

Case Name:
**Rogers Communication Partnership Inc. v. Network Site
Services Ltd.**

Between
Rogers Communication Partnership Inc., Plaintiff, and
Network Site Services Ltd., Defendant Plaintiff by
Defendant's Claim, and
Cable Control Systems Inc., Defendant by Defendant's
Claim

[2013] O.J. No. 3644

Court File Nos. SC-12-593 and SC-12-593-D1

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Small Claims Court - Kitchener, Ontario

S.M. McGill Deputy J.

July 25, 2013.

(49 paras.)

Counsel:

Anderson, T., Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Stock, E., Counsel for the Defendant.

Cressy, J., Employee of Defendant by Defendant's Claim.

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

S.M. MCGILL DEPUTY J.:--

INTRODUCTION

1 This case arises from a 2010 construction project involving the extension of McCarthy Road in Stratford. The City of Stratford awarded the defendant, Network, a contract to complete the con-

struction. During the excavation work at the intersection of McCarthy Road and Romeo Street the plaintiff's fibre optic and co-optic cables were inadvertently hit and damaged. In the main claim, Rogers seeks the cost of repair from Network. In the defendant's claim, Network claims contribution and indemnity from Cable Control Systems (CCS), the company that provided the cable "locate" to Network on behalf of Rogers. The cost incurred to repair the damage is agreed upon by the parties and the trial is to determine liability. The trial was heard over two days on June 25 and July 8, 2013.

2 Rogers claims that Network was negligent because it failed to properly interpret the utility locate, failed to update the paint markings, and failed to excavate carefully around the identified utility location.

3 The defendant denies liability saying that Rogers misrepresented the location of its utilities by providing Network with an inaccurate site diagram through its agent CCS. CCS submits that the locate was accurate, prepared in accordance with industry standard and agrees with Rogers that Network failed to properly interpret the locate, failed to update the paint markings and failed to follow industry standards when completing the excavation.

FACTS

4 In preparation for excavation work at the intersection of McCarthy Road and Romeo Street, Network contacted Rogers and Bell for locates of each of their utility lines. All parties agree that locates are valid for a period of 30 days, excavation is only to be done with a valid utility locate and hand digging is done within 1 meter of cables.

5 Rogers hired CCS to provide the locate to Network on its behalf and CCS produced its first locate on June 28, 2010. This locate involved two components: paint and paper. After locating the Roger's cable lines using a self-calibrating impulse RD4000 machine CCS marked the location on the ground with orange paint and completed a standard form document with a hand drawn sketch of the area and measurements identifying the place where Rogers' cables were present.

6 The sketch on the paper form shows four lines on the southeast side of Romeo Street; the lines were not all labelled. For the purposes of identification in these reasons, I refer to the four lines numerically as one through four starting at the most westerly line and proceeding east. Written across the second and third lines is the acronym "TV/FO". The drawing shows a distance of .5 meters between the second and third lines. Two of the lines, one and three, project into the intersection with McCarthy Road, the other two stop at the south edge of the proposed McCarthy Road extension. Arrows are drawn at the mid-point of Romeo's easterly intersect with McCarthy Road. The arrows indicate a distance of 4.4 meters from the first (most westerly) line to the third line. The acronym "TV/FO" is again written across line three in the intersection.

7 The CCS standard form has a legend with lines and symbols; four legend items were circled: PL for property line, P for paint, TV for a co-optic cable and FO for a fibre optic cable. Network relied upon the four symbols circled on the legend to interpret the four lines on the sketch. Network believed the first line was the curb line, the second line was the Roger's TV cable, the third line was the Rogers fibre optic cable and the fourth line was the property line. Therefore, Network interpreted the Rogers locate sketch as showing that cable lines two and three merged into one conduit in the Romeo intersection and that conduit was a distance of 4.4 meters from the curb line.

8 Bell contracted GTell to do its locate and GTell similarly used orange paint orange (with a B sprayed in it) to mark the ground where the Bell lines were located. It also produced a paper form with

a computer generated sketch showing five lines at the south east portion of Romeo and three lines running through the intersection. All lines are labelled. The first line is labelled CL which according to the legend means "Face of Curb", the second line is west edge of the sidewalk, the third and fourth lines are Bell cable lines and the fifth line is the easterly edge of the sidewalk. Horizontal arrows indicate that Bell cable lines are .3 and .6 meters east of the westerly edge of the sidewalk. The sidewalk lines turn left at McCarthy Road. The curb line and Bell lines continue into the intersection where they are described as "1 Duct and 2 Cables". Curb line measurements are noted at several points in the intersection. First, the cables are measured as 5.8 and 6.1 meters east of the curb line; 25 meters north the Bell cables are noted at 5.5 and 5.9 meters east of the curb line. The two lines eventually join into one line before separating again into multiple lines. The Bell/GTell diagram is much more detailed than the CCS sketch including labels for all lines, symbols and multiple measurements throughout and a specified definition of the reference points for the locate area including the east curb line of Romeo Street, the sidewalks, and the south hydro pole on Romeo. The Bell/GTell diagram also indicated that new cables were being placed.

9 Immediately after the June locate, Heurta, Network's excavator, compared the CCS sketch with the still existing curb and visible paint lines and confirmed the 4.4 meter distance from the curb line to the orange paint line on the grass on the east side of the Romeo Street intersection. Every 30 days thereafter, Network called for new Bell and Rogers locates. CCS provided Roger's re-locates in July, August and finally on September 28, 2010. The CCS locates for July, August and September differ from the June locate in that they involved only paint. Although the standard form document with sketch was reproduced each time with a new date, the sketch was never re-done or re-measured. No new reference point for measurement was provided by CCS after the curb and the sidewalk were removed. The diagram as sketched in June remained the only sketch ever provided to Network. The paint line was re-sprayed in July, August and September.

10 Re-spraying was necessary because the paint eventually disappears for several reasons. First the paint is water based and fades or washes away over time. Second, the area in question represented the major thoroughfare for dump truck access to the project and this eroded the paint. Finally, in order to complete the work at the intersection of Romeo, the sidewalk and the grass were both skimmed off the surface; taking the paint with them.

11 On Friday October 22, 2010, Network was ready to excavate in the area of the Rogers and Bell cable lines at Romeo Street. The paint was no longer visible and both the curb and sidewalk had been removed from the intersection area. Mr. Heurta, an employee of Network, ran a string line from the remaining curb line to the south and north of the intersection, measured 4.4 meters east from the string line to locate and mark the Rogers utility line in accordance with the measurement on the sketch. He left a safe zone of over one meter around the marked location and began digging at 6.1 meters using a mini back hoe. He struck a cable conduit which should have been only an empty or deactivated Bell conduit but unexpectedly it also included Rogers' fibre-optic cable which was damaged.

12 Heurta stopped work, reported the incident to Network and an investigation began. Following the Rogers and CCS investigations a dispute arose about the interpretation of the sketch measurements and whether the second line was a TV cable or the west edge of sidewalk and whether the fourth line was the property line or the east edge of the sidewalk.

13 The key facts were not in dispute. Network admits that paint was not visible on October 22; it did not call for a re-paint; it relied upon the CCS sketch and used a string line to identify the Rogers

cables; it left over a meter and began machine excavation at 6.1 meters. Network admits hitting and damaging the cable. Rogers and CCS admit preparing the initial sketch in June and never updating it in subsequent re-locates. The witnesses for each party were those involved with actual locating, excavating or investigating. All witnesses but one were credible and working from their actual recollections of events of the day. The CCS investigator, Mr. Knibbe, attended the site on Oct 22nd. He seemed to be giving evidence based upon his usual practice rather than actual recollection. Most of Mr. Knibbe's answers were phrased using the words "I would have" or "I would have done" or "probably". He was not a trained investigator. Therefore, where they conflict I prefer the investigative evidence of the Rogers investigator, Mr. Swan, who was trained in police and insurance investigation and appeared to have an actual recollection of his visit to the site.

ISSUES:

14 The following issues are to be determined:

- i.) What duties are owed by Rogers, Network and CCS with respect to locating, marking, and excavating around utility lines?
- ii.) Do the Ontario Regional Common Ground Alliance Best Practices set the standard of care for excavators working around utility lines?
- iii.) Did Network fall below the standard of care when excavating around the Rogers cable lines?
- iv.) Was the paper portion of the CCS utility locate inaccurate or misleading on its face?
- v.) Did CCS fall below industry standards when it prepared the locate?

ANALYSIS:

15 The plaintiff claims negligence against the defendant Network stating that as general contractor responsible for excavating around utility cables Network failed to meet the industry standard of care as described in the Ontario Regional Common Ground Alliance Best Practices Version 6.0. It is alleged that it failed to properly read, preserve and update the utility locate and it failed to take proper precaution when excavating around their utility line.

16 The defendant denies liability and claims that Rogers owed it a duty to provide an accurate locate of its cable line which Rogers failed to do. In the alternative, Network claims contribution and indemnity from CCS based upon negligent misrepresentation. As the subcontractor employed by Rogers to provide the locate to Network, it is alleged that CCS provided a false and misleading drawing of the location of the Rogers utility lines.

i.) What duties are owed by Rogers, Network and CCS?

17 Excavating around utility lines is regulated under the Occupational Health and Safety Act R.S.O. c. O.1 (OHSA). Section 228, of O. Reg. 213/91, as amended by O. Reg. 443/09, imposes the following statutory duties:

(a) the employer excavating shall ensure that all gas, electrical and other services in and near the area to be excavated are located and marked;

(b) the employer and worker locating and marking the services described in clause (a) shall ensure that they are accurately located and marked;

18 In the case at hand section 228(a) of the regulation imposes a clear duty on Network as an employer excavating to "ensure" the service is located and marked. Network claims it met this duty because it had a valid Rogers locate at the time of excavation. It maintains that the problem was that the sketch was not accurate.

19 Section 228(b) imposes the duty to ensure that services are "accurately" marked on the employer and worker "locating and marking the services". In this case CCS is obviously an employer marking and locating the service. However, it is less clear whether Rogers as owner of the service is also an employer "locating and marking the services" and therefore also charged with a duty to ensure accuracy.

20 The current regulation more clearly articulates that duties are owed by both the excavator and the entity locating the service than did the predecessor section considered in *Ontario (Labour) v. Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.* 2011 ONCA 13. The question of Rogers' liability is less clear under the current regulation because a key part of the section relied upon in the *Enbridge* reasoning is not present in the new regulation.

21 In the previous regulation, the excavator was expressly directed to request the owner of the service to locate and mark it. In *Enbridge*, that direction was interpreted as placing the owner of the service in the position of having to locate and mark the service itself or to employ someone else to do it; thereby imposing a duty and corresponding liability on both the owner and its subcontractor. This express direction to contact the owner is not present in the current section.

22 The Court of Appeal denied leave to appeal in *Enbridge* and therefore left in place the lower Court's finding that both the owner of the service and the contractor employed to do the locates were "employers" marking and locating the service and therefore owed duties. In denying leave the Court of Appeal expressly refused to opine on the interpretation of the then new, now current, section thereby leaving the question of Rogers' liability in the subject case unanswered.

23 I am of the opinion that the current section also results in a duty and therefore liability on both the owner of service and the subcontractor hired by the owner to perform the locate. I am guided to this opinion by paragraphs 54 and 58 of the Court of Appeal's *Enbridge* reasons. In paragraph 54, the Court of Appeal states that "only the owner has authority to" locate and mark the service and hiring a sub-contractor was recognition of the duty to locate and mark. As well the Court found that hiring the sub-contractor made the owner of the service an employer under the Act.

24 In paragraph 58, the Court holds that an interpretation that recognized only an excavator duty was "antithetical to the purpose of the OHS Act - protection of workers from preventable harm." I similarly hold that making both the owner and sub-contractor liable for the accuracy of the locate promotes a safe work place and advances the goal of the OHS Act by encouraging owners to hire competent, insured and responsible sub-contractors.

25 Therefore, I find that Network's statutory duty on October 22 was to hold or obtain a valid locate and Rogers and CCS both owed duties to ensure that the subject locate was accurate. The question of whether all parties met their duties goes to standard of care.

ii. Do the ORCGA Best Practices set the Standard of Care?

26 In a negligence claim, the burden is on the party alleging negligence to prove that the other party's conduct fell below the standard of care required in the circumstances. Evidence must be led to establish the appropriate standard of care. Neither Rogers nor CCS called an expert witness to establish the applicable standard of care for an excavating contractor working with cable utility locates. In alleging that Network was negligent, both rely upon The Ontario Region Common Ground Association Best Practices (ORCGA) to set the standard of care.

27 In my opinion the ORCGA Best Practices do not establish the standard of care applicable in the circumstances of this case for a number of reasons.

28 First, the general principle of law is that rules of professional conduct do not establish the standard on their own. The Supreme Court of Canada held in *Perez v. Galambas* [2009] 3 S.C.R. 247 para 29 that although rules of professional conduct "are of importance in determining the nature and extent of duties flowing from a professional relationship: *Hodgkinson v. Simms*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 377 (S.C.C.) at p. 425. They are not, however, binding on the courts and do not necessarily describe the applicable duty or standard of care in negligence: see, e.g. *MacDonald Estate v. Martin*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1235 (S.C.C.) at pp. 1244-45".

29 Second, the subject best practices in this specific case were produced in May 2010, only four months before the incident, and they state on their face that they are an optimum goal and not mandatory nor the commonly accepted standard. They are not presently followed by all member stakeholders. (Exhibit #9, page 1). Page one of the "Introduction" reads:

These practices represent a dynamic statement of the type of activities that ORCGA believes would provide optimum levels of diligence towards preventing damage to underground infrastructure. Not all stakeholders are presently in a position to adopt all of these practices, however, it is anticipated that progression will be made towards following the practice over time.

These are goals to be worked towards over time. Four months is not long enough to assume that the majority of stakeholders have adopted them. In order to accept these practices as the prevailing industry standard, I would require expert evidence on the practices of other contractors.

30 Finally, the Ontario Court of Appeal held in *Krawchuk v. Scherbak*, 2011 ONCA 352, para 125 that "External indicators of reasonable conduct, such as custom, industry practice, and statutory or regulatory standards, may inform the standard. Where debate arises as to how a reasonable agent would have conducted himself or herself, recourse should generally be made to expert evidence." There is debate in this case; Rogers and CCS insist that a locate involves both paint and paper and that a re-locate should have been ordered every time the paint became invisible. Network insists that re-ordering every time the paint disappears is unworkable at an excavation site and that a drawing alone may be relied upon to re-establish the location of the service. The best practice that recommends preservation of the mark includes the qualifier "where practical." Expert evidence is needed to establish what is practical in the circumstances. No independent expert evidence was introduced at trial and the claim of negligence fails at this point unless the specific allegations of negligence fall into an exception that requires no expert evidence.

iii. Did Network fall below the standard of care? (Specific Allegations)

31 The specific allegations against Network are that it fell below the standard of care by:

- a. Failing to call for a re-paint on October 22nd and proceeding to excavate based upon the sketch alone;
- b. Misinterpreting the four lines on the diagram so that measurement was wrong;
- c. Improperly measuring from a string line;
- d. Using a machine rather than hand digging in close proximity to the locate.

(a) *Re-paint or Sketch alone*

32 *Krawchuk* contemplates exceptions that require no expert evidence; generally this is when the behaviour is so obviously below standard that common sense dictates that the conduct is unreasonable. In my opinion, obviously unreasonable excavating behaviours would be if an excavator were to proceed without a locate at all or with an expired locate (older than 30 days) or when neither paint nor paper remain even within the 30 days. None of the Network behaviour appears obviously unreasonable in this case.

33 The other possible source for identifying standard of care is existing case law. In the *Enbridge* case the Court of Appeal makes a finding about industry practice with respect to locate duties imposed by s. 9(2) of O. Reg. 210/01 under the *Technical Standard and Safety Act, 2000, S.O. 2000 c. 16 (TSA)* under which Enbridge was licensed to distribute natural gas. At paragraphs 14 and 64 the court finds that "The regulation does not provide a specific form for the information about pipeline locations. The practice in the industry, however is one of "paint and paper": paint markings on the surface of the ground visible to excavators and a sketch of the services on paper." (para 14).

34 Although informative *Enbridge* does not determine the issue before me. First I cannot assume that duties and practices under the TSA for natural gas are the same as those for internet and TV cables under the OHSA. Natural gas is obviously a far more dangerous utility if disturbed. Second, the Court of Appeal's statement seems to deal with the initial locate. In the case at hand all parties agree that the initial locate involved both paint and paper. The issue in dispute relates to the need for re-locates and whether the paint and paper may be used as alternatives for each other (i.e. as long as the excavator still has either the paint or the paper within the 30 days no re-locate is necessary) or, as Rogers and CCS argue, paint and paper must be used jointly so that an excavator is required to order a re-locate even when valid paper still exists.

35 Without expert evidence I am unwilling to impose the higher standard and will not find that both paint and paper must be in existence at the time of excavation. I accept the lower standard that one or other is enough. Therefore, this allegation of negligence fails. Further, I note that if I were to accept the Rogers and CCS argument that paint and paper are both needed then it naturally follows that Rogers and CCS also breached their duties to provide an accurate locate by failing to provide new paper in their July, August and September locates. Accurate paper would require new measurements from existing reference points. Repeatedly providing the outdated June sketch referencing non-existent curbs and sidewalks amounted to re-locates of "paint only" not both "paint and paper". If both are required for the excavator then both must be provided by the locator and only one, the paint, was provided by CCS on the subsequent re-locates. Therefore, it appears to me that both excavator and locator were operating on the same standard: either paper or paint was enough. Rogers and CCS provided only paint on the re-locates and Network relied on only paper at the time of excavation.

(b) Misinterpretation of the four lines on the diagram

36 The parties differ on their interpretation of lines two and four on the CCS sketch. Network interpreted lines two and four as the Rogers TV cable line and the property line. Rogers and CCS say that lines two and four were the west and east edges of the sidewalk with line three representing both the TV and FO cables. Only the TV and FO cables were labelled on the sketch. Network applied the labels to lines two and three because "TV/FO" was written across both lines two and three, and after line two ended, solely across line three. Line two ended at the edge of McCarthy Road and Network interpreted this to mean that the two cables were combined into one conduit at the position of line three in the center of Romeo Street where the TV/FO acronym was written for a third and fourth times. The location of the now merged cable was described to be 4.4 meters from line one, the curb line. Therefore, at the time and location of excavation the relevant lines relied upon by Network are one and three. Two and four were irrelevant for Network's re-measurement purposes. Since all parties agree that line one was the curb line, there is no disagreement about identity of the relevant lines and the interpretation of lines two and four did not result in mis-measurement.

37 Rogers argues that line two as sidewalk is relevant because there was an additional measurement on the sketch showing line two as .5 meters west of line three. It submits that if the sidewalk rather than the curb had been used for the string line reference point it would have resulted in a more accurate location for hand digging. In hind sight this may be so but common sense would dictate the use of the curb line. The .5 measurement is well south of the dig site while the 4.4 measurement is virtually at the excavation point. It is common sense to work from the closest most relevant measurement making the curb line the appropriate point of reference.

38 In any event, I find Network's interpretation of the meaning of lines two and four to be most reasonable in the circumstances given CCS's failure to label the lines on the sketch, the legend notations and the visual confirmation completed by Heurta at the time of the initial locate in June. There was never a sidewalk on the easterly side of the Romeo Street intersection. According to the far more detailed Bell/GTell diagram the sidewalk made a ninety degree left turn at the south east corner of McCarthy. If line two were a sidewalk limit it should have stopped well short of line four to reflect a ninety degree turn in the sidewalk. It does not. Heurta checked the 4.4 meters in June and observed the paint line on the grass.

39 More will be said of CCS's failure to label the lines later but without labels it is reasonable to look to the legend to identify objects on the sketch. TV and FO correspond with the meaning in the legend and are circled on the legend. Paint is used on the ground and is circled on the legend. The remaining circled item is PL for property line. There would be no point in circling this item if it was not represented on the sketch. Sidewalk is neither on the legend nor marked on the sketch. By contrast the Bell/GTell diagram included the acronym SW for sidewalk in the legend and marked SW on the diagram where relevant. Network's interpretation of the lines on the CCS sketch was entirely reasonable in the circumstances.

(c) String Line Measurement

40 The allegation about the string line measurement again focuses on the impropriety of employing the tactic rather than calling for a re-paint and I have already rejected the obligation to call for a re-paint. As to the manner in which the string line measurement was completed, there was no evidence about either the practice of using string lines or how a proper string line measurement should have been done. Therefore no finding of negligence can be made.

(d) *Hand Digging*

41 All parties agree that excavators should hand dig within one meter around the locate position. The excavation point was over 6 meters from the former curb line according to Network's measurement; outside the 1 meter standard. The post damage investigations by Rogers and CCS do not pinpoint a location. The Rogers damage report form gives no exact measurements; under cross-examination the Rogers' investigator thought damage appeared to be at about 6 meters away but could not be sure because the curb was removed and the former curb may not have been straight. The failure to place new reference points on the sketch after the curb was removed prevents me from making any finding of fact about Network being inside the acknowledged one meter hand digging area.

iv. Was the paper portion of the Roger's utility locate inaccurate or misleading on its face?

42 As noted above, I am of the opinion that re-providing the June sketch in July, August and September without new measurements from actually existing reference points meant that the paper portion of the September re-locate was not up-to-date or current when it was provided to Network. The fact that locates expire after 30 days suggests that current and up-to-date re-locates are expected, otherwise one initial locate would suffice. Therefore, I find that the September 28th paper portion of the CCS re-locate was inaccurate. However, consistent with my conclusions above, the failure to provide an accurate sketch will only breach the locator's duty to provide an accurate locate if the duty required both paint and paper for a re-locate. As noted above there is not enough evidence before me to make this finding.

43 The allegation that the sketch was misleading arises from the differing interpretations of the four unlabelled lines on the sketch. As noted above I find that the unlabelled lines combined with the circled items on the legend made Network's interpretation of the diagram the most reasonable one in the circumstances and different from the interpretation intended by Rogers and CCS. Therefore the sketch is misleading.

v. Did CCS fall below the industry standards when it prepared the locate

44 In *Queen v. Cognos Ltd.*, [1993] 1 S.C.R. 87, the Supreme Court of Canada identified five elements necessary to prove negligent misrepresentation. There must be a duty of care arising from a special relationship; the representation must be false, inaccurate or misleading; the representer must have acted negligently; the representee must have reasonably relied upon the representation and reliance must be detrimental to the representee.

45 In the forgoing paragraphs I have found that CCS and Rogers owe a duty of care imposed by statute; that the sketch was inaccurate because it was not current and misleading because it was not labelled properly; that Network relied upon the sketch in pinpointing the safe distance for machine excavation and that reliance resulted in damage to the conduit. The only remaining element is whether CCS fell below industry standard when creating the sketch. Several sub-standard behaviours are alleged: the failure to produce a new sketch during the September locate, mis-measurement of the 4.4 meters on the original sketch, and the failure to properly label the lines on the original sketch.

46 Again no independent expert evidence regarding the standard for preparation of the written locate document was led and therefore as noted repeatedly above, I cannot find that CCS was under an obligation to re-do the sketch at each subsequent re-locate.

47 I am also unable to find that the 4.4 meter distance was inaccurately recorded or improperly determined in June. Again, there is a lack of independent evidence regarding accepted industry measurement protocols and I will not speculate.

48 However, there is one area of CCS's conduct that I am willing to say falls below the standard of care and that relates to the quality of the sketch provided in the June initial locate. I find it common sense and obvious even without expert evidence that lines should be labelled. Labelling could be contained on the diagram or through use of a legend. It is unreasonable to suggest that Network should have known that lines two and four were sidewalks when no reference to sidewalks exists anywhere on the sketch or in the legend. The failure to label lines one through four on the sketch falls below the common sense standard of care required. I find confirmation of this opinion when I look at the Bell/GTtell diagram which labels every line as well as providing much more detail and multiple reference points. The CCS sketch falls below the standard of care and as a result both CCS and Rogers failed to meet their duties and were negligent in the preparation of the original sketch.

CONCLUSION

49 With respect to the main claim, Rogers has failed to prove that Network's re-locate conduct fell below the standard of care applicable to excavators and therefore the negligence claim against Network fails. The finding that the CCS sketch did not meet the standard in the industry does not result in a judgment against CCS because it is not a defendant in the main claim and Network's defendant's claim is only for contribution and indemnity from CCS in the event of a Rogers' judgment in the main claim. Therefore, both the claim and the defendant's claim are dismissed. Costs in the main and defendant's claims are awarded to Network including a representation fee of \$2,000.00.

S.M. McGILL DEPUTY J.

cp/e/qlcct/qlpmsg/qlced

---- End of Request ----

Download Request: Current Document: 1

Time Of Request: Monday, October 06, 2014 13:57:55