

STATE OF ALABAMA BALDWIN COUNTY

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT-LAW SIDE.

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:-

You are hereby commanded to summon the Atlanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Company, a corporation, to appear within thirty days from the service of this Writ in the Circuit Court to be held for said County at the place of holding same, then and there to answer the Complaint of Norman Durant as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard, deceased.

Witness my hand this 14 day of wee, 1945.

R.S. Auch

COMPLAINT

NORMAN DURANT, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard, deceased,

Plaintiff.

VS.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

LAW SIDE.

COUNT 1.

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant the sum of Twenty-nine hundred Fifty Dollars (\$2950.00) as damages for that heretofore on to-wit, October 19, 1945, about 9:00 o'clock P. M., the Plaintiff's intestate was riding as a passenger in an automobile that was being driven by Johnnie Pugh along U. S. Highway NO. 31, at a point about 2½ miles North of Stapleton, Baldwin County, Alabama, where he had a right to be and the Defendant by and through its agent, servant, or employee, while acting within the line and scope of his employment, was operating or driving an automobile truck from the

opposite direction from which the automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was then riding on said highway at said time and Plaintiff further avers that Defendant's agent, servant or employee, then and there negligently caused the head lamps on said automobile truck to project a glaring or dazzling light to persons in front of such head lamps, blinding Johnnie Pugh, the driver of said automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was then riding and causing said automobile to collide with Defendant's automobile truck and as a consequence of said collision said automobile was knocked, pushed, thrown or precipitated immediately in front of another automobile truck that was being driven in the same direction that the Defendant's automobile truck was then traveling, by which it was struck, thereby causing Plaintiff's intestate to be so badly injured so as to cause his death within a few hours thereafter. The Plaintiff further avers that the death of Plaintiff's intestate as aforesaid was the proximate consequence of the negligent manner of causing Defendant's head lamps on its automobile truck to project a glaring or dazzling light on said occasion, by the agent, servant or employee of the Defendant, while acting within the line and scope of his employment thereby negligently causing said collision and the death of the Plaintiff's intestate as aforesaid, hence this suit.

> Mybart & hason Autorneys for Plaintiff

Plaintiff demands a trial by Jury.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEC 15 1945

G. A. MOSLEY, Sheriff

* copy of the wirking

Lec of Huto of

AND SAID Librar Burole

WAS SUCH WHEN SO SERVED

La Moley Normany Country

Vapay Sheet

SUMMONS & COMPLAINT

NORMAN DURANT, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard deceased,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

LAW SIDE.

FILED: December 14, 1945

RS. Luch

LAW OFFICES
HYBART & CHASON

Bay Minette, Alabama

The Fig. A Part I have a like the common of the common of

7

941

RICORRED

NORMAN DURANT, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard.	Ŏ.		
deceased,	Ø	IN THE CIR	CUIT COURT
Plaintiff	• ≬	_	
Versus	Ŏ	OF BALDWIN	COUNTY, ALA.
ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a Corporation,	Ø	LAW SIDE,	NO.
Defendant	0		
	Ž.		

Comes now the Defendant in the above styled cause and demurs to the complaint thereof and to each count thereof separately and severally and on the following separate and several grounds:

ONE

Sufficient facts are not alleged therein to constitute a cause of action.

TWO

Sufficient facts are not alleged therein to show a legal duty owing from the Defendant to the Plaintiff's intestate at the time and place of the matters referred to therein.

THREE

Sufficient facts are not alleged therein to show as breach of any legal duty by the alleged agent, servant or employee of the Defendant at the time and place of the matter therein referred to.

FOUR

Sufficient facts are not alleged therein to show as causal connection between the alleged breach of duty and the alleged injuries and death of Plaintiff's intestate.

FIVE

It is not sufficiently alleged therein that the alleged

injuries and death were a proximate result of the alleged negligence.

SIX

Sufficient facts are not alleged therein to constitute a cause of action for wrongful death.

SEVEN

The allegation therein that "Defendant's agent, servant or employee, then and there negligently caused the head lamps on said automobile truck to project a glaring or dazzling light to persons in front of such head lamps, blinding Johnnie Pugh, the driver of said automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was then riding and causing said automobile to collide with Defendant's automobile" is not sufficient to show actionable negligence.

EIGHT

The allegation therein describing the alleged negligence of the Defendant's agent, servant or employee is in general terms followed by and limited by particular allegations, describing the quo modo which do not constitute actionable negligence.

NINE

The allegation therein that the alleged negligent conduct resulted in "blinding Johnnie Pugh" is a conclusion of the pleader not supported by sufficient allegation of fact.

TEN

The allegation therein that the alleged negligence resulted in "causing said automobile to collide with Defendant's automobile truck" is a conclusion of the pleader not supported by sufficient allegation of fact.

ELEVEN

It does not sufficiently appear therefrom that the automobile

in which the Plaintiff's intestate was riding collided with the Defendant's automobile truck and immediately thereafter with another automobile truck all as a proximate result of the alleged negligence of Defendant's agent, servant or employee.

TWELVE

For aught appearing therein the said head lamps of the Defendant's automobile truck did not project glaring or dazzling light when the said vehicle was standing upon the level road and under such circumstances and conditions as must be present in order that such light be prohibited by law.

THIRTEEN

For aught appearing therein the said head lamps of the Defendant's truck in all respects complied with the requirements of Section 42 (b) of Title 36 of the Code of Alabama of 1940.

FOURTEEN

For aught appearing therefrom nome of the bright portion of the head lamps' beams on the Defendant's said truck rose above a horizontal plane passing through the lamps' centers parallel to the level road upon which the said loaded vehicle stood and such beams did not rise higher than forty-two (42) inches seventy-five (75) feet ahead of the said vehicle when standing on a level road and loaded.

Auchent Bree Fance Vacs Cam Attorneys for Defendant for 941

RECORDED

Hanau Lurant ers admi

/

Atlacta hur Oshaci Mator Dinght W

Julie Jan-151946 Wallets A the Estate of Mitt M. Woodaw Nece 2 12 Mitt M. Woodaw Nece 2 12 Planty Allanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Co a corp COUNT 1. A.

Stone Bisecut

Saud Bassum

Land Side

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant the sum of Twenty-nine Hundred, Fifty Dollars (\$ 2950.00) as damages for that on to-wit, October 19, 1945, about 9:00 o'clock P.M., the Plaintiff's intestate was riding as a passenger in an automobile that was being driven by Johnnie Pugh along U.S. Highway No. 31, at a point about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles North of Stapleton, Baldwin County, Alabama, where he had a right to be, and the defendant, by and through its agent, servant or employee, while acting within the line and scope of his employmment, was operating or driving an automobile truck from the opposite direction from which the automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was then riding on said highway at said time, and Plaintiff further avers that Defendant's agent, servant or employee, then and there negligently caused the head lamps on said automobile truck to project a glaring and dazzling light to persons in front of said head lamps, the bright portion of the head lamp beams rising above a horizontal plane passing through the lamp centers, parallel to the level road upon which said vehicle was being driven, and higher than forty-two inches, seventy-five feet ahead of such vehicle, blinding Johnnie Pugh, the driver of said automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was then riding and eausing said automobile to collide with Defendant's automobile truck, and as a proximate consequence of said collision, said automobile was knocked, pushed, thrown or precipitated immediately in front of another automobile truck that was being driven in the same direction that the Defendant's automobile truck was then travelling, by which it was struck, thereby causing Plaintiff's intestate to be so badly injured as to cause his death within a few hours thereafter. The Plaintiff further avers that the death of Plaintiff's intestate as aforesaid was the proximate consequence of the negligent manner of causing Defendant's head lamps on its automobile truck to project a glaring or dazzling light on said occasion, the bright portion of the head lamp beams rising above a horizontal plane passing through the lamp centers parallel to the level road upon which said vehicle was being driven, and higher than forty-two inches, seventy-five feet ahead of such vehicle, by the agent, servant or employee of the defendant, whide acting within the line and scope of his employment, thereby negligently causing said collision and the death of the Plaint9ff's intestate as aforesaid, hence this suit.

Attorneys for Plaintiff.

Plaintiff demands a trial by Jury.

COUNT 2.

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant the sum of Twenty-nine Hundred, Fifty Dollars (\$ 2950.00) as damages for that heretofore on to-wit; October 19th, 1945, an automobile in which plaintiff's intestate was riding was being operated or driven along U.S. Highway No.31, at a place about 2 miles North of Stapleton, Baldwin County, Alabama, and the defendant, by and through its agent, servant or employee, was operating or driving an automobile truck in the opposite direction along said highway, and while so operating or driving said automobile truck caused the automobile in which plaintiff's intestate was riding to run into, against or strike defendant's automobile truck, so as to knock, push or throw said automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was riding in front of an approaching automobile truck, by which it was struck, thereby causing Plaintiff's intestate to be so badly injured that he died from said injuries within a few hours thereafter.

Plaintiff avers that his said intestate was killed as aforesaid, as a proximate consequence of the negligent manner in which Defendant's automobile truck was operated on said occasion by the agent, servant or employee of defendant, while acting in the line and scope of his employment, in this that said agent, servant or employee of Defendant negligently caused the automobile in which Plaintiff's intestate was riding to run into or against or collide with defendant's said automobile truck, hence this suit.

Hyperd Shagen afternes in Plainty 94 BECORDED

AMENDED COMPLAINT

NORMAN DURANT, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard, deceased,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.
LAW SIDE.

FILED: February 28, 1946

Clerk.

LAW OFFICES

HYBART & CHASON

Bay Minette, Alabama

NORMAN DURANT, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard, Deceased,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a Corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

AT LAW.

PLEA

Now comes the Defendant and for Plea to the Complaint, as last amended, and to each and every count thereof, separately and severally, says:

1. In short by consent, the general issue, with leave to give in evidence any matter in defense of the action which would be admissible, if well pleaded, with leave for the Plaintiff to give in evidence in reply any matter that would be admissible, if well pleaded.

Attorneys for Defendant.

35

PLEA

NORMAN DURANT, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Wood-ard, Deceased,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

AT LAW.

Haller 25-19 4

NORMAN DURANT, as administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodard, Deceased,

Plaintiff,

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

VS.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

No. 941

INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED TO THE DEFENDANT BY THE PLAINTIFF:

- l. Please state your correct name. (a) Are you a Corporation and if so, when, and under the laws of what State were you incorporated? (b) What is your present home address?
- 2. Were you the owner of an automobile truck that was involved in a collision on October 19, 1945 about 9:00 o'clock P. M. on U. S. Highway 31 at a point about two and one-half miles North of Stapleton in Baldwin County, Alabama? (a) If you state that you were the owner of a truck involved in such collision, please state the name and address of your driver. (b) Was your truck loaded or empty at the time of the collision? (c) Was your driver acting within the line and scope of his employment by you at the time of such collision; and if not, why not? (d) Did he collide with an automobile that was being driven North at said time and place? (e) Was your truck traveling South toward Mobile, Alabama at said time and place?
- 3. Was another truck owned by you and being driven by your agent, servant or employee traveling a short distance behind the truck above mentioned and in the same direction, if so how far was this truck behind the other truck when the first truck was involved in the collision? (a) Was this second truck also involved in a collision, with the same automobile? (b) Please state the name and address of your driver of the second truck. (c) Did the first truck that collided with the car leave the paved surface of the highway after the collision, if so which side of the road did it leave? (d) Did the second truck involved in the collision leave

the paved surface of the highway after its collision with said car and if so where did it come to rest? (e) If you state that the first truck collided with the car what happened to the car after the collision with this truck? (f) What happened to the car after its collision with the second truck? (g) Was anyone thrown from the car when the second truck collided with it? (h) Was the collision with an automobile which was being driven by a man named Johnnie Pugh?

- trucks collided with the automobile? (a) Is the road level where the said trucks collided with said automobile and if not were the trucks going upgrade or downgrade? (b) How fast were the trucks going at the time of the collision and how close were they together? (c) How wide is the paved surface of the Highway at the point of collision with the first truck? (d) How wide is the body of each truck at its widest point? (e) How long is each truck that was involved in the collision? (f) How much would each truck weigh when empty? (g) How much did each truck weigh at the time of the collision with the automobile?
- 5. Was anyone else riding in the cab with either truck driver, if so give the name and address of such person and state which truck he was riding in. (a) If you state that you owned both of the trucks involved in the collision, please state where each of said trucks were going and what they were hauling. (b) Did the truck driver or drivers involved in this accident give their name and Post Office address and license number to someone in the immediate vicinity of the point where the collision occurred, if so give us the name and address of such person to whom they gave this information.
- 6. If you state that you were the owner of one truck that was involved in an accident at the time and place referred to in Interrogatory No. 2 what part of said truck was damaged in the collision and if you state that you were the owner of both trucks, please state what part of the truck that first collided with the car was damaged and what part of the truck that collided next was damaged.

7. Do you carry public liability and property damage insurance on your truck or trucks that were involved in the collision with a car driven by Johnnie Pugh at the time and place set out in Interrogatory No. 2? (a) if you state that you do carry such Insurance please state whether it is carried on one or both trucks and if on only one which truck and also state the name and address of such Insurance Company.

Attorneys for Blaintiff.

STATE OF ALABAMA

BALDWIN COUNTY

Before me Lewis A. Wilson, a Notary Public, in and for said State and County, personally appeared John Chason, who is known to me and who after being by me, first duly and legally sworn deposes and says that he is one of the Attorneys for the Plaintiff in the above styled cause; that the Defendant's Answer to the foregoing Interrogatories, if truthfully made, will be material testimony for the Plaintiff in the trial of said cause.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25 day of May, 1946.

Notary Public. Baldwin County, Alabama.

Sy M. IS HOLCOWEE, Sheriet

By M. IS HOLCOWEE, Sheriet

By M. IS HOLCOWEE, Sheriet

By M. IS HOLCOWEE, Sheriet

RECORDED

THE DEFENDANT BY THE PLAINTIFF

NORMAN DURANT, as administrator of the Estate of MITT M. WOODARD, Deceased,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

LAW SIDE.

No. 941.

FILED: May 5, 1946.

Clerk.

3) Sustriction.

LAW OFFICES
HYBART & CHASON

Bay Minette, Alabama

NORMAN DURANT, as administrator of the Estate of Mitt M. Woodward, Deceased,

Plaintiff,

VERSUS

ATLANTA, NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT

COMPANY, a Corporation,

Defendant.

LAW SIDE No. 941

DEFENDANT'S ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY PLAINTIFF

- 1. Atlanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Company. (a) Incorporated under the laws of Georgia. (b) Atlanta, Georgia.
- 2. Yes. (a) Eugene Buhler, New Orleans, Louisiana. (b) Partially loaded. (c) The driver was making a regular trip for us. (d) The automobile in which Mr. Mitt M. woodward was riding at the time came over on the wrong side of the road and ran into the left side of the Defendant's truck, which was at all times on its right side of the road. (e) Yes.
- 3. Yes. The second truck was 400 yards to 500 yards behind the first truck. (a) Yes. The automobile in which Mr. Woodward was driving after coming over on the wrong side of the road and hitting the side of the first truck of the Defendant careened off of the paved part of the road and then came back on the road a second time and ran into the left side of the second truck at which time this truck was, also, on its right side of the road, and thus the automobile in which Mr. Woodward was riding came over on the wrong side of the road twice and on each occasion hit the left side of

of one of the Defendant's trucks (b) Vice Tutt, formerly resided in New Orleans, Louisiana but is now residing in California. His present address there is not known.

- (c) Yes, partially. The driver of this first truck saw the car in which woodward was riding coming toward him, and he pulled so far to the right that his right front and rear wheels were at least a foot and a half off of the right side of the paved surface of the highway at the time the car in which Woodward was riding collided with its rear trailer wheel. The driver of this truck stopped almost immediately after it was hit. (d) Yes. The left side of the cab of this truck was struck by the car in which Woodward was riding and knocked off the West side of the road or to the right of the direction in which the truck was heading. It came to rest about thirty or forty feet from the point of its collision with the car, after the trailer had piled up on the back end of the cab. When it came to rest it was headed into the bank off to the right. (e) The car in which Mr. Woodward was riding sideswiped the left rear of the first truck. At that time the car was on the wrong side of the road. It then pulled back over on the right side of the road and went off of the pavement and then came back on the pavement and again came over on the left side of the road and struck the left side of the second truck. (f) It skidded on down the road and turned over on its side and came to a stop. (g) Defendant doesn't know.
- 4. Yes. (a) Practically level. (b) The trucks were going about thirty (30) miles an hour and were 400 to 500 yards apart. (c) The paved surface is about twenty feet (20 ft.) wide. (d) Not more than 8 feet. (e) About thirty-four (34) feet. (f) About 16,000 pounds. (g) About 25,000 pounds.

- 5. No. (a) They were going to New Orleans hauling freight.
- (b) Yes, to the highway patrol.
- 6. The left rear wheel of the first truck was slightly damaged and the second truck was damaged so much that it cost \$1200.00 to repair it, after being struck on the left side of the cab.
- 7. The defendant on the advice of counsel declines to answer Interrogatory #7 on the ground that the information called for is incompetent, irreverent and immaterial.

ATLANTA-NEW ORLEANS MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY

By Ougland Buhler

STATE OF ALABAMA -0

COUNTY OF MOBILE (

Before the undersigned Notary Public personally appeared EUGENE BUHEER, who being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says that he is agent of the Defendant and as such has given the foregoing answers to interrogatories and that the same are true and correct except as to matters of information and belief and as to such matters, he believes them to be true.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this the 14 day of

October, 1946.

Bublic, Mobile

941 RECORDED

answers to Interrogatives

Filed 10-15-46 R5. Nuch clerk syblice J. Duch

 $m_{
m Ham}_{m}$

Norman Durant, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M.Woodard, deceased

Plaintiff

٧s.

Atlanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Company, a corporation,

Defendant

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BAIDIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA:

I, Sibyl Pool, Secretary of State of Alabama, hereby certify that on the 15th day of December, 1945, I mailed by registered mail in an envelope addressed as follows:

"Atlanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Company, a corporation, Atlanta, Ga."

"Registered <u>Mail</u> "Return Receipt Requested "

bearing sufficient and proper prepaid postage, a notice bearing my signature and the Great Seal of the State of Alabama in words and figures as follows:

"Atlanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Company, a corporation Atlanta, Ga."

"You will take notice that on the 15th day of December, 1945, there was served upon me, in my official capacity, summons with complaint attached, in a case entitled Norman Durant, as Administrator of the Estate of Mitt M.Woodard, deceased, Plaintiff vs. Atlanta, New Orleans Motor Freight Company, a corporation, Defendant, in the Circuit Court of Baldwin County, Alabama, a true copy of which summons and complaint is hereto attached and the said service upon me as Secretary of State of Alabama, has the force and effect of personal service upon you.

WITNESS MY HAND and the Great Seal of the State of Alabama, this the 15th day of December, 1945.

(Signed) Sibyl Pool Secretary of State"

I further certify that the notice above set out which was so mailed in the envelope addressed as above set forth had attached to it a true copy of the summons and complaint, in the above styled cause, there being mailed in the envelope at the time shown the notice with copy of summons and complaint attached thereto.

I further certify that the attached receipt was received by me on December 20, 1945, showing the receipt by the designated addressee of said notice with attached summons and complaint aforesaid, which receipt I attach hereto.

WITNESS MY HAND and the Great Seal of the State of Alabama, this the 20th day of December, 1945.

Sibyl Fool, Secretary of State



and greatist and an experience from ozavan Politika II di. ురువినినికి మీకారి మూర్పింది. తెలుగ్రామకు మీకారా , Control of the second of the se I, diegil Pool, Scoreaung of Stave of Abdens, while cartify the on the iguidant cartify. The light cap The second secon Patikinio, lies Urleane Motor krofghig gospany, $= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_$ Lud godralik က ခြင်ဆိုသူမှုတွေအသည်။ တည်းသောကို provide STA bacurios avilliciado eco proper crepaid posuage, a c<mark>otico be</mark>ming up aigosturo amilidad tha Greni Seel of pee Soce of Clebras és de rourio e as l'iguares es l'allour: Publicabu, Ner Orleans Nover Fraight Congregg. melio antentente 11.50 judi silikali • padrone C to mob sicti est or donce estádo está iltimació don donce estádo dificación del Cenero do Mario Control de Callo de de C . Hog bogu solvase il marier in deskile has esmals e All deskile in Hadia Teo edikudi esti Co dise 5 deste soji čino dTETA di SCCTTTT • Bilgi yandimeno i Du njeb na Çi esti sini yened Jook Daydin (Eventa) professor edi oci bellom de com delde due dec erado estido edid desi gillores mediasi. Il adiressa sa abova sab ilambi hod abaalusd bo bb a sauk sabh o' bis adamona rud somplaint. In bus chows stylist seves, bhans belog asilisa in one sursiops as the time shown the mobiles with the nobles , Dit medakopg no sa ya pami osa san digisosa denosobe sab dani gilidyse neokyybi i 1915, churdhe bha medelek by bha daelighuad chrimedae di shid nobide vibb subada quanda and domplaint dropesiid, which medeleb I abbod harebu. gab strib ert gind jametali. De rioti est in leggi beset est bro isle in leggi Jacobski stania i programa i prog

703m 3511

RETURN RECEIPT

Reserved from the Postmaster the Registered or Insured Article, the original number of which appears on the face of this Card.

Millesta, Millest Online in Mille First Contraction of Advisor of

2 Marine of converse of the Legal could come of flowers in more an interesting large.

Date of Selver ______

A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	
Hot Office Projection S	Service that the control of the property of the service of the ser
The same of the sa	
	The state of the s
To any and a second	
STORETARY OF STATE	
Rawii la	
(RAME SE SEXPER)	
Inac and Nurder,) or Pos Gice Lou,)	
og Pro Citie Bodi	
Kecistered Arthole	
MI(O) V	TGOMERY,
insured parcel	
	<u>AILABAIN'A</u>
(89)	San C District Office Service
000: 25542 9225020202020202020202020	