. Defendants, their agents, and their  
25           attorneys, are prohibited from communicating with the class member  
26           judgment creditors about their judgments granted by this Order or  
27           securing any release or satisfaction of those judgments without first  
28


1           securing a further Order of this Court in this case. Class counsel is  
2           authorized to proceed with whatever remedies it deems advisable to  
3           enforce the money judgments rendered for the class members but shall  
4           hold in their IOLTA account any amounts collected on such judgments  
5           and only release such monies as specified by a further Order of this Court  
6           in this case. Class counsel is also authorized to use all of the judgment  
7           enforcement remedies provided for by NRS Chapter 21 in the name of  
8           "Michael Murray as Judgment Creditor" for the total amount of the  
9           unsatisfied judgments rendered in favor of all class members, they need  
10          not seek or issue writs of judgment execution or levy individually for  
11          each judgment creditor class member. Class counsel is also prohibited, in  
12          light of the potential for A Cab to receive satisfaction of certain judgment  
13          amounts as provided for under G, *infra*, until further Order is issued by  
14          the Court, from taking action to collect more than \$960,000 of the  
15          combined judgment value of \$1,033,027.81 that is entered under this  
16          Order;

17  
18          E.    The time for class counsel to apply for an award of fees and costs  
19               pursuant to NRCP Rule 54 is extended to 60 days after the service of this  
20               Order with Notice of Entry;

21  
22          F.    The court stays the severed case against defendant Nady for 60 days from  
23               the date of entry of this Order. That case shall remain stayed after that  
24               date until the Court issues an Order lifting such stay, the Court not  
25               anticipating doing so, or receiving any request from the parties to do so,  
26               until expiration of that 60 day period.

1 G. A Cab may present to the Court, at anytime after entry of this Order, a  
2 motion to have the Court enter satisfactions towards each class member  
3 judgment creditor's judgment amount for the amounts A Cab paid them  
4 under the consent judgment that are a portion of the \$58,136.61 paid  
5 under the consent judgment but not previously accounted for (§ 29). . It  
6 shall also have the right, within 60 days from the date of service of this  
7 Judgment and Order with Notice of Entry, to present to class counsel  
8 evidence of how the \$58,136.61 paid under the consent judgment but not  
9 previously accounted for (§ 29) should be set off against each class  
10 member judgment creditor. Class counsel shall be obligated to advise A  
11 Cab within 30 days thereafter if it agrees that A Cab it is entitled to a  
12 judgment satisfaction based upon such evidence. If it so agrees, class  
13 counsel must submit a motion to the Court within 10 days thereafter  
14 seeking an Order entering such agreed upon satisfactions. If after that  
15 date A Cab, after completing that process of conferral with class counsel,  
16 must still file a motion with the Court to secure any such judgment  
17 satisfactions, the Court will, if it grants that motion and also finds class  
18 counsel did not act reasonably in cooperating with A Cab on determining  
19 the amount of the satisfactions, award A Cab attorney's fees in connection  
20 with the bringing of such a motion.  
21

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23  
24   
25 Honorable Kenneth Cory  
26 District Court Judge  
27  
28

Date 8-21-18

# EXHIBIT "A"

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	<b>Totals for All Class Members</b>			<b>\$900,317.34</b>	<b>\$132,710.47</b>	<b>\$1,033,027.81</b>	<b>\$975,666.16</b>	<b>\$75,348.82</b>
2	<b>EE</b>	<b>Last</b>		<b>Total Lower Tier</b>	<b>Interest from</b>		<b>Total 2007-</b>	<b>Set Off</b>
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Minimum Wages</b>	<b>1/1 2016</b>	<b>Total with</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>From</b>
				<b>Owed 7/1/2007 -</b>	<b>through</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Shortage</b>	<b>USDOL</b>
				<b>12/31/2015 After</b>	<b>6/30/2018</b>			<b>Settlement</b>
				<b>Set Off and Over</b>				
				<b>\$10.00</b>				
3	3861	Abarca	Enrique	\$815.12	\$120.15	\$935.27	\$815.12	
4	3638	Abdella	Juhar	\$178.63	\$26.33	\$204.96	\$319.03	\$140.40
5	3331	Abdulahi	Faud	\$286.07	\$42.17	\$328.23	\$286.07	
6	105408	Abdulle	Abdirashid	\$165.36	\$24.38	\$189.74	\$165.36	
7	3606	Abebe	Tamrat	\$3,010.66	\$443.78	\$3,454.44	\$3,010.66	
8	3302	Abraha	Tesfalem	\$669.17	\$98.64	\$767.81	\$669.17	
9	105813	Abt	Daniel	\$891.35	\$131.39	\$1,022.74	\$891.35	
10	2640	Abuel	Alan	\$148.52	\$21.89	\$170.41	\$380.83	\$232.31
11	3513	Abuhay	Fasil	\$529.05	\$77.98	\$607.03	\$720.06	\$191.01
12	100221	Ackman	Charles	\$385.21	\$56.78	\$441.99	\$385.21	
13	3853	Acosta	Lorrie	\$135.08	\$19.91	\$154.99	\$135.08	
14	3257	Adam	Elhadi	\$522.90	\$77.08	\$599.98	\$522.90	
15	3609	Adamian	Robert	\$794.61	\$117.13	\$911.74	\$995.17	\$200.56
16	3896	Adams	Michael	\$193.46	\$28.52	\$221.98	\$283.69	\$90.23
17	3641	Adamson	Nicole	\$1,012.32	\$149.22	\$1,161.54	\$1,306.43	\$294.11
18	3035	Adem	Sued	\$731.28	\$107.79	\$839.07	\$731.28	
19	25411	Adhanom	Tewoldebrhan	\$124.16	\$18.30	\$142.46	\$124.16	
20	3846	Agacevic	Ibnel	\$299.99	\$44.22	\$344.21	\$299.99	
21	100821	Agostino	Nicholas	\$1,436.35	\$211.72	\$1,648.07	\$1,436.35	
22	3684	Ahmed	Ahmed	\$926.12	\$136.51	\$1,062.63	\$1,290.23	\$364.11
23	3678	Alemayehu	Tewodros	\$42.09	\$6.20	\$48.30	\$42.09	
24	3692	Alessi	Anthony	\$13.62	\$2.01	\$15.63	\$13.62	
25	3712	Alexander	Darvious	\$63.13	\$9.30	\$72.43	\$63.13	
26	3869	Alfaro	Joe	\$300.71	\$44.33	\$345.03	\$300.71	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
27	3661	Ali	Abraham	\$2,224.87	\$327.95	\$2,552.82	\$2,224.87	
28	104525	Allegue	Yusnier	\$1,414.77	\$208.54	\$1,623.31	\$1,414.77	
29	2903	Allen	Otis	\$9,556.92	\$1,408.73	\$10,965.65	\$9,556.92	
30	25979	Alnaif	Abdul	\$926.14	\$136.52	\$1,062.65	\$958.49	\$32.35
31	3787	Altamura	Vincent	\$503.89	\$74.28	\$578.17	\$503.89	
32	103822	Alvarado	Santiago	\$94.08	\$13.87	\$107.95	\$94.08	
33	3106	Alvero	Jose	\$105.62	\$15.57	\$121.18	\$105.62	
34	3769	Alves	Mary	\$988.61	\$145.72	\$1,134.33	\$988.61	
35	2968	Amato	Richard	\$4,000.14	\$589.64	\$4,589.78	\$4,000.14	
36	3645	Ameha	Samuale	\$244.82	\$36.09	\$280.91	\$244.82	
37	24038	Anantagul	Kamol	\$154.39	\$22.76	\$177.15	\$154.39	
38	3564	Anastasio	James	\$111.24	\$16.40	\$127.63	\$111.24	
39	2834	Anders	Matthew	\$417.90	\$61.60	\$479.50	\$417.90	
40	29709	Andersen	Jason	\$1,224.18	\$180.45	\$1,404.63	\$1,995.14	\$770.96
41	3672	Anderson	Roosevelt	\$2,114.65	\$311.71	\$2,426.36	\$2,787.37	\$672.72
42	106828	Anderson	Calvin	\$1,353.44	\$199.50	\$1,552.95	\$1,353.44	
43	3943	Anderson	William	\$289.40	\$42.66	\$332.06	\$289.40	
44	3650	Anif	Janeid	\$1,406.55	\$207.33	\$1,613.88	\$1,406.55	
45	2662	Antoine	Albert	\$310.19	\$45.72	\$355.91	\$310.19	
46	2942	Appel	Howard	\$23.47	\$3.46	\$26.93	\$23.47	
47	3614	Applegate	Angela	\$260.97	\$38.47	\$299.44	\$319.42	\$58.45
48	3730	Arar	Isam	\$1,726.82	\$254.54	\$1,981.36	\$2,235.96	\$509.14
49	104910	Archer	Bert	\$362.37	\$53.41	\$415.78	\$362.37	
50	3037	Archuleta	Alex	\$2,031.51	\$299.45	\$2,330.96	\$2,031.51	
51	3709	Arell	Roger	\$42.41	\$6.25	\$48.66	\$92.02	\$49.61
52	3931	Arena	Francis	\$527.13	\$77.70	\$604.83	\$527.13	
53	26553	Arnwine	Howard	\$2,020.90	\$297.89	\$2,318.78	\$2,185.05	\$164.15
54	2439	Artigue	David	\$315.09	\$46.45	\$361.53	\$315.09	
55	3676	Asad	Tassawar	\$28.49	\$4.20	\$32.69	\$28.49	
56	31622	Asefa	Wossen	\$456.31	\$67.26	\$523.57	\$456.31	
57	3828	Aseffa	Mulubahan	\$1,992.18	\$293.66	\$2,285.84	\$2,431.45	\$439.27
58	3741	Assena	Zenebech	\$41.86	\$6.17	\$48.02	\$41.86	
59	3873	Atanasov	Nikolay	\$154.17	\$22.73	\$176.90	\$154.17	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
60	3406	Atoigue	Marco	\$259.34	\$38.23	\$297.57	\$259.34	
61	3825	Atterbury	Joseph	\$159.92	\$23.57	\$183.49	\$159.92	
62	110476	Auberry Jr.	Glenn	\$309.98	\$45.69	\$355.67	\$309.98	
63	2432	Auckerman	Katherine	\$215.32	\$31.74	\$247.06	\$215.32	
64	3667	Aurich	Juan	\$1,489.26	\$219.52	\$1,708.78	\$2,508.20	\$1,018.94
65	2926	Awalom	Alemayehu	\$8,201.42	\$1,208.92	\$9,410.35	\$8,201.42	
66	3707	Azmoudeh	Bobby	\$208.23	\$30.69	\$238.92	\$208.23	
67	3605	Azzouay	El	\$135.48	\$19.97	\$155.45	\$135.48	
68	20210	Ba	Awa	\$1,270.02	\$187.21	\$1,457.22	\$1,270.02	
69	2555	Babinchak	Blaine	\$15.52	\$2.29	\$17.80	\$15.52	
70	108404	Baca	James	\$105.93	\$15.61	\$121.54	\$105.93	
71	27358	Baca-Paez	Sergio	\$2,124.87	\$313.21	\$2,438.08	\$2,501.92	\$377.05
72	2708	Badillo	Cesar	\$280.24	\$41.31	\$321.55	\$280.24	
73	3130	Bafrodu	Solomon	\$221.55	\$32.66	\$254.21	\$221.55	
74	3838	Baker	Timothy	\$2,135.81	\$314.83	\$2,450.64	\$2,431.20	\$295.39
75	27315	Bakhtiari	Marco	\$2,118.28	\$312.24	\$2,403.53	\$3,284.38	\$1,166.10
76	112015	Bambenek	Matthew	\$337.56	\$49.76	\$387.31	\$337.56	
77	112193	Bandi	Pedram	\$11.21	\$1.65	\$12.86	\$11.21	
78	2523	Banuelos	Ruben	\$150.22	\$22.14	\$172.36	\$150.22	
79	3909	Barbu	Ion	\$2,507.70	\$369.64	\$2,877.34	\$2,562.29	\$54.59
80	3760	Bardo	Timothy	\$746.65	\$110.06	\$856.71	\$746.65	
81	3369	Barich	Edward	\$1,270.10	\$187.22	\$1,457.31	\$1,270.10	
82	100158	Barnes	Benjamin	\$5,936.88	\$875.12	\$6,812.00	\$5,936.88	
83	2993	Barr	Kenneth	\$574.03	\$84.61	\$658.64	\$615.48	\$41.45
84	107792	Barrameda	Danilo	\$56.83	\$8.38	\$65.20	\$56.83	
85	3601	Barseghyan	Artur	\$373.48	\$55.05	\$428.54	\$488.18	\$114.70
86	3887	Barstow	Lance	\$131.44	\$19.37	\$150.81	\$131.44	
87	3829	Bartunek	Johnny	\$19.47	\$2.87	\$22.34	\$19.47	
88	3649	Bataineh	Ali	\$218.35	\$32.18	\$250.53	\$218.35	
89	2454	Batista	Eugenio	\$49.03	\$7.23	\$56.25	\$49.03	
90	3926	Bauer	William	\$217.42	\$32.05	\$249.47	\$217.42	
91	2063	Bean	Ronald	\$214.50	\$31.62	\$246.12	\$214.50	
92	2786	Bekele	Abraham	\$77.01	\$11.35	\$88.36	\$77.01	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
93	2856	Bell	Arthur	\$328.15	\$48.37	\$376.52	\$328.15	
94	25454	Bell	Jeffrey	\$26.45	\$3.90	\$30.34	\$26.45	
95	3594	Bellegarde	Josue	\$11.51	\$1.70	\$13.21	\$11.51	
96	3622	Benel	Christian	\$1,457.21	\$214.80	\$1,672.01	\$1,589.84	\$132.63
97	110687	Berger	James	\$58.09	\$8.56	\$66.65	\$58.09	
98	103219	Berichon	Mike	\$947.14	\$139.61	\$1,086.75	\$947.14	
99	23373	Bey	Ronald	\$3,483.14	\$513.43	\$3,996.57	\$3,483.14	
100	2960	Bialorucki	Richard	\$6,538.58	\$963.81	\$7,502.40	\$6,776.93	\$238.35
101	2986	Black	Burton	\$1,658.10	\$244.41	\$1,902.51	\$1,658.10	
102	29914	Bliss	Valerie	\$124.09	\$18.29	\$142.38	\$124.09	
103	112455	Blum III	Arthur	\$47.07	\$6.94	\$54.01	\$47.07	
104	3072	Blumenthal	Alan	\$1,925.31	\$283.80	\$2,209.10	\$1,925.31	
105	3101	Bly	Vertito	\$3,955.45	\$583.05	\$4,538.50	\$3,955.45	
106	3180	Bolden	Quincy	\$284.99	\$42.01	\$327.00	\$284.99	
107	2487	Boling	Freddy	\$2,571.76	\$379.09	\$2,950.85	\$2,571.76	
108	2814	Booth	Sean	\$643.34	\$94.83	\$738.17	\$643.34	
109	2802	Borja	Virginia	\$3,665.99	\$540.38	\$4,206.37	\$3,955.31	\$289.32
110	3003	Borowski	Edwin	\$227.27	\$33.50	\$260.77	\$227.27	
111	3723	Bowen	Christopher	\$674.72	\$99.46	\$774.17	\$674.72	
112	2767	Boyd	Kevin	\$862.73	\$127.17	\$989.90	\$862.73	
113	3508	Bozic	Nebojsa	\$1,242.08	\$183.09	\$1,425.17	\$1,242.08	
114	28324	Bradley	Leroy	\$2,391.80	\$352.56	\$2,744.36	\$2,810.40	\$418.60
115	2056	Brauchle	Michael	\$6,402.82	\$943.80	\$7,346.62	\$7,112.38	\$709.56
116	3254	Breault	Ronald	\$208.05	\$30.67	\$238.72	\$208.05	
117	2806	Brennan	Sheila	\$78.89	\$11.63	\$90.52	\$78.89	
118	3697	Briggs	Andrew	\$52.36	\$7.72	\$60.08	\$52.36	
119	3716	Brimhall	Tracy	\$3,804.84	\$560.85	\$4,365.69	\$3,804.84	
120	3621	Brisco	Allen	\$3,226.36	\$475.58	\$3,701.93	\$3,226.36	
121	100299	Briski	Louis	\$704.15	\$103.79	\$807.94	\$892.62	\$188.47
122	110579	Brooks	Jose	\$46.30	\$6.83	\$53.13	\$46.30	
123	3067	Brown	Maurice	\$1,528.59	\$225.32	\$1,753.91	\$1,528.59	
124	3949	Brown	Daniel	\$730.19	\$107.63	\$837.82	\$730.19	
125	2704	Buergey	Christopher	\$1,051.28	\$154.96	\$1,206.24	\$1,051.28	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
126	28249	Bunns	Tommy	\$564.89	\$83.27	\$648.16	\$564.89	
127	3340	Burgema	Kelemework	\$1,408.98	\$207.69	\$1,616.67	\$1,408.98	
128	111670	Burns	Brittany	\$122.95	\$18.12	\$141.08	\$122.95	
129	3327	Butler	Bonnie	\$984.83	\$145.17	\$1,129.99	\$984.83	
130	3160	Butts	Phillip	\$315.09	\$46.45	\$361.54	\$315.09	
131	3537	Cadman	Linda	\$43.84	\$6.46	\$50.31	\$43.84	
132	109309	Caldwell Jr	Paul	\$364.22	\$53.69	\$417.90	\$364.22	
133	3892	Calise	Domenic	\$57.13	\$8.42	\$65.55	\$57.13	
134	3791	Cancio-Bet	Rene	\$282.86	\$41.69	\$324.55	\$282.86	
135	3070	Canelstein	Glen	\$168.33	\$24.81	\$193.14	\$168.33	
136	106463	Capone	Gary	\$1,177.79	\$173.61	\$1,351.40	\$1,177.79	
137	3733	Carr	Jamaal	\$127.11	\$18.74	\$145.84	\$127.11	
138	2660	Carracedo	Sonny	\$380.97	\$56.16	\$437.13	\$380.97	
139	3899	Casiello	Anthony	\$552.19	\$81.39	\$633.58	\$703.35	\$151.16
140	102334	Castellano	Joaquin	\$419.56	\$61.84	\$481.40	\$419.56	
141	2850	Castillo	Franzes	\$32.11	\$4.73	\$36.84	\$32.11	
142	2740	Cater	Leslie	\$863.76	\$127.32	\$991.09	\$863.76	
143	3463	Catoera	Nestor	\$327.05	\$48.21	\$375.25	\$327.05	
144	2531	Catoggio	Alfred	\$143.11	\$21.10	\$164.21	\$143.11	
145	3843	Caymite	Luc	\$221.02	\$32.58	\$253.60	\$221.02	
146	2907	Cease	Alan	\$367.94	\$54.24	\$422.18	\$367.94	
147	2969	Champigny	Paul	\$133.62	\$19.70	\$153.31	\$133.62	
148	104310	Chana	Chen	\$658.00	\$96.99	\$754.99	\$658.00	
149	3420	Chang	Yun-Yu	\$1,093.43	\$161.18	\$1,254.60	\$1,093.43	
150	3831	Charouat	Malek	\$412.11	\$60.75	\$472.86	\$412.11	
151	24737	Charov	Ivaylo	\$67.83	\$10.00	\$77.83	\$67.83	
152	3663	Chasteen	Jeffery	\$38.80	\$5.72	\$44.52	\$38.80	
153	3714	Chatrizeh	Shahin	\$744.82	\$109.79	\$854.61	\$950.52	\$205.70
154	2420	Chau	Phi	\$45.97	\$6.78	\$52.74	\$45.97	
155	112394	Chavez	Rosemarie	\$13.29	\$1.96	\$15.25	\$13.29	
156	3249	Chico	David	\$3,982.14	\$586.98	\$4,569.12	\$3,982.14	
157	3258	Child	Gregg	\$232.80	\$34.32	\$267.11	\$232.80	
158	3729	Choudhary	Krishna	\$1,694.88	\$249.83	\$1,944.71	\$1,694.88	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
159	3588	Christense	Rosa	\$1,878.35	\$276.88	\$2,155.22	\$1,878.35	
160	3881	Christodou	Panos	\$584.13	\$86.10	\$670.23	\$584.13	
161	26783	Clark	Dennis	\$513.57	\$75.70	\$589.27	\$513.57	
162	31467	Clarke	Michael	\$69.42	\$10.23	\$79.65	\$69.42	
163	2994	Clift	Daniel	\$519.14	\$76.52	\$595.67	\$519.14	
164	2679	Clores	Edgardo	\$363.66	\$53.60	\$417.26	\$363.66	
165	107430	Cobon	Karl	\$1,023.14	\$150.81	\$1,173.95	\$1,023.14	
166	3802	Cobos	Aaron	\$258.72	\$38.14	\$296.85	\$258.72	
167	3885	Cohoon	Thomas	\$2,087.12	\$307.65	\$2,394.77	\$2,261.53	\$174.41
168	3552	Coizeau	Leonardo	\$3,285.52	\$484.30	\$3,769.81	\$3,433.58	\$148.06
169	2527	Colello	Robert	\$123.39	\$18.19	\$141.58	\$123.39	
170	3321	Collier	Samuel	\$326.95	\$48.19	\$375.15	\$326.95	
171	102415	Collier	Ella	\$293.00	\$43.19	\$336.19	\$447.70	\$154.70
172	3862	Collins	Lincoln	\$408.91	\$60.27	\$469.18	\$520.42	\$111.51
173	2676	Collins	Donald	\$297.17	\$43.80	\$340.97	\$297.17	
174	2481	Colon	James	\$999.75	\$147.37	\$1,147.12	\$999.75	
175	108041	Comeau	Brian	\$70.76	\$10.43	\$81.19	\$70.76	
176	3596	Conde	Carlos	\$103.01	\$15.18	\$118.19	\$103.01	
177	3900	Coney-Cun	Keisha	\$531.04	\$78.28	\$609.32	\$531.04	
178	3738	Conway	James	\$3,480.75	\$513.08	\$3,993.82	\$3,980.61	\$499.86
179	3546	Cook	Eugene	\$1,466.17	\$216.12	\$1,682.29	\$1,466.17	
180	3284	Cook	Robert	\$1,223.89	\$180.41	\$1,404.29	\$1,223.89	
181	112398	Corona	Fernando	\$775.97	\$114.38	\$890.35	\$775.97	
182	2051	Costello	Brad	\$2,277.69	\$335.74	\$2,613.44	\$2,668.39	\$390.70
183	3550	Craddock	Charles	\$1,473.65	\$217.22	\$1,690.87	\$1,473.65	
184	3935	Craffey	Richard	\$672.27	\$99.09	\$771.36	\$672.27	
185	23774	Crawford	Darryl	\$395.48	\$58.29	\$453.77	\$478.70	\$83.22
186	21457	Crawford	Maximillian	\$156.56	\$23.08	\$179.64	\$156.56	
187	30300	Cruz-Decas	Antonio	\$47.37	\$6.98	\$54.35	\$47.37	
188	3301	Csorba	Laszlo	\$512.50	\$75.54	\$588.04	\$512.50	
189	109796	Curtin	Ronald	\$1,891.68	\$278.84	\$2,170.52	\$1,891.68	
190	109130	Dacayanar	Liza	\$515.01	\$75.91	\$590.92	\$515.01	
191	23948	Daffron	Daniel	\$1,242.13	\$183.10	\$1,425.23	\$1,242.13	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
192	32238	Daggett Jr.	Rudolph	\$618.68	\$91.20	\$709.87	\$618.68	
193	3231	Dagley	Darryl	\$429.11	\$63.25	\$492.36	\$429.11	
194	3777	Daniels	Donald	\$3,274.58	\$482.69	\$3,757.26	\$3,274.58	
195	3480	Daniels	Katherine	\$645.94	\$95.21	\$741.15	\$2,170.19	\$1,524.25
196	110936	Daniels	James	\$57.14	\$8.42	\$65.56	\$57.14	
197	3511	Danielsen	Danny	\$508.57	\$74.97	\$583.54	\$508.57	
198	3428	D'Arcy	Timothy	\$5,450.15	\$803.37	\$6,253.52	\$5,450.15	
199	101103	Davila-Ron	Monica	\$58.85	\$8.67	\$67.52	\$58.85	
200	28065	Davis	Bradley	\$2,249.11	\$331.53	\$2,580.64	\$2,249.11	
201	2590	Davis	Nancy	\$71.07	\$10.48	\$81.54	\$71.07	
202	3419	Degefa	Dejene	\$385.27	\$56.79	\$442.06	\$385.27	
203	3548	Degracia	Bob	\$342.00	\$50.41	\$392.42	\$342.00	
204	3675	Deguzman	Leloi	\$619.41	\$91.30	\$710.71	\$619.41	
205	2573	Deguzman	Fermin	\$294.22	\$43.37	\$337.59	\$294.22	
206	3027	Dein	Fred	\$97.00	\$14.30	\$111.29	\$97.00	
207	111137	Dejacto	Giovanna	\$660.42	\$97.35	\$757.77	\$660.42	
208	25935	Delgado	Carlos	\$105.26	\$15.52	\$120.78	\$105.26	
209	2057	DeMarco	William	\$581.36	\$85.69	\$667.05	\$581.36	
210	3566	Deocampo	Michael	\$198.88	\$29.31	\$228.19	\$222.51	\$23.63
211	3936	Dial	Donald	\$811.92	\$119.68	\$931.60	\$811.92	
212	111062	Diamond	Jeffrey	\$273.19	\$40.27	\$313.46	\$273.19	
213	3719	Diaz	Aiser	\$22.90	\$3.38	\$26.28	\$22.90	
214	3657	Dibaba	Desta	\$958.68	\$141.31	\$1,099.99	\$958.68	
215	3905	Dillard	Corey	\$904.27	\$133.29	\$1,037.56	\$978.27	\$74.00
216	2031	Dinok	Ildiko	\$3,031.54	\$446.86	\$3,478.41	\$3,031.54	
217	6832	Dionas	John	\$87.73	\$12.93	\$100.66	\$87.73	
218	3756	Disbrow	Ronald	\$2,475.64	\$364.92	\$2,840.56	\$2,858.43	\$382.79
219	3395	Dixon	Julius	\$702.55	\$103.56	\$806.11	\$702.55	
220	2812	Djapa-Ivos	Davor	\$1,028.61	\$151.62	\$1,180.23	\$1,028.61	
221	3704	Dobszewic	Gary	\$2,278.69	\$335.89	\$2,614.57	\$3,064.20	\$785.51
222	3024	Donahoe	Stephen	\$998.20	\$147.14	\$1,145.34	\$998.20	
223	2811	Donleycott	Kevin	\$622.75	\$91.80	\$714.55	\$622.75	
224	3478	Dontchev	Nedeltcho	\$3,455.50	\$509.36	\$3,964.86	\$3,561.35	\$105.85

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
225	3378	Dotson	Eugene	\$590.77	\$87.08	\$677.85	\$656.43	\$65.66
226	3830	Dotson	Contessa	\$49.54	\$7.30	\$56.84	\$49.54	
227	2067	Doughty	Michael	\$308.33	\$45.45	\$353.78	\$308.33	
228	2919	Downing	Jennifer	\$133.31	\$19.65	\$152.96	\$133.31	
229	2839	Downs	David	\$324.58	\$47.85	\$372.43	\$324.58	
230	106763	Doyle	William	\$304.91	\$44.94	\$349.85	\$304.91	
231	2871	Draper	Ivan	\$5,002.36	\$737.37	\$5,739.72	\$6,105.13	\$1,102.77
232	2874	Dreitzer	Gail	\$294.20	\$43.37	\$337.56	\$294.20	
233	3754	Dudek	Anthony	\$1,421.81	\$209.58	\$1,631.39	\$1,421.81	
234	3084	Duff	Tommy	\$215.34	\$31.74	\$247.09	\$215.34	
235	3916	Duna	Lawrence	\$760.98	\$112.17	\$873.15	\$760.98	
236	3617	Durey	Robert	\$795.00	\$117.19	\$912.19	\$1,086.96	\$291.96
237	2006	Durtschi	Jeffrey	\$496.97	\$73.26	\$570.23	\$585.98	\$89.01
238	100046	Dymond	Ernest	\$62.96	\$9.28	\$72.24	\$62.96	
239	3220	Dyson	Edward	\$237.76	\$35.05	\$272.81	\$237.76	
240	1095	Eckert	Michael	\$44.98	\$6.63	\$51.61	\$44.98	
241	3907	Eddik	Muhannad	\$31.60	\$4.66	\$36.26	\$31.60	
242	2637	Edwards	Jeffrey	\$2,251.54	\$331.89	\$2,583.42	\$2,735.54	\$484.00
243	3381	Egan	Joseph	\$3,566.11	\$525.66	\$4,091.77	\$3,566.11	
244	3595	Ekoue	Ayi	\$2,813.75	\$414.76	\$3,228.50	\$2,813.75	
245	3125	Elam	Damon	\$2,368.35	\$349.10	\$2,717.46	\$2,368.35	
246	111822	Elgendy	Mohamed	\$96.88	\$14.28	\$111.17	\$96.88	
247	18678	Eliades	George	\$272.83	\$40.22	\$313.04	\$272.83	
248	3242	Eljawhary	Farid	\$233.11	\$34.36	\$267.47	\$233.11	
249	3771	Ellis	Charles	\$763.81	\$112.59	\$876.40	\$763.81	
250	109641	Emling	Paul	\$146.38	\$21.58	\$167.95	\$470.16	\$323.78
251	106698	Emter	Christopher	\$124.52	\$18.36	\$142.88	\$124.52	
252	2975	English	David	\$419.94	\$61.90	\$481.84	\$419.94	
253	3567	Ernst	William	\$2,071.00	\$305.27	\$2,376.27	\$3,661.62	\$1,590.62
254	3937	Esfarjany	Mahmood	\$61.93	\$9.13	\$71.06	\$61.93	
255	3689	Eshaghi	Mohammad	\$243.90	\$35.95	\$279.85	\$347.00	\$103.10
256	2865	Esser	David	\$57.32	\$8.45	\$65.77	\$57.32	
257	3889	Estrada	Michael	\$217.71	\$32.09	\$249.80	\$217.71	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
258	3628	Evans	Steven	\$23.51	\$3.46	\$26.97	\$23.51	
259	3703	Fadlallah	Michel	\$675.34	\$99.55	\$774.88	\$857.18	\$181.84
260	29981	Fair	Kirby	\$496.57	\$73.20	\$569.77	\$496.57	
261	3795	Farah	Yohannes	\$391.88	\$57.76	\$449.64	\$391.88	
262	2758	Feakes	Curtis	\$57.53	\$8.48	\$66.01	\$57.53	
263	2682	Fears	Thomas	\$4,474.10	\$659.50	\$5,133.60	\$5,067.14	\$593.04
264	3591	Feleke	Melak	\$979.78	\$144.42	\$1,124.20	\$1,190.60	\$210.82
265	3324	Ferrall	Edwin	\$240.80	\$35.49	\$276.29	\$240.80	
266	3549	Fesehazion	Teabe	\$2,143.08	\$315.90	\$2,458.98	\$2,702.14	\$559.06
267	111068	Filatov	Andrey	\$20.19	\$2.98	\$23.16	\$20.19	
268	3877	Filfel	Kamal	\$3,138.25	\$462.59	\$3,600.84	\$3,138.25	
269	3528	Fitz-Patrick	Michael	\$150.98	\$22.26	\$173.24	\$150.98	
270	109381	Fitzsimmons	Marc	\$327.92	\$48.34	\$376.25	\$327.92	
271	111729	Flanders	Mary	\$208.19	\$30.69	\$238.88	\$208.19	
272	3705	Fleming	Gary	\$3,227.44	\$475.74	\$3,703.17	\$4,079.24	\$851.80
273	2583	Foley	John	\$324.12	\$47.78	\$371.90	\$324.12	
274	3939	Ford	Todd	\$982.51	\$144.83	\$1,127.33	\$982.51	
275	3927	Fox	Gordon	\$258.33	\$38.08	\$296.41	\$258.33	
276	3860	Frankenberger	Grant	\$625.40	\$92.19	\$717.58	\$625.40	
277	2614	Franklin	David	\$530.60	\$78.21	\$608.81	\$530.60	
278	3196	Fredrickson	Steven	\$221.29	\$32.62	\$253.90	\$221.29	
279	3184	Friedman	Robert	\$384.78	\$56.72	\$441.50	\$384.78	
280	3774	Furst III	James	\$48.51	\$7.15	\$55.66	\$48.51	
281	107590	Galtieri	Frank	\$269.32	\$39.70	\$309.02	\$269.32	
282	2782	Garcia	John	\$10,117.38	\$1,491.34	\$11,608.72	\$10,275.94	\$158.56
283	3652	Garcia	Miguel	\$1,119.02	\$164.95	\$1,283.96	\$1,119.02	
284	3522	Gardea	Alfred	\$2,589.33	\$381.68	\$2,971.01	\$2,589.33	
285	3694	Gared	Yaekob	\$76.99	\$11.35	\$88.34	\$76.99	
286	3793	Garras	Bill	\$160.33	\$23.63	\$183.97	\$160.33	
287	26636	Garrett	Kathleen	\$20.07	\$2.96	\$23.03	\$20.07	
288	3642	Gaumond	Gerard	\$197.50	\$29.11	\$226.61	\$197.50	
289	3503	Gebrayes	Henock	\$582.20	\$85.82	\$668.02	\$582.20	
290	2870	Gebregiorge	Tewodros	\$57.35	\$8.45	\$65.81	\$57.35	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
291	3300	Gebrehan	Kebere	\$1,330.65	\$196.14	\$1,526.79	\$1,330.65	
292	3801	Gebremari	Meley	\$200.99	\$29.63	\$230.61	\$200.99	
293	3580	Gebreyes	Fanuel	\$513.28	\$75.66	\$588.93	\$933.43	\$420.15
294	3328	Gelane	Samuel	\$4,752.58	\$700.55	\$5,453.13	\$5,898.98	\$1,146.40
295	3589	Gessese	Worku	\$81.57	\$12.02	\$93.59	\$81.57	
296	3153	Getnet	Girma	\$151.67	\$22.36	\$174.03	\$151.67	
297	3865	Ghori	Azhar	\$205.23	\$30.25	\$235.48	\$205.23	
298	3759	Gianopoul	Samuel	\$1,133.49	\$167.08	\$1,300.57	\$1,406.99	\$273.50
299	3016	Giatropoul	John	\$68.57	\$10.11	\$78.68	\$68.57	
300	3696	Gillett	David	\$519.94	\$76.64	\$596.58	\$1,435.64	\$915.70
301	3600	Gilmore	Paula	\$16.54	\$2.44	\$18.98	\$82.81	\$66.27
302	3924	Gilo	Hobart	\$645.59	\$95.16	\$740.75	\$645.59	
303	31076	Glaser	Stephen	\$153.87	\$22.68	\$176.55	\$153.87	
304	3121	Gleason	John	\$4,310.08	\$635.32	\$4,945.41	\$5,660.07	\$1,349.99
305	3540	Glogovac	Goran	\$1,243.82	\$183.34	\$1,427.16	\$1,792.54	\$548.72
306	3762	Godsey	Kelly	\$1,233.95	\$181.89	\$1,415.83	\$1,233.95	
307	3739	Godsey	Thomas	\$90.55	\$13.35	\$103.89	\$90.55	
308	106897	Goettsche	Dale	\$31.60	\$4.66	\$36.26	\$31.60	
309	2064	Gohlke	James	\$381.88	\$56.29	\$438.17	\$381.88	
310	31840	Gokcek	Guney	\$99.83	\$14.72	\$114.55	\$99.83	
311	3688	Golden	Theresa	\$686.85	\$101.24	\$788.10	\$686.85	
312	3538	Goldman	Kevin	\$334.92	\$49.37	\$384.28	\$334.92	
313	3646	Golla	Dawit	\$72.45	\$10.68	\$83.12	\$72.45	
314	3848	Gomez-Go	Arlene	\$138.32	\$20.39	\$158.70	\$138.32	
315	3903	Gonzalez	Luis	\$1,355.04	\$199.74	\$1,554.78	\$1,355.04	
316	3586	Gonzalez	Ramon	\$503.17	\$74.17	\$577.33	\$503.17	
317	111390	Gonzalez	Pedro	\$263.79	\$38.88	\$302.67	\$263.79	
318	3929	Gonzalez-F	Jose	\$178.96	\$26.38	\$205.34	\$178.96	
319	3794	Goolsby	Victor	\$933.19	\$137.56	\$1,070.74	\$933.19	
320	3391	Grafton	Natasha	\$2,352.74	\$346.80	\$2,699.54	\$2,352.74	
321	3219	Gramatiko	Petko	\$88.94	\$13.11	\$102.05	\$88.94	
322	24757	Granchelle	Andrew	\$700.68	\$103.28	\$803.96	\$700.68	
323	19253	Gray	Gary	\$3,124.58	\$460.58	\$3,585.16	\$3,790.84	\$666.26

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
324	3197	Green	Tony	\$3,009.20	\$443.57	\$3,452.77	\$4,198.23	\$1,189.03
325	2755	Greever	Rickey	\$3,835.37	\$565.35	\$4,400.72	\$3,886.18	\$50.81
326	2843	Gregg	Gary	\$532.59	\$78.51	\$611.10	\$532.59	
327	2971	Gross	Timothy	\$1,831.66	\$269.99	\$2,101.65	\$1,831.66	
328	2868	Gross	Daniel	\$936.11	\$137.99	\$1,074.10	\$936.11	
329	3346	Gross	Mark	\$99.84	\$14.72	\$114.55	\$99.84	
330	2897	Gruttadauro	Martin	\$46.47	\$6.85	\$53.32	\$46.47	
331	18964	Guerrero	Daniel	\$1,211.23	\$178.54	\$1,389.76	\$1,211.23	
332	3655	Guinan	William	\$318.19	\$46.90	\$365.09	\$552.49	\$234.30
333	2832	Guinto	Philip	\$285.36	\$42.06	\$327.43	\$285.36	
334	3296	Gutierrez	Jose	\$196.73	\$29.00	\$225.73	\$196.73	
335	2841	Gutierrez	Michael	\$69.27	\$10.21	\$79.48	\$69.27	
336	3895	Gyuro	John	\$343.12	\$50.58	\$393.70	\$343.12	
337	103550	Habte	Amanuel	\$1,165.61	\$171.82	\$1,337.43	\$1,165.61	
338	3636	Habtom	Ermias	\$663.42	\$97.79	\$761.21	\$663.42	
339	3799	Hadley	Aaron	\$221.75	\$32.69	\$254.44	\$333.64	\$111.89
340	3827	Haigh III	Walter	\$202.61	\$29.87	\$232.48	\$202.61	
341	2619	Haley	Thomas	\$157.70	\$23.25	\$180.94	\$157.70	
342	111568	Hammoud	Wissam	\$618.64	\$91.19	\$709.83	\$618.64	
343	21446	Handlon	Michael	\$649.91	\$95.80	\$745.71	\$649.91	
344	2571	Hanley	David	\$188.29	\$27.75	\$216.04	\$188.29	
345	3734	Hanna	Christopher	\$353.39	\$52.09	\$405.48	\$353.39	
346	3402	Hansen	Jordan	\$1,997.58	\$294.45	\$2,292.03	\$2,169.31	\$171.73
347	2695	Hansen	Diana	\$104.28	\$15.37	\$119.66	\$104.28	
348	29609	Haralamb	Valko	\$260.48	\$38.40	\$298.88	\$260.48	
349	3519	Harms	Michael	\$1,568.25	\$231.17	\$1,799.42	\$1,568.25	
350	3761	Harrell	Mark	\$1,070.06	\$157.73	\$1,227.79	\$1,484.83	\$414.77
351	3855	Harris	Dennis	\$2,455.84	\$362.00	\$2,817.84	\$2,846.89	\$391.05
352	2564	Harris	Jay	\$1,894.66	\$279.28	\$2,173.95	\$2,053.65	\$158.99
353	3811	Harris III	Reggie	\$19.13	\$2.82	\$21.95	\$19.13	
354	3941	Harrison	Andrew	\$297.76	\$43.89	\$341.65	\$297.76	
355	24039	Hart	Brandi	\$162.45	\$23.95	\$186.40	\$162.45	
356	3656	Harun	Idris	\$114.58	\$16.89	\$131.47	\$114.58	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
357	3515	Hasen	Akmei	\$483.59	\$71.28	\$554.87	\$557.40	\$73.81
358	3742	Haskell	William	\$3,803.40	\$560.64	\$4,364.03	\$4,896.30	\$1,092.90
359	2206	Hay	Mark	\$3,837.98	\$565.73	\$4,403.72	\$3,837.98	
360	3808	Hays	Larry	\$2,054.93	\$302.91	\$2,357.84	\$2,293.24	\$238.31
361	109457	Hearne	Stephen	\$188.99	\$27.86	\$216.85	\$188.99	
362	110194	Henderson	Lloyd	\$467.13	\$68.86	\$535.98	\$467.13	
363	3933	Hendricks	Mark	\$352.95	\$52.03	\$404.97	\$352.95	
364	3634	Herbert	Christopher	\$1,177.50	\$173.57	\$1,351.06	\$1,177.50	
365	3763	Herga	Ryan	\$299.22	\$44.11	\$343.32	\$408.57	\$109.35
366	3283	Hernandez	Luis	\$1,247.20	\$183.84	\$1,431.04	\$1,247.20	
367	3094	Hernandez	Norberto	\$608.82	\$89.74	\$698.56	\$608.82	
368	101555	Hernandez	Rene	\$272.18	\$40.12	\$312.30	\$272.18	
369	107072	Hernandez	Amilcar	\$219.91	\$32.42	\$252.33	\$219.91	
370	3100	Hilbert	Edward	\$1,307.11	\$192.67	\$1,499.78	\$1,307.11	
371	112038	Hill	Douglas	\$294.63	\$43.43	\$338.06	\$294.63	
372	2913	Hill	Fred	\$165.97	\$24.46	\$190.43	\$165.97	
373	109792	Hinds	Monroe	\$304.22	\$44.84	\$349.06	\$304.22	
374	2097	Hinks	Dana	\$970.54	\$143.06	\$1,113.61	\$1,119.76	\$149.22
375	3765	Hirsi	Kamal	\$533.66	\$78.66	\$612.33	\$533.66	
376	2464	Hodge	Lee	\$1,173.17	\$172.93	\$1,346.10	\$1,173.17	
377	2490	Hoffman	Gery	\$30.38	\$4.48	\$34.86	\$30.38	
378	2017	Holcomb	Dalton	\$1,162.76	\$171.40	\$1,334.16	\$1,162.76	
379	3864	Holler	Alfonso	\$491.70	\$72.48	\$564.18	\$586.05	\$94.35
380	3809	Hollis	James	\$92.91	\$13.70	\$106.61	\$252.73	\$159.82
381	3509	Holloway	Maynard	\$94.89	\$13.99	\$108.88	\$94.89	
382	3822	Holt	John	\$2,920.16	\$430.44	\$3,350.60	\$2,920.16	
383	3653	Hooper	Donald	\$528.58	\$77.92	\$606.50	\$709.80	\$181.22
384	3026	Hoopes	Bryant	\$110.98	\$16.36	\$127.33	\$110.98	
385	2022	Hopkins	Robert	\$191.91	\$28.29	\$220.20	\$191.91	
386	3607	Hoschouer	Christina	\$1,321.54	\$194.80	\$1,516.33	\$1,321.54	
387	109584	Hosley	Tracie	\$185.20	\$27.30	\$212.50	\$185.20	
388	2560	Houlihan	Beth	\$59.77	\$8.81	\$68.57	\$59.77	
389	2191	Howard	Robert	\$658.09	\$97.01	\$755.10	\$658.09	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
390	2863	Howard	Thomas	\$325.57	\$47.99	\$373.56	\$325.57	
391	31648	Hu	Karl	\$137.49	\$20.27	\$157.76	\$137.49	
392	3849	Huerena	Samuel	\$51.18	\$7.54	\$58.72	\$51.18	
393	2289	Huffman	Britton	\$1,911.79	\$281.81	\$2,193.60	\$1,911.79	
394	2400	Hughes	Jerry	\$2,720.00	\$400.94	\$3,120.94	\$4,056.02	\$1,336.02
395	3780	Hunter	James	\$320.69	\$47.27	\$367.96	\$320.69	
396	3120	Huntington	Walter	\$1,078.23	\$158.94	\$1,237.17	\$1,078.23	
397	27788	Hurd	Donald	\$1,527.27	\$225.13	\$1,752.39	\$1,786.78	\$259.51
398	3782	Hurley	Robert	\$246.55	\$36.34	\$282.89	\$246.55	
399	2751	Hurtado	Hubert	\$6,197.96	\$913.61	\$7,111.57	\$6,197.96	
400	3835	Hussien	Leykun	\$568.36	\$83.78	\$652.14	\$568.36	
401	3529	Hyman	Irving	\$56.35	\$8.31	\$64.65	\$56.35	
402	17189	Imran	Muhammad	\$104.12	\$15.35	\$119.46	\$104.12	
403	3187	Isaac	Edsel	\$263.62	\$38.86	\$302.48	\$263.62	
404	108273	Isanan	Claro	\$199.02	\$29.34	\$228.35	\$199.02	
405	107191	Ivanov	Yordan	\$74.55	\$10.99	\$85.54	\$74.55	
406	2114	Ivey	Timothy	\$1,046.55	\$154.27	\$1,200.82	\$1,505.32	\$458.77
407	108839	Jackson	Frederick	\$2,776.86	\$409.32	\$3,186.18	\$3,154.65	\$377.79
408	3701	Jackson	Willie	\$2,678.80	\$394.87	\$3,073.67	\$3,577.43	\$898.63
409	3928	Jackson	Anthony	\$495.57	\$73.05	\$568.62	\$495.57	
410	107992	Jacobi	Donald	\$1,157.97	\$170.69	\$1,328.66	\$1,157.97	
411	20466	Jafarian	Moharram	\$13.55	\$2.00	\$15.55	\$13.55	
412	3020	Jarmosco	John	\$54.71	\$8.07	\$62.78	\$224.90	\$170.19
413	2483	Javelona	Mario	\$3,199.71	\$471.65	\$3,671.36	\$3,199.71	
414	2412	Jelancic	Vladko	\$1,366.25	\$201.39	\$1,567.64	\$1,773.01	\$406.76
415	3851	Jellison	Charles	\$327.35	\$48.25	\$375.60	\$513.14	\$185.79
416	2083	Jennings	Stanley	\$331.46	\$48.86	\$380.32	\$331.46	
417	3315	Jimenez	Michael	\$3,308.60	\$487.70	\$3,796.31	\$3,504.64	\$196.04
418	3109	Jin	Casey	\$2,255.12	\$332.41	\$2,587.54	\$2,255.12	
419	3151	Johnson	Kennard	\$1,657.18	\$244.28	\$1,901.46	\$2,649.47	\$992.29
420	3602	Johnson	Tony	\$377.73	\$55.68	\$433.41	\$377.73	
421	3844	Johnson	Richard	\$162.40	\$23.94	\$186.34	\$162.40	
422	3898	Johnson	Cary	\$91.90	\$13.55	\$105.44	\$91.90	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
423	3539	Johnson	Brian	\$81.93	\$12.08	\$94.00	\$81.93	
424	2127	Johnson	Rodney	\$44.73	\$6.59	\$51.32	\$206.39	\$161.66
425	2253	Jones	Glenn	\$3,712.11	\$547.18	\$4,259.29	\$4,106.08	\$393.97
426	2639	Jones	James	\$247.93	\$36.55	\$284.48	\$247.93	
427	1058	Jones	Doug	\$223.09	\$32.88	\$255.98	\$223.09	
428	3784	Joseph	Leroy	\$2,440.47	\$359.74	\$2,800.21	\$2,570.69	\$130.22
429	3239	Joseph	Loradel	\$172.42	\$25.41	\$197.83	\$172.42	
430	2849	Justice	Jason	\$479.91	\$70.74	\$550.65	\$479.91	
431	3919	Kabbaz	David	\$76.92	\$11.34	\$88.26	\$76.92	
432	111813	Kadir	Tura	\$23.88	\$3.52	\$27.39	\$23.88	
433	106642	Kadri	Abdelkrim	\$10.24	\$1.51	\$11.75	\$10.24	
434	3772	Kaiyooraw	Chaipan	\$3,065.66	\$451.89	\$3,517.55	\$3,065.66	
435	101942	Kalimba	Gaston	\$530.48	\$78.19	\$608.67	\$530.48	
436	29542	Kang	Chong	\$219.01	\$32.28	\$251.30	\$219.01	
437	3631	Karner	Adam	\$873.51	\$128.76	\$1,002.27	\$1,141.88	\$268.37
438	3819	Keba	Woldmarim	\$569.14	\$83.89	\$653.03	\$998.90	\$429.76
439	3303	Keber	Yilma	\$116.56	\$17.18	\$133.74	\$116.56	
440	2482	Keith	Marcus	\$190.51	\$28.08	\$218.60	\$190.51	
441	106153	Keller	Roger	\$390.90	\$57.62	\$448.52	\$390.90	
442	3531	Kelley	Jared	\$253.10	\$37.31	\$290.41	\$253.10	
443	2736	Kenary	Brian	\$3,450.45	\$508.61	\$3,959.06	\$4,804.46	\$1,354.01
444	3484	Kern	Gary	\$9,231.17	\$1,360.71	\$10,591.89	\$10,171.83	\$940.66
445	3637	Key	Roy	\$174.71	\$25.75	\$200.46	\$174.71	
446	3651	Khan	Zaka	\$53.04	\$7.82	\$60.86	\$53.04	
447	105794	Kimler	Ryan	\$198.87	\$29.31	\$228.19	\$198.87	
448	3798	King Jr.	John	\$115.51	\$17.03	\$132.54	\$179.87	\$64.36
449	2901	Kingsley	David	\$49.73	\$7.33	\$57.06	\$49.73	
450	111283	Kissel	Sean	\$51.23	\$7.55	\$58.78	\$51.23	
451	3893	Klein	Phillip	\$3,633.02	\$535.52	\$4,168.54	\$3,633.02	
452	3837	Knight	Tyree	\$262.37	\$38.67	\$301.04	\$262.37	
453	3215	Koch	Frederick	\$379.05	\$55.87	\$434.93	\$379.05	
454	3630	Kogan	Martin	\$6,773.74	\$998.48	\$7,772.22	\$7,609.17	\$835.43
455	3273	Kolasienk	Aemon	\$595.28	\$87.75	\$683.03	\$595.28	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
456	2789	Krouse	Stephen	\$906.46	\$133.62	\$1,040.07	\$1,187.50	\$281.04
457	103826	Kull Jr.	William	\$135.94	\$20.04	\$155.98	\$135.94	
458	3662	Kunik	Robert	\$301.44	\$44.43	\$345.87	\$301.44	
459	3878	Laico	Paul	\$102.52	\$15.11	\$117.63	\$102.52	
460	111231	Lant	Mark	\$694.00	\$102.30	\$796.29	\$694.00	
461	3535	Lantis	Glen	\$1,045.93	\$154.17	\$1,200.10	\$1,045.93	
462	3435	Laspada	Brian	\$746.94	\$110.10	\$857.04	\$746.94	
463	25362	Lathan	Joseph	\$269.57	\$39.73	\$309.30	\$269.57	
464	111290	Lay	Gilbert	\$139.80	\$20.61	\$160.40	\$139.80	
465	3013	Lazarov	Vasilije	\$205.51	\$30.29	\$235.80	\$205.51	
466	1053	Leacock	Brian	\$1,191.71	\$175.66	\$1,367.37	\$2,396.09	\$1,204.38
467	3685	Leal	Jill	\$2,181.82	\$321.61	\$2,503.43	\$2,592.70	\$410.88
468	2635	Ledbetter	Ernest	\$11.17	\$1.65	\$12.81	\$11.17	
469	3702	Lee	Thomas	\$2,952.81	\$435.26	\$3,388.06	\$2,952.81	
470	18960	Lee	Melvin	\$469.33	\$69.18	\$538.51	\$469.33	
471	3159	Lefevre	Stephen	\$405.67	\$59.80	\$465.47	\$405.67	
472	3666	Legesse	Dereje	\$555.76	\$81.92	\$637.68	\$776.75	\$220.99
473	2160	Leonardo	Vito	\$1,567.29	\$231.02	\$1,798.31	\$1,567.29	
474	3816	Ligus	Thomas	\$219.63	\$32.37	\$252.01	\$219.63	
475	25522	Link	Peter	\$1,068.46	\$157.50	\$1,225.96	\$1,372.28	\$303.82
476	3681	Linzer	Steven	\$42.56	\$6.27	\$48.83	\$42.56	
477	15804	Little	Dennis	\$742.99	\$109.52	\$852.50	\$1,016.34	\$273.35
478	3267	Liu	David	\$181.81	\$26.80	\$208.61	\$181.81	
479	3510	Lloyd	Mark	\$30.64	\$4.52	\$35.15	\$30.64	
480	3945	Lombana	Francisco	\$51.80	\$7.63	\$59.43	\$51.80	
481	3858	Lonbani	Khosro	\$607.51	\$89.55	\$697.06	\$829.71	\$222.20
482	111405	Lopez-Silve	Fidel	\$81.02	\$11.94	\$92.96	\$81.02	
483	3752	Lorenz	Dierdra	\$866.03	\$127.66	\$993.69	\$866.03	
484	3813	Lovelady	Warren	\$11.90	\$1.75	\$13.65	\$11.90	
485	2963	Lovett	Patrick	\$598.72	\$88.25	\$686.98	\$598.72	
486	1065	Lovin	Charles	\$247.32	\$36.46	\$283.77	\$422.42	\$175.10
487	3295	Lowe	John	\$767.67	\$113.16	\$880.82	\$767.67	
488	3006	Loyd	Gary	\$3,050.25	\$449.62	\$3,499.87	\$3,050.25	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
489	3326	Lucero	Arturo	\$1,825.80	\$269.13	\$2,094.93	\$1,825.80	
490	3339	Luo	Yue	\$490.93	\$72.36	\$563.29	\$490.93	
491	3778	Macato	Jaime	\$2,456.61	\$362.11	\$2,818.73	\$2,859.72	\$403.11
492	20936	Madi	Adam	\$137.47	\$20.26	\$157.74	\$137.47	
493	24918	Magana	Luis	\$565.73	\$83.39	\$649.12	\$749.60	\$183.87
494	3224	Magazin	Milorad	\$33.12	\$4.88	\$38.00	\$33.12	
495	107940	Maharit	Khamkhung	\$63.98	\$9.43	\$73.41	\$63.98	
496	2912	Mahmud	Omar	\$2,459.87	\$362.59	\$2,822.46	\$2,459.87	
497	2738	Mahoney	Kevin	\$638.30	\$94.09	\$732.39	\$638.30	
498	3096	Mainwarin	David	\$4,352.12	\$641.52	\$4,993.64	\$4,352.12	
499	2757	Majors	John	\$10,258.22	\$1,512.10	\$11,770.32	\$10,258.22	
500	3312	Mandefro	Nebiyu	\$1,046.39	\$154.24	\$1,200.63	\$1,046.39	
501	22809	Manitien	Ted	\$13.83	\$2.04	\$15.87	\$13.83	
502	3890	Manor	Quincy	\$1,366.55	\$201.44	\$1,567.99	\$1,544.98	\$178.43
503	3583	Maras	Maria	\$2,195.44	\$323.62	\$2,519.05	\$2,614.23	\$418.79
504	110053	Martinez	Francisco	\$1,713.26	\$252.54	\$1,965.80	\$1,713.26	
505	106666	Martinez	Arturo	\$63.48	\$9.36	\$72.83	\$63.48	
506	3866	Martinez-F	Eduardo	\$757.35	\$111.64	\$868.98	\$1,043.05	\$285.70
507	100287	Martins	Julio	\$298.27	\$43.97	\$342.24	\$298.27	
508	1033	Masetta	Ronald	\$593.06	\$87.42	\$680.48	\$593.06	
509	3088	Massey	Michael	\$752.45	\$110.91	\$863.36	\$752.45	
510	3325	Mastilovic	Branislav	\$296.04	\$43.64	\$339.68	\$296.04	
511	3698	Mastrio	Angelo	\$287.39	\$42.36	\$329.75	\$287.39	
512	110618	Mastrio	Pamela	\$234.23	\$34.53	\$268.76	\$234.23	
513	110108	Mathis	George	\$297.42	\$43.84	\$341.26	\$297.42	
514	3669	Maza	Inez	\$349.93	\$51.58	\$401.51	\$349.93	
515	111284	McCall	Melvin	\$169.85	\$25.04	\$194.88	\$169.85	
516	111199	McCarroll-	Claudia	\$17.52	\$2.58	\$20.11	\$17.52	
517	2587	McCarter	Patrick	\$3,774.48	\$556.37	\$4,330.85	\$3,893.89	\$119.41
518	3690	McCarthy	John	\$3,474.77	\$512.20	\$3,986.97	\$4,182.28	\$707.51
519	3654	McConnell	Therral	\$873.55	\$128.77	\$1,002.32	\$873.55	
520	3743	McCoubre	Earl	\$1,347.94	\$198.69	\$1,546.63	\$1,347.94	
521	107427	McDougle	Jeffrey	\$124.87	\$18.41	\$143.27	\$124.87	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
522	3111	McGarry	James	\$1,615.01	\$238.06	\$1,853.07	\$1,615.01	
523	3745	McGowan	Sean	\$228.69	\$33.71	\$262.40	\$228.69	
524	3547	McGregor	Matthew	\$1,725.05	\$254.28	\$1,979.33	\$1,725.05	
525	2178	McIntyre	Kelly	\$1,180.66	\$174.03	\$1,354.69	\$1,180.66	
526	3722	McNeece	James	\$147.35	\$21.72	\$169.07	\$147.35	
527	25641	McSkimmi	John	\$901.92	\$132.95	\$1,034.87	\$901.92	
528	2054	Mears	John	\$22.75	\$3.35	\$26.11	\$22.75	
529	3098	Medlock	Michael	\$93.32	\$13.76	\$107.08	\$93.32	
530	3345	Mekonen	Solomon	\$557.43	\$82.17	\$639.60	\$557.43	
531	3066	Melesse	Abebe	\$529.55	\$78.06	\$607.60	\$529.55	
532	3665	Melka	Tariku	\$27.31	\$4.03	\$31.34	\$27.31	
533	2596	Meloro	Paul	\$4,927.61	\$726.35	\$5,653.96	\$5,177.64	\$250.03
534	3262	Mengesha	Alemayehu	\$521.70	\$76.90	\$598.60	\$861.06	\$339.36
535	3568	Menocal	Pedro	\$1,029.70	\$151.78	\$1,181.48	\$1,029.70	
536	2838	Mersal	Beth	\$2,597.07	\$382.82	\$2,979.89	\$2,597.07	
537	102328	Meyer	Ronald	\$53.72	\$7.92	\$61.64	\$53.72	
538	26609	Mezzenas	Pedro	\$1,317.06	\$194.14	\$1,511.19	\$1,523.84	\$206.78
539	3542	Michaels	Terry	\$110.59	\$16.30	\$126.89	\$110.59	
540	110334	Michilena	Luis	\$66.26	\$9.77	\$76.03	\$66.26	
541	2959	Miller	Darryl	\$5,060.89	\$746.00	\$5,806.88	\$5,060.89	
542	30196	Miller	Jason	\$983.37	\$144.95	\$1,128.32	\$983.37	
543	3275	Miller	John	\$472.50	\$69.65	\$542.15	\$472.50	
544	22514	Miller	Michelle	\$88.70	\$13.08	\$101.78	\$88.70	
545	2875	Miller	Florence	\$87.31	\$12.87	\$100.17	\$87.31	
546	17855	Milliron	Darrol	\$2,152.74	\$317.32	\$2,470.06	\$3,924.93	\$1,772.19
547	3314	Milton	Shawn	\$959.25	\$141.40	\$1,100.64	\$959.25	
548	3620	Mindyas	James	\$579.57	\$85.43	\$665.00	\$855.65	\$276.08
549	3904	Mirkulovsk	Danny	\$550.09	\$81.09	\$631.18	\$550.09	
550	2933	Mitchell	Jimmy	\$4,570.58	\$673.72	\$5,244.30	\$4,570.58	
551	31966	Mitrikov	Ilko	\$2,230.42	\$328.77	\$2,559.19	\$2,414.03	\$183.61
552	104887	Miyazaki	Nisaburo	\$912.41	\$134.49	\$1,046.90	\$912.41	
553	2759	Moffett	Larry	\$1,118.37	\$164.85	\$1,283.23	\$1,118.37	
554	3317	Mogeeth	Ehab	\$323.43	\$47.67	\$371.10	\$323.43	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
555	3318	Mohr	Donald	\$135.02	\$19.90	\$154.92	\$135.02	
556	105284	Monforte	Peter	\$5,074.87	\$748.06	\$5,822.92	\$5,074.87	
557	3882	Monteagu	Oscar	\$937.81	\$138.24	\$1,076.04	\$937.81	
558	3735	Montoya V	Francisco	\$551.62	\$81.31	\$632.93	\$1,112.68	\$561.06
559	30777	Moore	Jimmy	\$1,597.64	\$235.50	\$1,833.13	\$1,597.64	
560	2110	Moore	Jerry	\$1,429.18	\$210.67	\$1,639.85	\$1,471.54	\$42.36
561	3913	Moore	Aileen-Louise	\$328.57	\$48.43	\$377.01	\$328.57	
562	3664	Moreno	James	\$4,373.10	\$644.61	\$5,017.71	\$5,220.56	\$847.46
563	3626	Moretti	Bryan	\$1,422.89	\$209.74	\$1,632.63	\$1,422.89	
564	3411	Morley	David	\$1,407.06	\$207.41	\$1,614.46	\$1,610.99	\$203.93
565	8321	Morris	Thomas	\$4,599.67	\$678.01	\$5,277.68	\$4,599.67	
566	2162	Morris	Robert	\$2,890.99	\$426.14	\$3,317.13	\$2,890.99	
567	106703	Mosely	David	\$1,143.38	\$168.54	\$1,311.92	\$1,143.38	
568	3282	Mosley	Rory	\$177.21	\$26.12	\$203.33	\$177.21	
569	3785	Mostafa	Ahmed	\$500.20	\$73.73	\$573.93	\$500.20	
570	28917	Motazedi	Kamran	\$181.66	\$26.78	\$208.44	\$181.66	
571	27059	Mottaghia	Joseph	\$30.98	\$4.57	\$35.54	\$30.98	
572	107704	Muhtari	Abdulrahman	\$615.74	\$90.76	\$706.50	\$615.74	
573	3518	Muldoon	Thomas	\$345.81	\$50.97	\$396.78	\$345.81	
574	2735	Mumma	Donald	\$388.18	\$57.22	\$445.40	\$388.18	
575	3847	Murawski	Richard	\$1,593.10	\$234.83	\$1,827.93	\$1,593.10	
576	2018	Murray	MichaelP	\$4,393.97	\$647.69	\$5,041.65	\$4,393.97	
577	2642	Murray	MichaelJ	\$2,654.68	\$391.31	\$3,045.99	\$2,654.68	
578	2018	Murray	Michael P.	\$770.33	\$113.55	\$883.88	\$770.33	
579	2717	Murray	Melinda	\$523.81	\$77.21	\$601.02	\$523.81	
580	3856	Murray	Mark	\$23.74	\$3.50	\$27.24	\$23.74	
581	3255	Mutia	Junno	\$173.69	\$25.60	\$199.29	\$173.69	
582	107440	Nantista	Peter	\$212.28	\$31.29	\$243.57	\$212.28	
583	3859	Nazarov	Mikael	\$2,455.84	\$362.00	\$2,817.84	\$2,736.49	\$280.65
584	3804	Ndichu	Simon	\$366.18	\$53.98	\$420.16	\$366.18	
585	102656	Nedyalkov	Atanas	\$321.59	\$47.40	\$369.00	\$321.59	
586	3530	Negashe	Legesse	\$1,456.47	\$214.69	\$1,671.16	\$1,792.40	\$335.93
587	3335	Negussie	Berhanu	\$177.66	\$26.19	\$203.85	\$177.66	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
588	111494	Nemeth	Zoltan	\$353.54	\$52.11	\$405.65	\$353.54	
589	25190	Ngo	Tuan	\$1,607.52	\$236.95	\$1,844.47	\$1,607.52	
590	3545	Nichols	Keith	\$937.37	\$138.17	\$1,075.54	\$937.37	
591	2990	Nick	Harry	\$1,427.52	\$210.42	\$1,637.94	\$1,427.52	
592	1098	Nicol	Thaddeus	\$2,390.59	\$352.38	\$2,742.98	\$2,390.59	
593	3122	Niculescu	Adrian	\$1,081.63	\$159.44	\$1,241.06	\$1,081.63	
594	3823	Nigussie	Gulilat	\$480.17	\$70.78	\$550.95	\$620.79	\$140.62
595	3000	Nolan	Jeffrey	\$455.61	\$67.16	\$522.77	\$455.61	
596	28989	Nolan	Eamonn	\$107.87	\$15.90	\$123.77	\$107.87	
597	3639	Norberg	Christopher	\$919.23	\$135.50	\$1,054.73	\$996.85	\$77.62
598	3876	Norvell	Chris	\$4,691.89	\$691.60	\$5,383.49	\$4,691.89	
599	2713	Novaky	Adam	\$811.29	\$119.59	\$930.88	\$811.29	
600	3841	Ocampo	Leonardo	\$882.56	\$130.09	\$1,012.66	\$967.99	\$85.43
601	30295	Ogbazghi	Dawit	\$489.50	\$72.15	\$561.65	\$1,075.06	\$585.56
602	109172	O'Grady	Francis	\$404.46	\$59.62	\$464.08	\$404.46	
603	3836	Ohlson	Ryan	\$752.25	\$110.89	\$863.14	\$924.94	\$172.69
604	3753	Olen	Virginia	\$2,224.07	\$327.84	\$2,551.91	\$2,224.07	
605	3748	Oliveros	Mario	\$671.02	\$98.91	\$769.93	\$671.02	
606	3868	Olson	Eric	\$514.53	\$75.84	\$590.38	\$514.53	
607	3271	O'Neill	Terry	\$84.85	\$12.51	\$97.35	\$84.85	
608	3644	Ontura	Tesfaalem	\$259.20	\$38.21	\$297.41	\$259.20	
609	3308	Orellana	Byron	\$829.67	\$122.30	\$951.96	\$829.67	
610	3934	Orr	Mark	\$147.62	\$21.76	\$169.38	\$147.62	
611	3863	Ortega	Saul	\$439.49	\$64.78	\$504.27	\$439.49	
612	104938	Ortega	Paul	\$47.24	\$6.96	\$54.20	\$47.24	
613	3894	O'Shea	Kevin	\$163.81	\$24.15	\$187.96	\$163.81	
614	25832	Osterman	Victor	\$209.00	\$30.81	\$239.81	\$683.24	\$474.24
615	3783	Overson	Michael	\$636.00	\$93.75	\$729.74	\$636.00	
616	3789	Oyebade	Vincent	\$116.31	\$17.14	\$133.45	\$116.31	
617	3717	Ozgulgec	Tunc	\$1,477.21	\$217.75	\$1,694.95	\$1,626.46	\$149.25
618	3618	Pak	Kon	\$374.87	\$55.26	\$430.13	\$374.87	
619	3099	Pannell	Norbert	\$167.92	\$24.75	\$192.68	\$167.92	
620	106025	Paone	Chris	\$1,093.84	\$161.24	\$1,255.08	\$1,093.84	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
621	2810	Paranhos	Eurico	\$1,750.43	\$258.02	\$2,008.45	\$1,750.43	
622	3597	Pariso	David	\$4,792.27	\$706.40	\$5,498.67	\$5,508.79	\$716.52
623	109637	Park	Danny	\$38.85	\$5.73	\$44.58	\$38.85	
624	16676	Parker	Gary	\$1,387.79	\$204.57	\$1,592.35	\$1,387.79	
625	3750	Parker	Shawnette	\$481.18	\$70.93	\$552.10	\$713.53	\$232.35
626	3884	Parmenter	William	\$1,713.94	\$252.64	\$1,966.58	\$1,713.94	
627	3659	Paros	Nicholas	\$14.71	\$2.17	\$16.88	\$14.71	
628	19858	Passera	Charles	\$65.93	\$9.72	\$75.64	\$65.93	
629	3624	Patry	Michael	\$2,186.37	\$322.28	\$2,508.64	\$2,583.67	\$397.30
630	2647	Patterson	Robert	\$489.44	\$72.15	\$561.59	\$489.44	
631	3932	Patton	Dorothy	\$43.03	\$6.34	\$49.37	\$43.03	
632	112811	Peace	Kimberly	\$241.57	\$35.61	\$277.18	\$241.57	
633	29536	Peacock	Paula	\$118.57	\$17.48	\$136.04	\$118.57	
634	3806	Pearson	Jon	\$988.94	\$145.77	\$1,134.71	\$1,150.94	\$162.00
635	31112	Peer	Yuda	\$1,613.84	\$237.89	\$1,851.73	\$1,613.84	
636	3396	Penera	Eric	\$143.90	\$21.21	\$165.11	\$298.45	\$154.55
637	2776	Pepitone	Leonard	\$1,687.56	\$248.75	\$1,936.31	\$1,687.56	
638	3834	Perrotti	Dominic	\$343.23	\$50.59	\$393.82	\$421.61	\$78.38
639	111257	Petculescu	Ciprian	\$28.97	\$4.27	\$33.24	\$28.97	
640	1076	Peterson	Steven	\$3,638.58	\$536.34	\$4,174.92	\$3,638.58	
641	15968	Peterson	Kenneth	\$978.12	\$144.18	\$1,122.30	\$978.12	
642	3736	Petrie	Theodore	\$49.32	\$7.27	\$56.59	\$49.32	
643	3740	Petrossian	Robert	\$678.86	\$100.07	\$778.92	\$678.86	
644	2440	Pettaway	Marvin	\$589.60	\$86.91	\$676.51	\$589.60	
645	2473	Phillips	Gordon	\$3,008.26	\$443.43	\$3,451.69	\$3,008.26	
646	106089	Phillips	Larry	\$881.80	\$129.98	\$1,011.78	\$881.80	
647	3281	Phonesava	Paul	\$1,217.26	\$179.43	\$1,396.68	\$1,217.26	
648	3523	Pilkingtton	Margaret	\$2,165.08	\$319.14	\$2,484.22	\$2,988.83	\$823.75
649	107617	Pineda	Carlos	\$2,994.17	\$441.35	\$3,435.52	\$2,994.17	
650	2826	Pitts	Amir	\$967.07	\$142.55	\$1,109.62	\$1,202.20	\$235.13
651	2407	Platania	John	\$556.69	\$82.06	\$638.75	\$1,038.00	\$481.31
652	3265	Pletz	David	\$4,184.29	\$616.78	\$4,801.08	\$5,203.24	\$1,018.95
653	3647	Pohl	Daniel	\$186.19	\$27.45	\$213.64	\$186.19	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
654	26679	Polchinski	Paul	\$111.37	\$16.42	\$127.78	\$111.37	
655	3017	Polk	Craig	\$96.33	\$14.20	\$110.53	\$96.33	
656	31149	Pony	David	\$51.52	\$7.59	\$59.11	\$51.52	
657	3563	Portillo	Mario	\$593.50	\$87.48	\$680.98	\$593.50	
658	3287	Portillo-Sa	Carlos	\$417.87	\$61.60	\$479.46	\$417.87	
659	1030	Poulton	Todd	\$11.77	\$1.73	\$13.50	\$11.77	
660	3129	Povolotsky	Anatoly	\$227.53	\$33.54	\$261.07	\$227.53	
661	3152	Prather	Robert	\$445.01	\$65.60	\$510.60	\$445.01	
662	3201	Presnall	Darryl	\$2,341.64	\$345.17	\$2,686.80	\$2,471.47	\$129.83
663	2568	Price	James	\$3,555.64	\$524.12	\$4,079.75	\$5,036.02	\$1,480.38
664	3800	Price	Allen	\$630.95	\$93.00	\$723.95	\$630.95	
665	3449	Prifti	Ilia	\$418.70	\$61.72	\$480.42	\$418.70	
666	26363	Punzalan	Luciano	\$236.08	\$34.80	\$270.87	\$236.08	
667	3687	Purdue	Robert	\$210.21	\$30.99	\$241.20	\$312.22	\$102.01
668	2122	Purvis	James	\$58.24	\$8.58	\$66.83	\$58.24	
669	3556	Pyles	Joseph	\$682.49	\$100.60	\$783.09	\$682.49	
670	3307	Qian	Jie	\$376.94	\$55.56	\$432.51	\$376.94	
671	3002	Rabara	Antino	\$698.55	\$102.97	\$801.52	\$698.55	
672	107548	Rainey	James	\$219.28	\$32.32	\$251.60	\$219.28	
673	3883	Ramirez	Erney	\$760.59	\$112.11	\$872.70	\$760.59	
674	2180	Ramos	Lawrence	\$122.19	\$18.01	\$140.20	\$122.19	
675	3085	Ramsey	Gary	\$1,312.85	\$193.52	\$1,506.37	\$1,312.85	
676	3525	Rasheed	Willie	\$4,450.03	\$655.95	\$5,105.98	\$4,450.03	
677	3812	Ray	William	\$12.61	\$1.86	\$14.47	\$12.61	
678	2857	Reevell	Jeffrey	\$15.47	\$2.28	\$17.75	\$15.47	
679	108758	Regans	Mark	\$379.98	\$56.01	\$435.99	\$379.98	
680	2805	Reina	Linda	\$77.46	\$11.42	\$88.88	\$77.46	
681	2237	Relopez	Craig	\$2,166.42	\$319.34	\$2,485.76	\$2,933.59	\$767.17
682	3544	Reno	Michael	\$4,966.19	\$732.04	\$5,698.22	\$4,966.19	
683	2266	Reynolds	James	\$289.68	\$42.70	\$332.38	\$289.68	
684	14261	Riipi	Karl	\$126.47	\$18.64	\$145.11	\$126.47	
685	109502	Rios-Lopez	Oscar	\$189.76	\$27.97	\$217.73	\$189.76	
686	107701	Risby	Clifford	\$1,060.42	\$156.31	\$1,216.73	\$1,060.42	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
687	111756	Risco	Pedro	\$554.56	\$81.74	\$636.30	\$554.56	
688	3191	Rivas	Victor	\$1,763.13	\$259.89	\$2,023.03	\$1,763.13	
689	104109	Rivero-Ver	Raul	\$288.88	\$42.58	\$331.46	\$288.88	
690	101317	Rivers	Willie	\$642.53	\$94.71	\$737.24	\$642.53	
691	3575	Roach	Jayson	\$665.36	\$98.08	\$763.44	\$665.36	
692	3305	Roberson	Ronnie	\$108.61	\$16.01	\$124.61	\$108.61	
693	2842	Roberts	James	\$1,756.75	\$258.95	\$2,015.70	\$1,756.75	
694	104171	Robinson	Mikalani	\$398.94	\$58.81	\$457.75	\$398.94	
695	3526	Robinson	William	\$383.59	\$56.54	\$440.14	\$383.59	
696	3629	Robles	Mark	\$49.78	\$7.34	\$57.11	\$49.78	
697	3744	Rockett Jr.	Roosevelt	\$81.28	\$11.98	\$93.26	\$81.28	
698	31847	Rodriguez	Armando	\$30.79	\$4.54	\$35.33	\$30.79	
699	3814	Rohlas	Polly	\$2,985.34	\$440.05	\$3,425.39	\$3,615.12	\$629.78
700	2666	Rojas	David	\$68.35	\$10.07	\$78.42	\$68.35	
701	3874	Romano	Anthony	\$1,169.52	\$172.39	\$1,341.91	\$1,306.60	\$137.08
702	3587	Romero	Ruben	\$687.24	\$101.30	\$788.54	\$687.24	
703	3104	Rosenthal	John	\$2,113.74	\$311.57	\$2,425.31	\$3,513.66	\$1,399.92
704	108742	Ross	Lee	\$174.37	\$25.70	\$200.07	\$174.37	
705	3225	Ross	Larry	\$74.22	\$10.94	\$85.15	\$74.22	
706	3850	Rothenber	Edward	\$239.11	\$35.25	\$274.36	\$239.11	
707	3504	Rotich	Emertha	\$2,099.57	\$309.49	\$2,409.06	\$2,099.57	
708	3912	Rousseau	James	\$657.44	\$96.91	\$754.35	\$657.44	
709	3021	Rubino	Joseph	\$103.47	\$15.25	\$118.72	\$103.47	
710	3693	Ruby	Melissa	\$265.99	\$39.21	\$305.20	\$265.99	
711	3477	Ruiz	Travis	\$1,117.07	\$164.66	\$1,281.73	\$1,117.07	
712	2965	Russell	Mark	\$1,239.03	\$182.64	\$1,421.67	\$1,239.03	
713	3875	Russell	Darrell	\$657.42	\$96.91	\$754.33	\$657.42	
714	2260	Sackett	Kathryn	\$203.37	\$29.98	\$233.34	\$203.37	
715	3944	Sadler	James	\$82.91	\$12.22	\$95.13	\$82.91	
716	3323	Saevitz	Neil	\$2,364.73	\$348.57	\$2,713.30	\$2,364.73	
717	3169	Salameh	George	\$2,142.47	\$315.81	\$2,458.27	\$2,702.72	\$560.25
718	3042	Saleh	Jemal	\$8,393.73	\$1,237.27	\$9,630.99	\$8,393.73	
719	103096	Sam	Phea	\$625.84	\$92.25	\$718.09	\$625.84	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
720	21811	Sameli	Sabino	\$921.22	\$135.79	\$1,057.01	\$921.22	
721	100128	Sampson	James	\$644.31	\$94.97	\$739.28	\$644.31	
722	109349	Sanchez-R	Natasha	\$288.44	\$42.52	\$330.96	\$288.44	
723	3570	Sanders	Acy	\$737.61	\$108.73	\$846.33	\$737.61	
724	2859	Sandoval	Yolanda	\$421.83	\$62.18	\$484.01	\$421.83	
725	29769	Sans	Thomas	\$769.01	\$113.35	\$882.36	\$769.01	
726	3011	Santos	Billy	\$86.61	\$12.77	\$99.38	\$86.61	
727	3915	Sapienza	Gino	\$261.74	\$38.58	\$300.32	\$261.74	
728	3648	Saravanos	John	\$5,143.32	\$758.15	\$5,901.46	\$5,143.32	
729	26687	Sargeant	Michael	\$164.64	\$24.27	\$188.91	\$164.64	
730	105273	Sayed	Jamil	\$645.44	\$95.14	\$740.58	\$904.94	\$259.50
731	1093	Schall	Douglas	\$1,002.07	\$147.71	\$1,149.78	\$1,002.07	
732	106913	Schraeder	Scott	\$569.96	\$84.01	\$653.98	\$569.96	
733	25981	Schroeder	William	\$2,110.35	\$311.07	\$2,421.42	\$2,110.35	
734	3313	Schwartz	Steven	\$4,584.18	\$675.73	\$5,259.91	\$4,584.18	
735	29172	Schwartz	George	\$601.41	\$88.65	\$690.06	\$601.41	
736	109028	Secondo	Muridi	\$391.43	\$57.70	\$449.12	\$391.43	
737	3536	Sedgwick	Anthony	\$226.67	\$33.41	\$260.08	\$226.67	
738	2657	Seller	Paula	\$295.78	\$43.60	\$339.38	\$295.78	
739	3134	Serio	John	\$3,739.93	\$551.28	\$4,291.21	\$4,092.51	\$352.58
740	3057	Serrano	Hector	\$2,494.64	\$367.72	\$2,862.36	\$2,990.45	\$495.81
741	3359	Sevillet	Otto	\$453.18	\$66.80	\$519.98	\$706.90	\$253.72
742	3879	Sexner	Alexis	\$955.88	\$140.90	\$1,096.77	\$1,075.72	\$119.84
743	19451	Shafiei	Abdolreza	\$552.17	\$81.39	\$633.56	\$552.17	
744	2899	Shallufa	Azmy	\$9,805.00	\$1,445.30	\$11,250.30	\$10,290.01	\$485.01
745	2955	Shank	Lyle	\$52.32	\$7.71	\$60.03	\$52.32	
746	3294	Sharp	Omar	\$276.16	\$40.71	\$316.87	\$276.16	
747	3619	Shein	Efraim	\$304.28	\$44.85	\$349.13	\$304.28	
748	3532	Shenkov	Svetlozar	\$275.95	\$40.68	\$316.62	\$275.95	
749	103821	Sherman	Jason	\$214.72	\$31.65	\$246.37	\$214.72	
750	3724	Shinn	Kevin	\$463.14	\$68.27	\$531.41	\$463.14	
751	3790	Shoyombo	Rilwan	\$1,426.49	\$210.27	\$1,636.76	\$1,833.70	\$407.21
752	3803	Siasat	Manuel	\$32.38	\$4.77	\$37.15	\$32.38	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
753	112766	Sibre	Christopher	\$294.20	\$43.37	\$337.56	\$294.20	
754	3758	Siegel	Jeffrey	\$91.32	\$13.46	\$104.78	\$91.32	
755	105863	Siljkovic	Becir	\$1,854.68	\$273.39	\$2,128.06	\$2,017.09	\$162.41
756	23388	Simmons	John	\$1,545.83	\$227.86	\$1,773.70	\$2,558.25	\$1,012.42
757	3264	Sinatra	Anthony	\$296.21	\$43.66	\$339.88	\$296.21	
758	3524	Sinay	Abraham	\$858.58	\$126.56	\$985.14	\$858.58	
759	3677	Singh	Baldev	\$180.81	\$26.65	\$207.47	\$180.81	
760	3683	Sitotaw	Haileab	\$118.59	\$17.48	\$136.06	\$118.59	
761	2972	Smagacz	Stephen	\$185.28	\$27.31	\$212.59	\$185.28	
762	2630	Smale	Charles	\$935.99	\$137.97	\$1,073.96	\$935.99	
763	3041	Smith	Lottie	\$6,722.83	\$990.97	\$7,713.81	\$6,722.83	
764	3521	Smith	Lisa	\$1,094.07	\$161.27	\$1,255.34	\$1,094.07	
765	3870	Smith	Jepthy	\$284.41	\$41.92	\$326.33	\$484.69	\$200.28
766	3033	Smith	Toby	\$140.20	\$20.67	\$160.86	\$140.20	
767	2923	Smith	Jerry	\$30.69	\$4.52	\$35.21	\$30.69	
768	3610	Smith Jr.	Willie	\$1,287.44	\$189.77	\$1,477.21	\$2,123.86	\$836.42
769	2667	Solares	John	\$453.45	\$66.84	\$520.29	\$453.45	
770	3643	Solis	Brigido	\$174.25	\$25.69	\$199.94	\$174.25	
771	22804	Solymar	Istvan	\$303.84	\$44.79	\$348.63	\$303.84	
772	3854	Soree	Mladen	\$1,445.54	\$213.08	\$1,658.62	\$1,445.54	
773	105304	Sorkin	Jack	\$336.28	\$49.57	\$385.85	\$336.28	
774	3770	Sorrosa	Juan	\$1,888.94	\$278.44	\$2,167.38	\$2,214.82	\$325.88
775	3797	Soto	Johnny	\$196.46	\$28.96	\$225.41	\$352.89	\$156.43
776	2638	Soto	Jacob	\$128.04	\$18.87	\$146.91	\$413.13	\$285.09
777	2873	Spangler	Peter	\$93.78	\$13.82	\$107.61	\$93.78	
778	3727	Sparks	Cody	\$19.56	\$2.88	\$22.45	\$19.56	
779	3845	Spaulding	Ross	\$244.25	\$36.00	\$280.25	\$244.25	
780	2592	Sphouris	Constantine	\$71.48	\$10.54	\$82.02	\$71.48	
781	3087	Spiegel	Louis	\$113.17	\$16.68	\$129.85	\$113.17	
782	3055	Spilmon	Mark	\$8,254.49	\$1,216.75	\$9,471.24	\$8,891.81	\$637.32
783	3481	Springer	Marvin	\$1,483.49	\$218.67	\$1,702.17	\$1,483.49	
784	111364	Stanley	John	\$286.26	\$42.20	\$328.46	\$286.26	
785	3366	Starcher	Richard	\$871.76	\$128.50	\$1,000.26	\$871.76	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
786	3821	Stauff	John	\$113.93	\$16.79	\$130.72	\$113.93	
787	3737	Stayton	William	\$119.03	\$17.55	\$136.57	\$119.03	
788	109013	Stearns	Thomas	\$528.37	\$77.88	\$606.25	\$528.37	
789	3757	Steck	Gregory	\$5,829.47	\$859.29	\$6,688.75	\$6,511.90	\$682.43
790	3625	Stephanov	Liuben	\$219.81	\$32.40	\$252.21	\$398.92	\$179.11
791	3695	Stern	Robert	\$292.29	\$43.08	\$335.37	\$292.29	
792	3165	Stevenson	John	\$2,662.56	\$392.47	\$3,055.03	\$2,662.56	
793	3872	Stockton	Clarence	\$1,336.84	\$197.06	\$1,533.89	\$1,336.84	
794	3713	Stonebrea	Dawn	\$1,992.26	\$293.67	\$2,285.92	\$2,489.85	\$497.59
795	25450	Tafesh	George	\$976.87	\$143.99	\$1,120.86	\$976.87	
796	102400	Talley	George	\$301.76	\$44.48	\$346.24	\$301.76	
797	112063	Tapia-Verg	Agustin	\$587.64	\$86.62	\$674.26	\$587.64	
798	3338	Tarragano	Stephen	\$1,370.43	\$202.01	\$1,572.43	\$1,370.43	
799	3333	Taurins	Walter	\$407.00	\$59.99	\$466.99	\$407.00	
800	31977	Taylor	Marvin	\$714.56	\$105.33	\$819.89	\$714.56	
801	111807	Taylor	Brent	\$632.29	\$93.20	\$725.49	\$632.29	
802	109745	Taylor	David	\$324.21	\$47.79	\$372.00	\$324.21	
803	3728	Tedros	Biserat	\$405.38	\$59.75	\$465.13	\$588.25	\$182.87
804	3720	Terry	James	\$937.23	\$138.15	\$1,075.38	\$937.23	
805	3726	Thomas	Scott	\$2,673.14	\$394.03	\$3,067.17	\$2,673.14	
806	3045	Thomas	Anthony	\$1,285.73	\$189.52	\$1,475.25	\$1,285.73	
807	31400	Thomas	Cator	\$427.93	\$63.08	\$491.01	\$427.93	
808	104732	Thomas	Hasan	\$247.81	\$36.53	\$284.34	\$247.81	
809	27963	Thompson	Michael	\$6,744.25	\$994.13	\$7,738.38	\$7,044.25	\$300.00
810	3867	Thompson	Glen	\$2,921.34	\$430.62	\$3,351.95	\$2,921.34	
811	29040	Timko	Robert	\$224.07	\$33.03	\$257.09	\$224.07	
812	110796	Toka	Tamas	\$445.88	\$65.72	\$511.60	\$445.88	
813	2980	Tracy	Dennis	\$67.90	\$10.01	\$77.91	\$67.90	
814	22120	Travis	Brian	\$1,783.28	\$262.86	\$2,046.14	\$2,502.26	\$718.98
815	2632	Travis	Patricia	\$1,049.36	\$154.68	\$1,204.04	\$1,049.36	
816	3083	Tripi	Joseph	\$1,325.47	\$195.38	\$1,520.85	\$1,325.47	
817	104747	Trump	Robert	\$211.10	\$31.12	\$242.22	\$211.10	
818	3110	Tsegay	Alexander	\$441.20	\$65.04	\$506.24	\$441.20	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
819	103413	Tsegaye	Miheret	\$51.23	\$7.55	\$58.78	\$51.23	
820	3207	Tucker	Kenlon	\$2,873.20	\$423.52	\$3,296.72	\$2,873.20	
821	20386	Tucker	Carl	\$768.69	\$113.31	\$882.00	\$768.69	
822	3679	Tullao	Isaac	\$411.83	\$60.71	\$472.54	\$411.83	
823	3880	Turner	Michael	\$39.72	\$5.86	\$45.58	\$39.72	
824	3686	Tyler	Christopher	\$267.85	\$39.48	\$307.33	\$267.85	
825	110836	Uba	Chima	\$201.50	\$29.70	\$231.20	\$201.50	
826	3612	Ullah	Mohammad	\$90.03	\$13.27	\$103.30	\$90.03	
827	3073	Urban	David	\$319.32	\$47.07	\$366.38	\$319.32	
828	3792	Urbanski	Anthony	\$1,411.23	\$208.02	\$1,619.25	\$1,411.23	
829	3668	Valdes	Lazaro	\$162.21	\$23.91	\$186.12	\$162.21	
830	2925	Van Camp	Carl	\$3,552.87	\$523.71	\$4,076.58	\$3,552.87	
831	3640	Vanluven	RJ	\$1,726.16	\$254.44	\$1,980.60	\$1,726.16	
832	2846	Vaughan	William	\$3,886.52	\$572.89	\$4,459.40	\$3,886.52	
833	3710	Vences	Alfredo	\$839.90	\$123.81	\$963.71	\$839.90	
834	3103	Verdine	Craig	\$634.21	\$93.49	\$727.69	\$634.21	
835	3721	Viado	Ramon	\$2,051.73	\$302.43	\$2,354.16	\$2,369.87	\$318.14
836	3682	VonEngel	Stephen	\$29.89	\$4.41	\$34.30	\$29.89	
837	3796	Vongthep	Christopher	\$2,710.64	\$399.56	\$3,110.20	\$2,710.64	
838	109475	Vonkagele	Mark	\$130.27	\$19.20	\$149.48	\$130.27	
839	3842	Wagg	John	\$221.46	\$32.64	\$254.10	\$221.46	
840	3776	Wakeel	Daud	\$679.94	\$100.23	\$780.16	\$679.94	
841	28448	Walker	Arthur	\$114.57	\$16.89	\$131.46	\$114.57	
842	3820	Wallace	Roy	\$3,681.35	\$542.65	\$4,224.00	\$3,681.35	
843	3766	Warner	Terrance	\$1,694.50	\$249.78	\$1,944.27	\$2,356.86	\$662.36
844	3496	Weaver	Gerie	\$4,828.49	\$711.74	\$5,540.23	\$6,465.81	\$1,637.32
845	3826	Webb	Ricky	\$624.58	\$92.07	\$716.64	\$923.04	\$298.46
846	109066	Webster	Brock	\$254.41	\$37.50	\$291.91	\$254.41	
847	3578	Weiss	Matthew	\$60.25	\$8.88	\$69.13	\$60.25	
848	2785	Welborn	Paul	\$849.94	\$125.28	\$975.22	\$972.84	\$122.90
849	2215	Welden	Matthew	\$407.24	\$60.03	\$467.27	\$407.24	
850	3632	Weldu	Berhane	\$266.45	\$39.28	\$305.73	\$266.45	
851	2661	Wells	Fredrick	\$341.45	\$50.33	\$391.78	\$341.45	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
852	3044	Welsh	Sylvia	\$150.95	\$22.25	\$173.20	\$150.95	
853	3616	Welzbache	Daniel	\$2,367.50	\$348.98	\$2,716.47	\$2,789.72	\$422.22
854	3071	White	Donavan	\$2,061.42	\$303.86	\$2,365.28	\$2,061.42	
855	111878	White II	Prinest	\$153.22	\$22.59	\$175.81	\$153.22	
856	3117	Whitehead	Timothy	\$66.66	\$9.83	\$76.49	\$66.66	
857	2946	Whiteman	Rick	\$1,470.20	\$216.71	\$1,686.92	\$1,470.20	
858	2866	Wiggins	Andrew	\$79.09	\$11.66	\$90.75	\$79.09	
859	2569	Wilcox	Todd	\$19.02	\$2.80	\$21.82	\$19.02	
860	3611	Williams	Danny	\$273.88	\$40.37	\$314.25	\$273.88	
861	2548	Wilson	Richard	\$719.61	\$106.07	\$825.68	\$719.61	
862	2862	Wilson	Constance	\$284.95	\$42.00	\$326.95	\$284.95	
863	3608	Wilson Jr.	Mose	\$3,332.43	\$491.21	\$3,823.64	\$3,332.43	
864	3097	Windsor	Benjamin	\$670.57	\$98.84	\$769.41	\$670.57	
865	3947	Wing	Roland	\$81.95	\$12.08	\$94.04	\$81.95	
866	107624	Witte	Daniel	\$228.39	\$33.67	\$262.05	\$228.39	
867	3623	Wolde	Hailemariam	\$385.93	\$56.89	\$442.81	\$385.93	
868	3603	Woldeghe	Berhane	\$1,037.22	\$152.89	\$1,190.11	\$1,037.22	
869	110866	Wolfe	Thomas	\$726.91	\$107.15	\$834.06	\$726.91	
870	3166	Wollnick	Steven	\$79.10	\$11.66	\$90.76	\$79.10	
871	3840	Wondired	Eshetu	\$423.24	\$62.39	\$485.63	\$423.24	
872	3910	Wong	Jorge	\$2,325.07	\$342.72	\$2,667.79	\$2,325.07	
873	28160	Wong	Wanjin	\$1,115.61	\$164.45	\$1,280.06	\$1,115.61	
874	3706	Woodall	Charles	\$610.19	\$89.94	\$700.13	\$610.19	
875	3582	Workneh	Abent	\$36.29	\$5.35	\$41.63	\$36.29	
876	3573	Worku	Abiye	\$253.73	\$37.40	\$291.13	\$253.73	
877	108239	Wright	Edward	\$744.31	\$109.71	\$854.02	\$744.31	
878	3092	Yabut	Gerry	\$5,428.49	\$800.18	\$6,228.67	\$5,549.53	\$121.04
879	3533	Yabut	Vincent	\$415.21	\$61.20	\$476.42	\$415.21	
880	108389	Yamaguchi	Alicia	\$3,089.15	\$455.35	\$3,544.50	\$3,089.15	
881	3852	Yepiz-Patro	Ubaldo	\$18.78	\$2.77	\$21.54	\$18.78	
882	3472	Yesayan	Razmik	\$387.19	\$57.07	\$444.26	\$387.19	
883	3691	Yihdego	Abdulkadir	\$642.61	\$94.72	\$737.33	\$642.61	
884	3633	Yimer	Yidersal	\$643.72	\$94.89	\$738.61	\$643.72	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
885	2081	Younes	Ahmed	\$228.31	\$33.65	\$261.96	\$228.31	
886	17259	Yurckonis	Hilbert	\$2,395.57	\$353.12	\$2,748.69	\$2,395.57	
887	3824	Zabadneh	Randa	\$167.13	\$24.64	\$191.77	\$167.13	
888	30374	Zafar	John	\$605.99	\$89.33	\$695.32	\$605.99	
889	3062	Zanfino	Michael	\$798.38	\$117.68	\$916.06	\$798.38	
890	2273	Zawoudie	Masfen	\$2,656.70	\$391.61	\$3,048.31	\$2,656.70	
891	17936	Zekichev	Nick	\$324.17	\$47.78	\$371.95	\$324.17	
892	3235	Zelege	Abraham	\$1,593.23	\$234.85	\$1,828.08	\$2,183.95	\$590.72