IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

)	Re: Docket Nos. 2150 and 2151
Debtors.)	
)	Substantively Consolidated
CABLE & WIRELESS USA, INC., et al.,)	Case No. 03-13711 (RB)
)	
In re:)	Chapter 11

MEMORANDUM OPINION WITH RESPECT TO OPPOSITIONS TO THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH OMNIBUS OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN 2003 PROPERTY TAX CLAIMS¹

The Trustee for the Omega Liquidating Trust (the "Trustee") created under the confirmed chapter 11 plan of reorganization, filed Fifteenth and Sixteenth Omnibus Objections involving 2003 property tax claims of local taxing authorities listed on Exhibits 'A' and 'B' attached hereto [Docket Nos. 2150 and 2151] (the "Objections"). In response to the Objections, the taxing authorities filed various responses, to which the Trustee has filed a reply [Docket No. 2260] (the "Reply").

Hearing on the Objections and responses was set for April 6, 2005. However, the tax authorities complained that they had insufficient notice of the Objections² and therefore requested time to file additional briefs together with time to take deposition testimony of the Trustee's witness.

Accordingly, the Court continued the matter with respect to the taxing authorities' responses, granted the taxing authorities' requests and reset the hearing for May 5, 2005, and continued the hearing for the Florida taxing authorities to June 15, 2005. The Court advised the parties that certain issues raised by

¹ This Memorandum Opinion constitutes the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7052.

² The Fifteenth and Sixteenth Objections were filed March 7, 2005.

the taxing authorities would be decided by the Court in advance of the hearing after receiving memoranda from the taxing authorities. As noted by the Trustee's Reply, the taxing authorities advance five principle arguments, namely: (1) requests for abstention of the objections to state court or administrative agencies; (2) procedural and jurisdictional arguments; (3) valuation contests; (4) state sovereign immunity defenses; and (5) matters dealing with individual treatment of the objections (*e.g.*, amounts owed and classification of the claims, whether priority or secured).

Responses to the Trustee's Reply have been filed by St. Johns County, Florida Property

Appraiser, on behalf of six responding Florida county appraisers, as well as Texas and Tennessee tax authorities. These responses argue that the pending proceedings require the filing of an adversary proceeding, that this Court lacks jurisdiction under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States

Constitution since each county appraiser is an "arm" of the State, that the appraisers are not properly joined as parties to this proceeding and that venue should be transferred to a bankruptcy court in the State of Florida to cure improper joinder, or this Court should abstain from jurisdiction.

In order to resolve the Trustee's Objections in an orderly manner, I determined the jurisdiction and other issues should be resolved prior to the May 5, 2005 hearing, including the taxing authorities' responses based on the Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity doctrine, abstention invoking section 505 of the Bankruptcy Code³ and 28 U.S.C. section 1334, failure to join indispensable parties, improper joinder, change of venue and the proper legal standard for appraisal of the 2003 properties.

A. <u>State Sovereign Immunity</u>

³ Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to statutory sections are to the Bankruptcy Code (the "Code"), 11 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*

The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another state, or by citizens or subjects of a foreign state.

The Eleventh Amendment was adopted to overrule Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. 419 (1789), holding a state was liable to suit by citizen of another state. After adoption, *Hans v. Louisiana*, 134 U.S. 1 (1890), held the Eleventh Amendment prohibits suits by individuals against states. In certain cases Congress may abrogate the states' sovereign immunity under sections 1 and 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment. Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida ("Seminole Tribe"), 517 U.S. 44 (1996). Footnote 16 of Seminole Tribe, responding to the dissent's view that the holding would prohibit federal jurisdiction over suits to enforce bankruptcy laws, noted that position was exaggerated. Following Seminole Tribe, and after Congress attempted to abrogate state sovereign immunity by amending section 106(a), five circuit courts of appeal have held Section 106(a) unconstitutional. In re Creative Goldsmith of Washington, D.C., 119 F.3d 1140, 1147 (4th Cir. 1992); In re Nelson, 310 F.3d 820 (7th Cir. 2002); In re Fernandez, 123 F.3d 241, 243-44 (5th Cir. 1997); In re Mitchell, 209 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2000); In re Sacred Heart Hosp. of Norristown ("Sacred Heart"), 133 F.3d 237 (3d Cir. 1998). One circuit has upheld section 106(a). *In re Hood*, 319 F.3d 755 (6th Cir. 2003). As noted in *Sacred Heart*:

Eleventh Amendment immunity, however, is not absolute. When, as here, a plaintiff seeks recovery only from the state, and not from its officials, there are two ways to divest a state of its Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity and hale the state into federal court. First, a state may waive its Eleventh Amendment immunity and consent to suit in federal court.

133 F.3d at 242 (citing Atascadero State Hosp. v. Scanlon, 473 U.S. 234, 238 (1985)). The

second method involved Congress's abrogation of immunity where adoption is specific and express under a valid exercise of congressional power, for example, *Seminole Tribe*'s decision on the Fourteenth Amendment.

As to waiver of sovereign immunity in bankruptcy reorganization cases, it has long been held since *Gardner v. New Jersey*, 329 U.S. 565 (1947), that:

It is traditional bankruptcy law that he who invokes the aid of the bankruptcy court by offering a proof of claim and demanding its allowance must abide the consequences of that procedure. If the claimant is a State, the procedure of proof and allowance is not transmitted into a suit against the State because the court entertains objections to the claim. The State is seeking something from the debtor. No judgment is sought against the State. The whole process of proof, allowance, and distribution is, shortly speaking, an adjudication of interests claimed in a res. It is none the less such because the claim is rejected in toto, reduced in part, given a priority inferior to that claimed, or satisfied in some way other than payment in cash. When the State becomes the actor and files a claim against the fund it waives any immunity which it otherwise might have had respecting the adjudication of the claim.

Id. at 573-74 (internal citations omitted); see also State of Maryland v. Antonelli Creditors' Liquidating Trust, 123 F.3d 777, 786 (4th Cir. 1997) (holding that the liquidating plan binds state taxing authorities despite the Eleventh Amendment because confirmation is not a "suit" against the state even if the state did not appear in the chapter 11 case, since jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court is jurisdiction over the debtor, its assets and creditors).

Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation v. Hood ("Hood"), 541 U.S. 440 (2004), recently reinforced the rationale of the Gardner decision regarding res and in rem jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court to defeat state sovereign immunity. In Hood, the Court held the bankruptcy court's in rem jurisdiction over the res and the bankruptcy court's exercise of its jurisdiction to discharge debt

does not infringe on state sovereign immunity.⁴ Id. at 447-48.

Other bankruptcy courts have relied extensively on *Gardner* in holding that a tax liability determination is not a "suit" within the scope of the Eleventh Amendment. *See, e.g., In re Psychiatric Hospitals of Florida, Inc.*, 216 B.R. 660, 661 (M.D. Fla. 1998). The same is true of *Gardner*'s holding on waiver by filing a proof of claim. *In re NVR L.P.*, 206 B.R. 831, 851-52 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 1997), *aff'd in part and reversed in part*, 189 F.3d 442 (4th Cir. 1999), *cert. denied*, 528 U.S. 1117 (2000).

Moreover, political subdivisions of states do not qualify for Eleventh Amendment immunity.

Mt. Healthy City School District Board of Education v. Doyle, 429 U.S. 274, 280 (1977); Lincoln County v. Luning, 133 U.S. 529, 530 (1890) (Immunity does not extend to counties and similar municipal corporations). To circumvent such doctrine, the Florida taxing authorities argue that each taxing authority is an "arm of the state" and thus enjoys state sovereign immunity, citing Christy v.

Pennsylvania Turnpike Comm'n., 54 F.3d 1140, 1144-45 (3d Cir. 1995). The party asserting such doctrine bears the burden of proof. Id. at 1144. The criteria of such test is well settled in Christy, as well as in the cases of In re Polygraphex Systems, Inc., 275 B.R. 408 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2002), and In re L. Luria & Sons, Inc., 282 B.R. 504 (S.D. Fla. 1999), following Eleventh Circuit decisions that:

Our oft-reiterated test entails three distinct inquiries: (1) whether, in the event the

-

⁴ On April 4, 2005, the United States Supreme Court granted certiorari in *In re Wallace Bookstone's, Inc. v. Central Virginia Community College*, 106 Fed. Appx. 341, 2004 WL 1763229 (6th Cir. 2004), which followed *Hood v. Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation*, 319 F.3d 755 (6th Cir. 2003), holding that Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress authority to abrogate state sovereign immunity on grounds the states ceded such authority to Congress under Article 1. Thus, the issue on application of the Bankruptcy Clause as abrogating state sovereign immunity in bankruptcy cases will now be addressed by the Supreme Court.

plaintiff prevails, the payment of the judgment would come from the state (this includes three considerations: whether the payment will come from the state's treasury, whether the agency has sufficient funds to satisfy the judgment, and whether the sovereign has immunized itself from responsibility for the agency's debts); (2) the status of the agency under state law (this includes four considerations: how state law treats the agency generally, whether the agency is separately incorporated, whether the agency can sue and be sued in its own right, and whether it is immune from state taxation); and (3) what degree of autonomy the agency enjoys.

Christy, 54 F.3d at 1144-45 (internal citations omitted).

Citing two conflicting cases, *Polygraphex* and *Luria & Sons*, *supra*, one holding the county tax collectors and property appraiser was an arm of the state (*Luria & Sons*) and the other (*Polygraphex*) holding just the opposite, the Florida tax authority comes down on the side of *Luria & Sons*.

After considering the authorities cited by the Florida tax authorities, I conclude, based on the Supreme Court decisions of *Gardner* and *Hood, supra*, that these *in rem* proceedings seeking to adjust property values are not "suits" against the State. Further, as to all counties that filed proofs of claim, these counties clearly waived any defense of state sovereign immunity, even assuming those counties are an "arm" of the state. The other two counties are properly before the Court under the holding that this proceeding is not a suit against the state and this Court has *in rem* jurisdiction over the appraisals and therefore the tax authorities.

B. Abstention under 11 U.S.C. section 550 and 28 U.S.C. section 1334

28 U.S.C. section 1334(c)(1) authorizes permissive abstention:

Nothing in this section prevents a district court⁵ in the interest of justice, or in the

6

-

⁵ A bankruptcy court is a unit of the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 151.

interest of comity with State courts or respect for State law, from abstaining from hearing a particular proceeding arising under title 11 or arising in or related to a case under title 11.

Section 505(a) provides that the bankruptcy court "may determine the amount or legality of any tax, any fine or penalty relating to a tax, or any addition to tax, whether or not previously assessed, whether or not paid, and whether or not contested before and adjudicated by a judicial or administrative tribunal of competent jurisdiction."

As held in In re Lipetsky, 64 B.R. 431 (Bankr. D. Mont. 1986):

In reviewing Section 505 and the authorities cited by each party, as well as other decisions, there is no conflict among the decisions regarding the purpose and meaning of Section 505. The determination of a debtor's tax liability is a core proceeding under Section 157 of the Code and this Court thus has jurisdiction to determine the amount and legality of the tax, except where such tax has been fixed by final order of an administrative of judicial tribunal, after being reasonably contested by the taxpayer. *In re Palm Beach Resort Properties*, supra [51 B.R. 363]. As stated in *In re Northwest Beverage*, *Inc.*, supra, at 46 B.R. 634-635:

Section 505 is derived from the Bankruptcy Act sections which allowed the Court to hear and determine questions concerning the amount or legality of unpaid taxes. Several Act cases have construed the language used in the predecessor Section to Section 505 to mean that:

"[W]here after a hearing, a quasi-judicial body—determines the amount of tax due, with the right on the part of the taxpayer to a judicial review of the determination, al confirmable with the requirements of due process, such determination, upon becoming final by operation of law, is conclusive upon a court of bankruptcy, for mathematical error in the computations of the amount of tax or legal error in its assessment."

Section 505 of the Bankruptcy Code and the predecessor Section in the Act were enacted to "... protect[s] the estate from the negligence or indifference of a debtor who has defaulted in tax assessment proceedings ..." 3 <u>Collier on Bankruptcy</u>, 505-23 (15th Ed.). In enacting Section 505 Congress was primarily concerned with protecting creditors from the dissipation of the estate's assets which could result if the creditors were barred by a tax

judgment which the Debtor, due to his ailing financial condition, did not contest."

Id. at 433-34 (internal citations omitted); *Accord*, *In re Custom Distribution Services Inc.*, 224 F.3d 235, 240 (3d Cir. 2000) (holding that the Bankruptcy Court is allowed to review tax claims even after the time has run under a state law prohibiting the taxpayer's right to challenge the assessment and tax).

There are two purposes for the enactment of section 505(a). One, noted above, is to protect the creditors from the dissipation of the estate assets occurring from the failure of the debtor to protest the tax. The second is to afford an alternative forum, the bankruptcy court, to allow prompt administration of the estate which would be otherwise threatened if the estate had to litigate the tax or assessment in several state jurisdictions. *In re Stoecker*, 179 F.3d 546, 549 (2d Cir. 1999) ("If federal courts could not determine the debtor's liability for state taxes – if they had to abstain pending a determination of that liability in state court – bankruptcy proceedings would be even more protracted than they are.").

The forum situation is plainly put in issue by the response to the objection of Duval County, Florida, which filed a proof of claim and highlights the dilemma of the estate, where the response states that under section 194.171(2) Florida Statutes, "no action shall be brought to contest a tax assessment after 60 days from the date the assessment being contested is certified for collection under 193.122(2)." The tax collector of Duval County certified the 2003 tax rolls for collection on October 19, 2003, which bar date for appeal expired December 18, 2003, and the debtor failed to pursue its state remedy, in spite of proper notification. As stated in *In re Piper Aircraft Corp.*, 171 B.R. 415 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 1994):

A bankruptcy court has authority to determine the amount of a debtor's tax liability, notwithstanding the debtor's failure to comply with state law procedures. *See, e.g.,* [*In re AWB Associates, G.P.,* 144 B.R. 270, 277 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1992)]; [*In re Warren Street Associates,* 143 B.R. 326, 329 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1992)]; [*In re Ledgemere Land Corp.,* 135 B.R. 193, 196 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1991)].

Id. at 418. In addition, *Piper Aircraft* further holds a debtor may seek relief under section 505 "notwithstanding the sale of the underlying obligation by a county to a third party." *Id.* at 419.

The memorandum filed by St. Johns County, *et al.*, does not address the State's exhaustion of remedy problem. *In re Hospitality Ventures/Lavista*, 314 B.R. 843 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2004), contains an excellent and exhaustive discussion of the preclusive abstention cases, section 505(a) discretion for abstention and impossibility of discretion in precluding abstention.

Given all of this evidence of Congressional intent and the absence of any express language granting discretion to abstain, the Court cannot conclude, from the use of the ambiguous word "may," that § 505(a) authorizes discretionary abstention other than what § 1334(c)(1) permits.

Id. at 859-60.

So what of the application of 28 U.S.C. section 1334(c)(1)? *Hospitality Ventures* answers this issue in concluding:

The Court holds that 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c)(1) does not allow permissive abstention with regard to § 505(a) relief if there is no alternative forum to decide the dispute and that § 505(a) does not permit a bankruptcy court to decline to exercise jurisdiction other than under § 1334(c)(1).

314 B.R. at 864. *Security Farms v. International Brotherhood*, 124 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 1997), reiterates this principle in holding:

Abstention can exist only where there is a parallel proceeding in state court. That is, inherent in the concept of abstention is the presence of a pendant state action in favor of which the federal court must, or may, abstain. *See, e.g., In re S.G. Phillips Constrs.*,

Inc., 45 F.3d 702, 708 (2d Cir. 1995).

Id. at 1109-10. Other taxing authorities have also raised the exhaustion of state remedy issues and the failure of the debtor to timely file statutory appeals of the assessment and/or tax, thus foreclosing an available state forum. The bottom line under 28 U.S.C. section 1334(c)(1) is simply that abstention is not legally available because no parallel state forum exists to decide the tax issues.

C. <u>Adversary Proceeding and Non-Joinder</u>

Citing Metromedia Fiber Network Inc. v. Various State and Local Taxing Authorities ("Metromedia"), 299 B.R. 251 (Bankr. S.D. N.Y. 2003), for the proposition that an adversary proceeding must be filed to challenge a tax or assessment under section 505, the Florida tax authorities reason that Florida statutes govern each assessment and tax issue and sec. 194.181(2), Florida Statutes, requires that in any case brought by the taxpayer contesting its assessment, "the county property appraiser shall be a party defendant." A careful reading of *Metromedia* reveals that decision does not at all address the necessity of filing an adversary proceeding under Rule VII to determine tax liability involving section 505(a). Indeed, *Metromedia* involved twelve adversary proceedings commenced by the debtor under section 505, and therefore Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 was not implicated. Indeed, the adversary proceedings were dismissed under the doctrine of sovereign immunity. I also note *Metromedia*'s conclusion that the decision regarding *in rem* and *in* personam jurisdiction is clearly at odds with Hood, supra, which holds: "Here, however, the bankruptcy court's in rem jurisdiction allows it to adjudicate the debtor's discharge without in personam jurisdiction over the state." See Metromedia, 299 B.R. at 272-74. Hood also concludes the debtor may proceed to exercise its in rem jurisdiction by motion under Rule 9014 as a contested

case, which satisfied all due process requirements. I see no difference in the bankruptcy court's *in rem* jurisdiction on objections to claims described in *Gardner* and the *in rem* holding in *Hood* on dischargeability of a debt.

The simple fact is that since there is no procedure proscribed in section 505(a), Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7001 does not list resolution of a creditor's claim as an adversary proceeding. *See Hood*, 124 S.Ct. at 1914; *In re Carson*, 227 B.R. 148, 149 (S.D. Ind. 1998); *In re Whelan*, 213 B.R. 310, 313 (Bankr. W.D. La. 1997) (holding a determination of debtor's tax liability should be made under Bankruptcy Rule 9014, which specifically incorporates specific provisions of Rule VII, including discovery provisions, entry of judgment, etc.).

As to the issue raised in the Florida County memorandum that the tax assessor is not joined as a party, I find that argument specious. The Trustee's motion to determine the tax liability through the Fifteenth and Sixteenth objections to claims serves not only the local tax collectors but the assessor as well. The entire local entourage involved in the assessment and the tax is thus before the Court, and therefore all due process requirements are satisfied.

D. <u>Venue</u>

The Florida memorandum asserts the tax disputes should be transferred to the bankruptcy court of the Middle District of Florida for resolution in order to satisfy the holding and criteria of *In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.*, 146 B.R. 1008 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1992), to wit:

- 1. Location of the Plaintiff and the Defendant.
- 2. Availability of subpoena power for unwilling witnesses.
- 3. The ease of access to necessary proof.
- 4. The expense related to obtaining willing witnesses.
- 5. The enforceability of any judgment rendered.

- 6. The ability to receive a fair trial.
- 7. The state's interest in having local controversies decided within its borders by those familiar with state law, and
- 8. The economies of the estate administration.

Id. at 1011.

Applying the above factors, I determine transfer of venue is not necessary for reasons set forth below, as many of the *Hillsborough Holdings* factors can be avoided or the burdens lessened considerably for all parties, especially with respect to factors such as access to proof, expense, fair trial, state interest in uniformity and economies of administration can be avoided or burdens lessened considerably for all parties.

An affidavit by Morgan Gilreath, property tax appraiser for Volusia County, Florida, made on behalf of himself and the other five Florida counties, asserts that under the cost approach (which is rejected by debtor's value witnesses, who adopted a market value approach), the available information is in each respective county office, the cost of witness travel to Delaware would be expensive and also inconvenient and Florida law on value will apply and a Florida judge who is familiar with Florida law *ad valorem* tax concepts would be better able to conduct and decide the valuation issues. In sum, the Florida county appraisers argue that they would be disadvantaged by having to make their presentation to the Delaware bankruptcy court.

The plea for allowing Florida county appraisers to testify from or in a Florida venue has merit. Some suitable alternatives may satisfy that issue. Rather than transfer venue to the bankruptcy court in Florida, this Court may allow each Florida appraiser to file a sworn declaration in question and answer format with this Court before trial, and then have each witness available by telephone to respond to any

cross-examination by counsel for the Liquidating Trust. After cross-examination, Florida counsel would then have the opportunity to conduct any redirect examination of the witness. Another option is that the testimony of each Florida appraiser could be submitted by deposition arranged between counsel for each party so that the expense of travel to Delaware of each witness would be eliminated.

E. <u>The Proper Standard for Fixing Assessment.</u>

Memoranda filed by Texas, Tennessee, together with the Florida authorities, state the 2003 assessments were created using the "sales approach" applied to data submitted by the debtor; while the Trust's witness's "appraisal approach" is based on a simple nationwide valuation of fair market value (willing seller, willing buyer, neither under any compulsion) and includes the bankruptcy liquidation sale of assets.

Based upon the memoranda and affidavits of the respective parties, the Court has sufficient information at this time to determine which appraisal method is acceptable for fixing the tax assessment. Each tax authority must enjoy and apply a uniformity of assessment within its tax jurisdiction. I adopt the rationale set forth in *Metromedia*, which rightly held:

The problem with the debtor's "streamlined," unified approach to determining the "fair market value" of all of their Taxable Property in multiple taxing jurisdictions using a single methodology or combination of methodologies is that the resulting uniform valuation may produce results which are highly anomalous and discriminatory vis-a-vis other similarly situated taxpayers in the various taxing jurisdictions. Moreover, all of the defendants employ their own individualized schemes and methodologies for allocating the burden of taxation amongst all of the taxpayers in their respective jurisdictions. Even if, as the debtors assert, all of the defendant tax jurisdictions purport to utilize a concept of market value in the assessment process, the methodologies used are bound to differ. Any uniform valuation of the debtors' Taxable Property determined by this Court is bound to be at variance with state or local methodologies mandated by local

law or practice, and with assessment valuation by the defendants of other taxpayer properties within their respective jurisdictions, producing disparate and discriminatory results.

Uniformity in the laws governing bankruptcies is constitutionally mandated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4; but uniformity in taxation is not. Nothing in the Constitution or the Bankruptcy Code entitles a debtor to uniform property tax determinations in differing tax jurisdictions, and nothing in federal law entitles the federal courts to impose uniform taxation schemes or methodologies on state and local governments.

299 B.R. at 283. Use of the nationwide appraisal standards is at variance with each State's methodology, and thus is not an appropriate valuation method.

Moreover, in Tennessee's case, and probably others, there was substantial write down of value between 2002 and 2003, which was submitted to tax assessment authorities by Cable & Wireless and accepted by those authorities.

Finally, Texas properly notes that use of Savvis's purchase at a liquidation sale a year after the 2003 assessment is not only remote in time, but as Tennessee states, use of the Savvis, Telegent and Genuity sales were made within bankruptcy liquidation context, which does not satisfy the willing seller/willing buyer test, neither under any compulsion to buy or sell concept, and therefore would be inadmissible evidence.

Further, the two affidavits filed by the Trustee of Don Schmitt and Alan Dalass and Mr. Schmitt's testimony detail the Trustee's appraisal method. Mr. Schmitt states: "Tax assessors generally use the cost approach, applying a depreciation schedule to the original cost of the property subject to property tax, to obtain an assessed value from which to calculate the appropriate property tax due from the taxpayer." Mr. Schmitt criticized such local methods, and as described above, embarked on a nationwide review of oversupply of telecommunication assets which he claims greatly inflated the value

of assets. This approach sets local uniformity of tax assessment and tax on its head. I further note the Savvis/Debtor sale, which he states was at a competitive auction, simply does not satisfy the willing seller test. Mr. Dalass also used the Savvis sales data and one of Nortel to reallocate the assessment and thus deviate from uniform local practice.

In *ANC Rental*, Judge Walrath ordered abstention because, among other reasons, "In the context of section 505, abstention is often used where the uniformity of assessment is an issue." 316 B.R. at 159 (citing *Metromedia*, 299 B.R. at 281 and *In re AWB Assocs.*, *G.P.*, 144 B.R. 270, 276 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1992)). *AWB Assocs*. held:

The valuation of property for purposes of determining property taxes must be consistent with state law principles, as the valuation is merely part and parcel of the adjudication of the tax due and owing, a question controlled by state law . . ., the bankruptcy court gives full faith and credit to the law of the state upon which the tax is based.

144 B.R. at 278 (citing *In re Fairchild Aircraft Corp.*, 124 B.R. 488, 492 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. 1991)); see also Connecticut Performing Arts Foundation v. Brown, 47 B.R. 911, 917-18 (D. Conn. 1985) (holding that although the bankruptcy court properly accepted jurisdiction over the dispute concerning the validity of a tax exemption against a claim of state sovereign immunity, it improperly applied stringent Connecticut law in mandating the grant of the exemption).

Finally, the *AWB Assocs*. case, specifically held that property located in New Jersey is subject to the substantive law of New Jersey and that property assessments made by the proper tax authority are presumed correct. 144 B.R. at 278-79. In sum, to overcome a presumption of correctness, the debtor must apply state law, not national standards. I see nothing in the Schmitt testimony that satisfies local assessment standards. It must be reiterated that in order to use the sale of the assessed property

or like property to determine the property's value for tax assessment purposes, the sale must be a normal, fair, arm's-length transaction between parties who are willing, but not forced to sell or buy. *See Sales Price as Basis for Tax Assessment*, 89 A.L.R.3rd 1136, 1139-1141, § 6, and 7(b) (Receiver's Sale); *Nelson v. State Tax Comm.*, 29 Utah 162, 506 P.2d 437 (1973) (noting that the price paid for property for which there was a limited market and sold in bankruptcy proceedings, warranted rejection of the sales price in valuing the property for tax assessment purposes).

The sworn testimony of Stephen Barreca, presented by the Florida taxing authorities, is persuasive. He states that sales involving a bankruptcy do not meet the willing seller test because there is an element of compulsion in the sales transaction, even if it is an auction sale. He also gave the opinion, contrary to Schmitt's testimony, that the telecommunications market was not depressed in 2003, giving the example of Nortel's gross revenues in 2003 of \$10,193,000,000. I would also add that "Fair Market Value" means neither panic value, auction value, speculative value, nor a value fixed by depressed or inflated prices. In fact, a market may be established only where there are willing sellers and buyers in substantial numbers. *See In re Board of Water Supply of City of New York*, 14 N.E.2d 789, 792-93 (N.Y. 1938). That is why the C.A. Turner Telephone Plant Index (2003),⁶ introduced by Orange County through its tax assessor, is a valid test for the market rather than the meager sales, including bankruptcy sales, used by Schmitt to devalue the market by 97% after he had presented renditions to the tax authorities based on a cost approach less depreciation. I therefore reject the testimony of Schmitt, as fundamentally flawed, based as it is on a confidential study, not

⁶ Since the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, indexes were developed for and provided to the telecommunications industry in general. Copies of these schedules were presented in Exhibit "B" of the Florida tax appraiser's testimony.

presented in evidence, of Pricewaterhouse in conjunction with the 2004 sale of Debtors' bankruptcy assets to Savvis, and the bankruptcy liquidation sale of telecommunications assets in the Telegent chapter 11 case and one non-bankruptcy sale of assets to Nortel, which Barreca opined should be disregarded because it was not a sale at retail, but was for resale of remanufacture of switches.

Moreover, Schmitt conceded that he never reviewed the bankruptcy cases filed on which sales he relied, including how they occurred, who was involved and what the underlying factors were at the time of the sale.

I therefore give weight to the appraisal methods utilized by the local and state tax assessors. See In re Mayfair Mills, Inc., 295 B.R. 827 (Bankr. D. S.C. 2002); In re Custom Distribution Services, Inc., 216 B.R. 136 (Bankr. D. N.J. 1997); In re Liuzzo, 204 B.R. 235 (Bankr. N.D. Fla. 1996) (holding that the bankruptcy court should follow state law); Fairchild Aircraft Corp., 124 B.R. at 492.

In sum, the Liquidating Trust has failed through competent and reliable evidence to overcome the *prima facie* validity of each of the tax claims and the objections of the Trust are therefore rejected and overruled. I determine this finding is consistent with Federal Rule of Evidence 702, Testimony by Experts, where Schmitt's testimony does not assist the trier of fact because he does not present reliable, credible evidence of fair market value by his use of alleged comparable sales which are not representative of the market. *See*, *e.g.*, *In re Broad Associates Ltd. Partnership*, 110 B.R. 632, 637 (Bankr. D. Conn. 1990).

For the reasons set forth above, I conclude:

1. The defense of sovereign immunity is not validly asserted by the state or local taxing

authorities;

- 2. Abstention under 28 U.S.C. section 1334(c)(1) is not warranted;
- 3. This Court has jurisdiction to decide the matters presented by the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Objections to Claims under section 505(a);
- 4. Evidence by the Liquidating Trust of a nationwide market value standard would be contrary to the uniformity of tax assessment procedures by local authorities, and use of bankruptcy liquidation sales is not admissible;

- 5. Each State's assessment practice set by statute or otherwise is the acceptable method of valuation and assessment, and is presumed correct; and
- 6. The Fifteenth and Sixteenth Omnibus Objections to Certain 2003 Property Tax
 Claims listed on Exhibits "A" and "B" will be denied and each proof of claim will be allowed as filed.

A separate order shall enter.

DATED this 24th day of June, 2005.

BY THE COURT

HONORABLE JOHN L. PETERSON

United States Bankruptcy Judge

Exhibit A

WF3:1122821,5 062838.1001

Omego Liquidating Trust 189 Om-bas Olymbon - Ismahing

17.25 12.25 1.00	11/11/20	1,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	### 1999 1999	### MATERIANS ###################################	ADIS COMMENTE ME, ORLANDO SPO \$-COMMETE ME,
Control Country Control Co		8	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	FERTINE STATES OF THE PROPERTY	2015 DAMEE ME GRUANDE STORE OF BOTHVILLE
CONSIDER COUNTY CONSIDER C			### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ##	### ##################################	2015 COMMER ME OF UMENO 2015 COMMENDE SY, CFLANDO 99 W CO HORNO E SY, CFLANDO 99 W CO HORNO E SY, CFLANDO 99 W CO HORNO E SY, CFLANDO
ONMERCICUMPT ONESSES 177 41421.377.00			### 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	44444 44444 44444 44444 44444 44444 4444	STEE CHANGE FAS COUNTILE STEELS FAS COUNTILE STEELS FAS COUNTILE STEELS FAS COUNTILES STEELS
Obsersect COUNTY			SALES	表 2000年	SOSTONES AND MOUNTED STATES AND
CONTRICTORNITY CONT			155.00 15	はなる ではなる ではなる をはなな をはな をはな をは	SULVANDOR OF THE POST OF THE P
DESCRIPTION 107 152,500.00	" "		15524.4 15524.9 15245.9 15245.9 15245.7 1524.7 1	SECOND SE	SULVANOR NO TO SINGER
Octobact COLNITY			90.000 90.000	### ##################################	SITVINOS AC ADORNATION
ORNAGE COUNTY			### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ##	TEAN TO THE	SIT OF BOUNDA
CONTROL COUNTY			200003 510000	在 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	STANCE SOCIALITY
Order County			100 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00		STA OF ROCK/ALL
OCHANGE COLNITY		S TO THE STATE OF	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	SALES CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY	JII VA BOAN AS AD
OPUMES COMMITY			######################################	を発生した。 1000年	STANDON AND DESCRIPTION
OUTUAL COMPTY			2011-101 7-1-101 1-101 1-101 1-1-101 1-1-101 1-1-101 1-1-101 1-1-101 1-1-101 1-1-10	BLANCE OF THE PARTY OF THE PART	STA OF BOKINE
DECUME CONSTITY			SELECTOR SEL	Particular Particular	STEA OF POCKVILLE
DEFAUE COMITY			7-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1	FLOORS BEACH B	TILVIS OLIV OLIV OLIV OLIV OLIV OLIV OLIV OLIV
A			4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	# 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	CITY OF BOWNIE.
DECAMB CORNEY ADM COUNTY PLANS 1917 228 \$584,0900 \$			11 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1	### ##################################	TIVNOG 45-45-
ADM COUNTY STATUS 228 SERVICE	- W	***	2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016		
A			구 55 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명 명	FERRITA OF THE PROPERTY OF T	
9 100 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	w		也可以 學		
9000021979 228 84,778200 91000221979 228 84,97100 91000221979 228 84,97100 91000221979 228 84,97100 9100022393 228 84,97100 9100022393 228 84,97100 9100022393 228 84,97100 9100022393 228 84,77000 9100022393 228 84,77000 910002393 228 84,77000 910002393 228 84,77000 91000239 228 84,77000 91000239 228 84,77000 91000239 228 84,77000 91000239 228 84,77000 91000239 228 828 92,77000 91000239 228 828 92,77000 91000239 228 828 92,77000			80.00 80 80.00 80.00 80.00 80.00 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8		
STROCCESSORY 2248 SERVICE			25.55 26.55		
STREETHY STATE STATE			# 12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
9100523490			50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5		
STATE STAT			200 mm m		
00720718 252 2620000			655 551 552 553 553 553 553 553 553 553 553 553		
9400672593 229 6404020 9400672594 228 444777400 PMOG72594 228 44477700 PMOG72595 228 44277700 PMOG72595 228 44277700 PMOG72595 228 44277700 PMOG72595 228 44277700 PMOG7259 228 44277700 PMOG725		***	2		
OCCUPATES SEE			11.12 12.12 13.12 13.13		
PROJUCE 2004 228	ਨ ਹੋ ਨ		12 12 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	2	
PATICAL SERIES PATICAL SERIES	n		보고 25 전 전 25 전 25 전 25 전 25 전 25 전 25 전 2		
90000228999 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.0000228999 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.000228999 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.000228999 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.00022899 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.0002899 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.0002899 228 40.13,100.0 Fr. 10.0002899 23.0000289 23.0002899 23.0002899 23.0002899 23.0002899 23.0002899 23.0000289 23.0002899 23.0002899 23.0000289 23.000289 23.0002899 23.	3 **		808 808 808 1911 111	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,0	₩**		\$5050 \$5050 \$1.04	51.25.94 51.25.95 51.25.9	
1,000,000,000 1,000,000	₩.		25.04 25.04 31.17	10.00 10.00	
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,0	•		3 TH	1828 1828 1828	
9.106221679 228 41.201.00 9.106221679 228 41.501.00 9.106221629 228 41.501.00 9.10622229 228 41.501.00 9.10622329 228 42.501.00 9.10622329 228 42.501.00 9.10622329 228 42.501.00 9.10622329 228 42.501.00 9.10622329 228 42.501.00 9.10622329 128 528 528 528 500.00 9.10622329 128 528 528 500.00 9.10622329 128 528 500.00 9.10622329 128 528 500.00 9.10622329 128 528 500.00 9.1062232 128 528 500.00 9.1062232 128 528 500.00 9.106223 128 528 500.00 9.106223 128 528 500.00 9.106223 128 528 500.00 9.106223 128 5		u	171	12.51	
\$1,000,000.00 \$2.00 \$10,000.00 \$10,0		u			
9,006,022,041 273 \$17,223,000 19,006,025,041 23,000 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,041 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024,024,024 19,006,024 19,006,024		u			
94006223992 2.35 42,4440 94006223964 2.36 45,494,00 9400622364 1538 52,494,00 9400627 1538 52,494,00 9400627 1538 52,494,00 9400627 1538 52,494,00 9400627 1538 54,440,00 9400627 1538 54,440,00 9400627 1538 54,440,00 9400627 1528 54,440,0	41,496.20 314,764.8				
1000823893			000		
### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ##	-		30 750		
Control Cont				200	
Colorect		0.01	Daniel Control	******	
20001229 1538 1518200 20001239 1538 1542134,00 20001239 1538 1542134,00 20011239 1538 1542134,00 20011239 1538 1542134,00 2001123 1538 15441,00 2001123 1538 15441,00 2001123 1538 1544,00 2001123 1538 1544,00 2001123 1538 1544,00 2001124 1538 1538		•	100	2K1742	
700,000	27.		27	1931	
O'CHALLES COCK		9072	1029	e de la constante de la consta	
201202 1598 40,000 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0			1070	97.5	
Control Cont	_			CHOR	
1001/1781 1023 1034 104/1000 1034 104/1000 1034 1034 1034 1034 1034 1034 1034		KKOR	900	54465	
10594521 10525 115915.00 10594632 11525 1525 1525 1525 1525 1525 1525 1			£	#13#	
10-14-24				2000	
10-9443-3 14-52 \$12,021.00 30-916-4 14-52 \$12,021.00 30-916-4 14-52 \$12,021.00 30-916-6 14-52 \$14,021.00 30-916-6 14-52 \$15,02 \$14,021.00 30-916-6 14-52 \$15,02 \$1,02.00 30-916-6 14-52 \$15,02 \$1,04,02.00 30-916-6 14-52 \$1,04,02.00 30-916-			2		
150 CALCAN CALCA	-				
181800 18180 1818 1818 1818 1818 1818 1					
3091595 1525 345612000 1525 34561200 1525 34561200 1525 34561200 1525 34561200 1525 34		•		207	
3091597 1525 150000 1000000			ij	1. 4	
			7	510.30	
100-100	•	315402	77.	\$100.87	
CHARLES BOOK BASINGS		528625	155	97794	
	*	_	212	#07K#	
			12.20	24	
Section 2000	•••	•	44	22.05	
10 may 1 may			17.13	# H	
A CAMPA STATE			176.12	\$47.43	
15 CONT. 15			27 /02	4	
1906	COMPANY OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR		2002	374.45	
	l		18.26	\$242T	

Demografikandstörg Trust. 150 Omebus Objection - Remeining

Š	manage colection		Ā			2003.48				
ě	- ŧ	Percel Interdige	4	ZUZS Assessment	2003 February	Assessment	16, ty 8000	Property to Children	AL HET DE COM	Comments
₽	COSMOUNTY	67,8000		\$1412(60	\$0.00K\$	11-95# 1d	ŀ			
e	CHOSSIN COUNTY	444000		\$50,384,60	8404.50	\$5,782.08	100,000	44.4	1	
e	CHESSA COUNTY	25450		11383.16	\$100.22	St. Arte 20	CM 619			
9	CLESSAL COUNTY	19-8000		00000000000	2000	10000				
9	CASSAL ECURETY	17- 01 00		6170 OC 10	1 PAR 1				11100	
9	DISSIA COUNTY	4Roomb		A CONTRACTOR						
5	Passas en Labora	10000							£1841	
	Access to the second second	2000				E100013	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	が	1373	
2 1	CASSING MICH.	non-		8		110,000,01	, ES		100.002	
R	CASSILLACY MAY	2-0000		11.006.00	2225	\$2,020.30	20	47.72	07810	
	CHRESTAN				58.15634		14.14			
9	ELMORE COMMON	16763	9		7	44 670 48			90004	
•	BINOSECTOREN	4870					97	į	2000	
	GINANOC CANTERNA		<u> </u>		****	200		813	12,120	
2 (ESTRUCTURE CONTROL		ê		11,100.78	11,335,40	5153.41	200	\$100 m	
0	ELECTRE COLUMN	1678	£	57 (57) (BEA)	118864	(1) 189.02	11,000	200	A V	
₽	ELMONZ COUNTY	757	¥	SEC. 728.03	1000	4			The state of the s	
0	ELMONE COLLARY	1476	4	100						
6	Highlichner		2 :			9		5	2.40	
,			3	237, 237,00		HE BOTH SEL	P2'22'5	814823	ALC: N	
	ELECTRECORUM	16773	2	00.557.07	77 DOM	70 CASA2	44 CF3	1 5		
۵,	ELMORE COUNTY	1,11	8	2057.00	200					
	ELECTRIC COUNTY				140 BH BV				27.75	
•	SOUTHWAT CONTROL		ź				201		\$721.63	
		Onno.	Ř	12465200		114514 14514	12,560	75	CK CC	
2 :	COMPANIE COUNTY	#000G	ř	State of the state	2015	1146.27	877	27	4	
e	GOODING COUNTY	20005	Ħ	\$1000000	31,100,30	\$10 KBD 34	45.000 A	9		
₽	COCOMIC COUNTY	Be000	2	STOSMORED	80 100	00 100				
•	Groding county	23,000	5				*******		144	
£	Contraction of page			ATT CONTRACT OF	1			9	SALES	
2	Control Control	SPORTS	ž	537.161.00	25.00.60	11,100,23	200777	维兹	528.32	
4	PACIFICATION OF THE PACIFI				\$3,836,00		24040	242617	\$31.2164	
	MPEDOKA DOJNYY	P		4167,089.E	11,701.60	\$19,775.16	1300 Apr	44.74	7777	
•	MENDOCKY ESTRAFY	9		57,488,08	277.50	70.00			***************************************	
o	MENDORS OF STATE	Ħ		A 135 KL	A 304 E.	1000000				
	MENDACA CREATE					7			× ×	
9	MONETO AND PARTY AND PARTY.			1				1	NAME OF THE PERSON	
ŝ	ATAITMAN CONTRACTOR	1						25.00.22	5	
	Marris Marriage County 1	TO SE		612 MD D0	11000	\$2.543.24	10°2#	4	2442	
	MUNICIPAL COLLEGE				PLACE LE		200	20.00	- The state of the	
9	WARRIED COLUMN	STATE.		G160,053,00	1000	HE CORPOR				
ş	VMM RESIL COLLIERY	7000		152 160 00	A1 100 10	45.170.00				
	WORKERSYCOLOGIC					2000		8	4407	
ä	COMP SCOOL COMMENTS	***************************************	į		11000		2 22 25		150.54	
1	The same of the same		ļ			12 C-0 11	55,473	99113	400,15	
Ė				200	#1.7#		24.00	S1134	2	
6	CELLORE COMETY	4424044-003		20,00	27 SC#	6131400	## 2#	Į	1	
¥	quecos cooms	41237784-DD4		934.978.50	2140.10	£7 667 41			1	
꾩	SULPORD COURT	4125788-005		63853839	5	40.000			Ì	
H	SULPTURE COLUMN	et 2 F278,088		- Constitution			2	1	19125	
E,	CAMBRIDA COLUMN			1000000			1,03		#5°E	
1	Catalogue and war	500				2075	ž	24.23	# L24	
! 5		Single State of the state of th		200	8		I	\$0.7¢	EG WA	
. .		4.028.788.60#		23,842,00	25.00		450.00	1000	246.30	
¥	GULDORD COUNTY	4128784-010		112883.00	*****	報の数数	5			
	GLEFORD COUNTY				N 250.45				7	
¥	PAUS COUNTY	ä	ĺ	ALC: A SAC AND THE		200			343690	
¥	Wide Chamber	į	11			200			83	
5	-	7	Ì	10 to 10 50 feet			2	27.42	0005	
2 9	PANE CAUTA	2	Ê	\$ 50 Miles	7,69164	MAT () 78.20	250.03	10000	8	
2 9	- Contraction		3	2000	77	17872	2075	88	9 05	
إ	PULL LAURE	New Part Control	2	\$75,245,08	87.5	F87527-03	SP-ES	45.00	\$	
	MAKE COUNTY				123.100.73		* 50.46	43 10mm	200	
					1		-	San and San and	MATERIAL PROPERTY.	

Exhibit B

WP3:1122821.5

į			į	2038	760 Sec. 32	2908.44	Anna and To-		And Man Tax Channel	Promone
		Parce south		-			MI OKANA			The state of the s
ž	CERTIC COUNTY			\$239 £68.00	\$6,274.73	\$17.311.00	\$458.02	5200.44	\$251.58	
	STERE COMMY				\$4,274,73	:	2000	7787	25.15E	
₹	CLYMPICOL COURTY	143254804	ř.	\$184,180,00	CO 150 HIS	18 Bar 18	10 CO		25.00	
₹	CLYMPOCA COURTY	217.294524	10	200	本作的	80 MIN SE			#7E25	
₹	C.Mercial county	19449-1254	e e	2740.00	1247.66	\$111.35	26.50		0000	
₹	CONNECTOR COURTY	796.524464	£	00085787	31,575,16	94,000.78				
₹	CONNECT COURTY	202075200	E.	129,400 DG	20 SACO (SA	#4.74 #4.74			THE STATE OF	
E	CLYSHOOK COURTY	32525-6406	E W	42830.00	28 384 52	1177.43	20 583.86		27122	
ē	CONSHIDOR COUNTY	545 29 6234	Ę	125,113.00	\$2.467.4E	6,492,42	2000		07674	
ŧ	Christoca Collectiv	204.785.23	¥.	131,473.00	DG 100 2 1	18,200.88	114611		170011	
Ē	CONTROCA COURTY	788-22-534A	875	127,340.00	47.77	171	44479		\$11.10	
4	CIMPIOSICOUNTY	814343414	57	133 250 00	17,141,78	29,757,85 20,185	\$2.00 PE		95738	
	CONTROOR COUNTY				\$48.985.42		11,406.08	9	114000	
8	UNRECOUNTY		rer	E306,000,00	#E 82239	\$34,000,00	2487.17	AT 102		
l	CHRN COUNTY				8228	1	1768#		0004	
굗	DAVIDSON COUNTY			1398 272 70	27 Mary	\$100,008.78		2000	Par Constitution	MACAGINES CITY OF MACAGINETIC
	DAVIDBON OO HELL				127.386.48		54.037.09	•		
×	MINISTRONG COUNTY		17.16	ST. 1887 1984	AT COP PA	752,000	to Leave	\$2508.74	7	3
i	ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY		į	4	15 DOG 15	1		**************************************		
اء	AUSTR COURTY		17.22	148,130,00	1721.00	TO MAN COR	12.59,00			ACI OTTAINS
	Austral Country				27.77					•
¥	BEXAS COGNEY	Automot 150	27	\$172.52.00 0	\$2196E	\$12.438A2	2346	114328		
ř	SEXAL COUNTY	r d	1741	00'002'562'5	24,538.00	\$37,139,00	8712.6			
	AECHA COOMIY		į	:	10.724.00	!	#1901#	2442.46	11.61	
≝ i	CHICOTTES CONTA	17860	10			200	24852			
ž i	CALIBRICAL COUNTY	3.11	101	#23,020.00	27.7					
ے آھ	CHICAGO COUNTY	2595	101	27.7						
ᆈ	CALEMELL COURTY	2598	1674	20.00	1118	\$1,938,10	100		4.33	
	COLDSTALCOUNTY		!		E 519			OCTOR.	2100 ex	
ř	CAMPCOUNTY	4500030	2	\$114,5-0.ID	2.2808.EB	520,237.38	2176864E	SIAAO	2224.55	
i	Consciona		1		1		1000		2	
۲ j	CHESTERANT	O-MODES.	3 :			i i		4 1	2 2	
5)	OSS COUNTY	COMME	2 2		6000	27 40 40 A		9 F		
£ 2	Accepto the selection	CONOCCO	1	100 more and a		200000	20 CM		2 T	
<u>خ</u> ک	OFFICE PARTY AND A STATE OF THE PARTY AND A ST	CHARGOOD	1453	2000	E + 6 [34]	54664	7 60	E. 5 12		
. 2	AMANO SAFO	490096	1459	100 CO	11.024.50	ERST217	11111	867.75	5100	
, <u>2</u>	COS COMMA	20000	1451	455 CAB DO	E 143	243645	44.2 62	25025	07/257	
<u>ا</u>	CASS COLUMN	Description	. §	\$83,000,00		\$10,699.75	R	22.03	5	
	CHESC DOLUMEN	dennes.	Į.	\$16.60p.co	ES PROF	25.891.03	# 55	181.08	7	
: }:	Me couldn't	ucaona a	ž	57804000	50.100	177333	7	G		
5 2	Ches not below	CONCOR	136	TABAGO DA	T. CK	1	7.00	14.51		
5 }	Child for the state	49004	į	000,00	9	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Ì		1 \$	
5 2	ALCO CALLED			STORY STA						
5 }	Secondaria	Table 1	9 7		20.000				•	
4	Assessment	asource	7170	- Society	90,5004	BT KOMOTO	A COUNTY IN			
ř	Calca Calcania	7	•	1000		2000			•	
5 ;	THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH	1,000	4 1	CHOCK SEA	2010017			7. 0.0	2000	
ا.	CHARGOS COMPANY	- 17-17			EN STATES	97.18	1	1344	•	
ž	C. Mar Charles	90.65	10.00	C3605.00	20.00	200 2	i i	7		
5 }	Total Control	¥ 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		00-70WPC	10000		2016		100 F	
5 7	A TO SHOULD BE	2000	1					****	2077	
<u> </u>	CAUTI CAURITY	Organ	4 7	2000	75764	47 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	10000 C	•		
≤	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE	2000	2	200700	42.078.34	77.00	20000	A STATE OF	Charle and	
<u> </u>	DALLAM COUNTY	21 1,000 0000 2,800	Ë	\$4,730.00	\$174	3866.53	10.27			
<u> </u>	DATE AND DECIDENCE	Design Control of the	1							
			177	165,175,00	\$24D60	100000			H 82	

1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,0					E		POST VET				
Decision of the control of the con	å		Parcel los Offer	Chim fig.	Appending	2003 Total San	Assessment	2008 A4 Tex		Adj. Spell Tree Owner.	Cotrascela
March Control Contro	l x	DALLIAM COUNTY	84 2003 0000 8000	171	00 100 923	149.33	15,040,54	\$18.62	1654	10201	
Committee Country Committee Country Committee Country Committee Country Committee Country Coun	×	CALLAN COUNTY	21.30003 6000 2800	1712	44,138,00		#8# TR	51,72	7,12	ន្ទ	25
Collision Coll	×	SALLAM COUNTY	45 20003-8000 1000	77.	200 SOUTH	界 量 才	\$12,250.78	2000 P	また	27.7g	
COMESTIONING TOTAL STANDARD CONTRINGUES TO COMESTIONING TO COMESTIONING TOTAL STANDARD CONTRINGUES TO COMESTIONING TO COMES	×	DALLING COURT	83 10003 4000 5300	11.	8	7 E	27.00	171	ã	8	
	×	CHELLAN COUNTY	84 10009 4000 5000	17.7	200 200 200	1274		\$1.15 11.15	7	51.62	
Contribution Cont	×	CALLAN COUNTY	42 1000 \$ 4000 \$400	5713	657.908.00	11.000	22,386,75	15429	154.18	\$100.15	
CONTICONINT CONTINE		DALEAM DOUBLE				12 C29 E8		# 155 FE	90'62'13	184778E	
CONDITIONAL TO STANDING 773 MILESTAND 1882-200 MILESTAND 1882-20	×	DOME EVED LAFF	20030167	47	1,480.00	1380.0	#1,648.41	\$7.0E	6563	13561	8
Description 17.0 87.0000 17.0 17.000	×	54CV 6400	ST TROOT	17.1	2000	35 72 72	50 Std 613	25.2	1115	4130.40	
COME/FORUMY 20081177 17.19 \$6.280.00 \$	×	DOMLEY COUNTY	20021189	471	24 886.00	\$124.53	11,122,48	330.27	61 at	\$22 08	
Content County Content	,	DOMEST COUNTY	20086170	477	25,220,00	14.2800	112.451.74	129621	180.16	\$22.5.96	
Section	-	DOMESTICA HATY	20081123	912	223 026 00	30 000	20 AND 12	200	*88*	55.54	
REACTORNICY 150 \$66,000 \$27,194.1 \$15,794.0 \$15,		Com Depth Lifty	-10+6H1T3	į	450 450	11.00	405 474 Q4			1	
December 10 1985		Anna Sound and	21436472	77,77	DOWNER TOWN	1 2 1 2 1 2	382,148,00	2012/2014	STATE OF	10000	
ENGINEERING STATE		WALET WORK		ļ	1	2	***		100		
ENGINEERING DIME	к:	EL PRODUCTURAL		8	DO: 000 815		100				i Nacovius
EMECONAMY DINK	إير	EL #MSG COUNTY		8	133.148.00	# (2) X	12,149,57	360 30	2002	\$100.11?	
		EL PASOCOUNTY				2 2 2 E		\$17.00 10.00	A TOTAL	H 1	
Dies Chart Die	×	ELABS COMPANY		164	148 250 DO	1715.11	2007	87.78	\$47.05	\$29.00	OSI SIND
Color (Sept Control	,,	ELAIS COMMITY	GNESS TRANSPORTED COTT	1542	1,986.0	1000E	20.00		15.23	14.14	
TOTAL ESSAN CONTITY THE PROPERTY		ELLIS COUNTY				61 M		120.90	34848	47.03	
CHAST STATE S	,	FORT REND CONFIT			\$1,216,650,00	\$2 BM MB	A. Sept. 7.45	阿尼斯		7	
The color The		The Control of the Control	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	ž	20.00			-	200	1	
Free Born Court Process 2000 Free Process 20	. ,		COURSE OF THE STATE OF THE				1000	1	4441	3 (
Foreign county State Control C	٠,	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	State of the state	į	1					31	
Color Colo	4 :	TURB BOND COUNTY	Top-back-company	ŝ			27.0		200	OTTAK	
Forestable Country Sepand 2-80-00-00-90 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 15-12-14 15-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 15-12-14 15-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 17-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-2-0.0 12-14-14 12-12-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2	*	Road Stoke county	9999403-247-0090-612	2	2000	2	2000	#13.88		870	
CHANG SEAD COUNTY STATES S	×	ROFE BENED COUNTY	2004000 200 200 200	8	00000	251	\$100.45	15,77	3	8	
Control of the cont	×	FORM BEING COUNTY	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	Š	22222	100 JUNE	20.25	19,E.2	\$1.379.68	K	THE STATE OF THE S
CONTRACT SECURITY	.	Rowal Select Country	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	1300	\$20,856,00	\$134.05	CT WELL	47.46	421	20,04	STAFFERS MALK, SD
CONTRACTOR WESTERS 1771 SPACEAGE COUNTY SECTION	ŀ	FORT BEND COUNTY				130,738,96		九位江	12,000.M	10.01	
Compact Content	×	SONZALES COUNTY	**************************************	G	8 40,00	\$235.46	11.094.70	47.77	115.57	100 M	
CONTINUE COUNTY WENDERS 1717 STDA-AMORD STSSA-LIL STDS-SCORE STASSA-LIL STDA-SCORE STOCK STDA-SCORE STOCK STDA-SCORE STDA-SCOR	×	STATES COUNTY	V-80882	7	MT.428.00	\$1.17LB1	26.121.36	2126.60	47.2	20.00	
CONTONING WESTERS 17.7 MILL COUNTY STATE STATE STATES COUNTY STATES COUNTY STATE STATES		CONTRACTO COUNCILY	ARTIGRES	-	\$120,400,000	12 344 03	SERVICES	25.50	4	6.00	
PAGE COUNTY 252299	- >4	SOUCH ES COUNTY	3880980	17.	00000	35 MC3	27.12	10 10	4.4	24.43	
MALL COMPITY 2522591 17705 5526240 752234 752244 752		SOUTH PLONING				20.00		# 148 4	200	10000	
HALL COMPITY	,	THE LOSS OF THE PARTY.	TO STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	į	200		** 101.0	1000		100	
MALL COMPIT 202289 1709 2062484 202244 202244 202249 202244 202249	.,		100000	5				20.00			
MALL COMMITY Marker Flaux, step. 1703 5585-6400 518002.35 518002.35 51800.75 51800.	ж 1		10000		A 44 40 13	1707	1			2	
MALLOCALITY	ا پ	HARL COURTY	26228	138	2 4 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5	2	18095.35	200	F 12	#3#2.B1	
NAMES COUNTY NY PRICE PRIA, FEE, 1953 559-600.00 5400-20		HALL COURTY				200		#C578	户 司	\$343.05	
Number Counter	15	HAMMES OCCUMENT	WITH MARKE, Filmer, arts.		23,454,00	자	\$1,000 to	£ 55	20.75	\$0.28	の世代
MARINE COUNTY WIP MARE, Files, res. 1754 \$1,044.00	전	HUNTES COUNTY	Q17-08(00784	25	280.280.00	27.00	\$4.22.54 \$4.25.54	368.42	百	30.47	A CLA ISO
H-SRES COUNTY Wildling Resign Their The Table 1 12000 State 1	낻	MARIES COUNTY	阿斯斯 Par. 在	7		1961 PS	\$3,406.46	84.19	#3.64	10.54	C80804-80
HAMBS COUNTY	ద	HARING COUNTY		1969	CENT 590.00	85 EVO 78	\$124317	267.64	10.2	15 98	
HAMBS CRUMTY C99-C076-4 TT. \$74,900.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,770.00 \$14,000.00 \$4,000.00	25	MARRIES COUNTY		5	DOLLO CONTROL	25 No. 12	43.484.59		ğ	Ş	CONTRACTOR STANSON
House county	. 2			į	174.969.00	A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	SE DON BE			7, 0	TOTAL OF THE PARTY
	5 2	Clair Control	- Carolina	1 3			200	3			
	5 ;		0.00		CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE	Z T		200	5	2	
House county	*	PARTITION OF THE PARTIT	Spirit Branch (S)	g	1 104 130 10	2 KI KI	212102033	52 OM 13	1,983.14	66,118	
Homes county	25	HARRIES COUNTY	Spring Branch JED	2	23.790.00	CUTEDOS	27.25	1515	7 T	80.24	
HAMES COUNTY	×	HANNES CECINIS	Moustain St.	4	13,172,010.00	は、田田田	\$217,680.45	\$2,978.15	25.74.52 27.74.53	92854	DSI HOUSTON
Hydrat COUNTY	쿈	HANNES CYCINITY	20384249	20	43,202,010,000	E4.77.09	#CONTENTS	\$2,851.25		\$24.97	STOCKE
HARRIS COUNTY 2 deported 2 2523 9 44617 10,000 9 4 200.54 552,56.04 552,016.04 552,016.04 552,016.04 552,016.04 552,016.04 552,017 542,01 </td <td>×</td> <td>HARBS COUNTY</td> <td>20800178</td> <td>g</td> <td>FL 664 190:00</td> <td>127,855.61</td> <td>111199.73</td> <td>\$1,445.18</td> <td>10 CL3 20</td> <td>512.71</td> <td></td>	×	HARBS COUNTY	20800178	g	FL 664 190:00	127,855.61	111199.73	\$1,445.18	10 CL3 20	512.71	
HAMPING COUNTY	Ħ	HARBIS COUNTY	20900084	2222	1461710.00	\$4,000.54	\$32,546.05	\$250.00	STALES	24.53	
HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 7255 1-7/50-30 538.39 53,186.48 \$2.55 \$2.55 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$4.41 \$40.37 \$12.33 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$40.37 \$12.34 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$10.31 \$10.44 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$10.31 \$10.44 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$10.31 \$10.44 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$10.31 \$10.40 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$10.31 \$10.40 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$21,150.00 \$11.41 \$10.31 \$10.40 HARRIS COUNTY 2-400/0764-1280-18 2.253 \$11,150.00 \$1	Ħ	HARMS COUNTY	2-0000384-00047		00'081'94'5	879	53,121,75	4	\$4.21	300	
HAVES CONFIT 24600784-19834 2783 89,820,000 \$4.61 \$641.97 \$0.22 \$9.820 HAVES CONFIT 24900784-19834 2783 821,50,00 80.04 \$1.04 \$0.07 \$1.00 HAVES CONFIT 34900784-19839 2783 821,25,00 \$1.54 \$2.04 \$1.04 \$1.04 HAVES CONFIT 34900784-19839 2783 \$21,50,00 \$1.54 \$2.04 \$1.04 \$1.04 \$1.04 HAVES CONFIT 34900784-19839 2783 \$21,50,00 \$1.54 \$2.04 \$1.04 \$1.04 HAVES CONFIT 34900784-19839 2783 \$21,50,00 \$1.54 \$2.04 \$1.04 \$1.04 HAVES CONFIT 34900784-19839 2783 \$2.04 \$2.04 \$2.04 \$2.04 \$2.04	2	HARBES CONDITY	2-COOMS4-C284-B		147,450.00	S	\$5.186.48	85	¥.	2010	
HAMME COUNTY 24400074-05636 2253 \$21,50,00 \$10.68 \$1,41.44 \$13.5 \$10.5 \$	i	HARMS COURTY	7-000/05/4-C0004	2	20 0000	J	454.67	6	2	2000	
Husting Columny 2-6-cordinate Columny 2-6-co	íĦ	Navigoria Commonly	2-4-00084-09836	Į,	121,150,00	840.58	\$1.401.43	ğ	E G	Ş	
HARDE COUNTY 24000744-05942 2243 \$15,100,00 \$11,00 \$11,00 \$11,00 \$12,00 \$10,00		HAMMED COUNTY	1460084-08639	1	531,230,00	215.00	\$2.00 LOS	101	\$103	3 3	
According Section 1 The Control of t	iż	HARDE COMMY	3.400/084.1/064.2	1	115180-00	•	10.00	į	1 5	5	
		MARKES COMMUN	A PROUP POLITICANE	į	140.44		41 282 25	490		2 5	

Ome ja Ligaidading Trust 18th Contine Objective - Reporting

STOOMS	į			į		,	\$MEGCZ				
The color of the	1	University of the Control of the Con		d III	ŀ	Manager Const	Assessor	ZUB AN Tex	Promonto to Cycle	AL Retine	Commence
Company		HARDE AND THE			00000	2	\$5,404,89	91.13	913		
10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,	-	MARCH COLUMN	A CANADA PRESIDENT		00'00'00		द्राधास	7	32.55		
STATE STAT			CARAGO	R	2280,000,00	# 155 F	京記の質	222	1234.20		
COUNTY C	- 1	roderts Colone	WIP JALE, 4Der, 4tt.	1969	\$18,840,00	1231.33	K, 121.73	10.01	82.628		TOKER ALL ISIN
Commonweight 1700 150,000 15		PARTIES COLUMNY				\$165,510.BS		KANDLINE SALIGRANIA	310 638.48	•	‡ }
1900/05/14 1908 1904/05/16 1904/05 1			\$19901\$	1708	\$156,540.CE	12230.02	\$12.781.45	\$18249	07:49TB	\$15 Q	95
17,000		TOWNS TO A COUNTY	52500014	5	12M 118/00	H08.01	S17 49 C45	257.25	546.83	27175	
1000000000000000000000000000000000000			22822013	1708	#200 BEE DOC	188	\$16,405.85	# P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P	\$22	27.72	
100980	- 6	HAMOLES COURSEY	\$2508025	1708	\$125,006,00	1285.85	\$110000	114.13	\$19.65	5	
1,10,000 1,10,000	-	MULTIPLE COLUMNY				足が無な		2000	Chaich	469.00	
1008020 1977 1944020 154003 1971-24 19120200 19120200 1912020 1912020 1912020 1912020 1912020 1912020 1912020 1912020 191202		HAPS COURTY	P102894	2024	\$44,900.00	STOTE	640,77054	C# 500C#	200	N E	
100,000 100,		H475 COLMIT	P102897	17.00	000000	\$1,450,38	\$38.218 W	ţ	0000	100 Per 100 Pe	
1102880 1102881 1102891 1102		HATS COUNTY	H03803	2837	\$4,550,00	2	17.70.43	443			
1102800 1012800 1012800 1512800 1512800 15128		HASTS COUNTY	FE02194	2678	10.595.FE	5	AN OCCUPA				
1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,		HAS COUNTY	1102000	950	200	1				\$15 216	
1,15,15 and reference		NASS COMPATE	Capacia.	79,00	200	2 2		* ;		*	
1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,		-ues country				1 m	CC96777864		Ros	27.75	
Table Tabl		EREDINANCE AND A TOTAL OF THE PERSON AND A T	The second second	***	444 400 000		100			2	
1,000,000,000 1,000,000		ENFRANCE CINEMIA	1	į	ACT DON'T		27,714	*	47.0	\$2.00.00 \$1.00.00	
Control		EHERSON ORINA	40.00 00.00	5 3	Dines in			# Y	1002	14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.1	
Trigger Control Trigger Co		SECURITY COLUMN	ACCOUNT OF COMM	1	* 104,020,02		\$18,000.08		3	29.28	
Marche March Mar		Appropriate description	normal and an	E :	00000 C	SG7.13	\$E44630	1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	18773	1200E	
Marchanol		CITATION INC. INC.	TOTAL COMO.		\$74.540.00	\$2,000 th	113,543,54	12021	2042.00	27 OPE	
Marchelle 1500 1514-00 184.15 1515-01 1514-00 184.15 1515-01 1515-01 1514-00 1514-00 1515-01 1515-01 1514-00 1514-00 1515-01			;			2.03		4824.59		587.23	
Manualment D		CHARLESON COUNTY	Perform ISO	93	200001	44.75	61,674,37	20.00	33.00	Ž,	
Manualmen City 1330 15/24/20 181/24 15/24/20		CONTROL COUNTY		R	111 44500	\$200 38	100 July 100	EXPE.SM	#35#	416.40	
Minimater Ed. 1330			Sandilla City	2	1241810	87.79	11,280.52	1. C.	\$1.15	25	
Marinanic District 1370				8	21,22,000	20.57	E-100	\$20.51	31.30	お日	
Marinet City 1370 1420404 154.0				6	130.40	# 12 C	22,305,23	\$215.30	野子	\$100.13	
Mariesta		Commence County	Program City	ŝ	43,430.00	T 200	SE. TOW.25	10'pTS	51.72		
75.1544, 17.00 \$17.00		MANAGEMENT	Calenda	8	\$6,900.00	200	14 00 H	*15.95	2		
March Marc		CONTROL COUNTY				\$7.46.86		100 mg	200		
March Marc		Company COURTY	75154J	*	136 480.00	\$128.92	STANS S	2000	CRPU	i	-
T. 10799		CARTILLES COUNTY	138911	2746	00186544	4	\$3.674.46	282.63	50 E25		
T130010		CHEMIC COUNTY		200	\$32,700.00	ST 75.25	\$2.400.78	200	3		7
138001 1340 3124901		CLERATOR COLLEGY	27007	e e	124,780.00	\$546.80	\$1,712.00	12.00	2	8	
March		WIRMON COUNTY	113801	1745	37,340,00	0618833	\$1.80m 45	į	5	1000	
\$100.00 \$100		CUPATION COUNTY				7230EE		200.00	40.4	OCTA-	
March Marc		ESA COMPLY	McG:D	ş	\$41930 BD	- \$712.B1	C14 659 44	20 100			!
For the color For the colo		EQUI COBANTY	41.00 M	5	\$10.671 mm					198.86	NOMBANISTE ISD
		EDN CODINTY	000000	928	** 64.00						ACMINISTRATION
FF1139		SON CONTITY		-	A PARTIE A	12.52	TQ-CC	20 T	30		CON OF HORSES
POLICE P		Authorite Chilany	4	į	1	200		4444 75	90'R	200000	
1000 1000		ADMINISTRATION SERV		1	0001888	*	100 mg	3	1972	\$41.33	
		A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	Law Alle		2000	85	121206	1246.27	TIS.P.	\$228.33	
Triangle		(California Odmense				25.783		200	25.53	9976973	
MOTIVATION 1995 111,000 (D) 4500,00 117,000 (D) 471,139 174,130 MOTIVATION 1995 145,000 (D) 417,00 (D) 410,00 (D)		TOTAL COUNTY	14.150000	7	177	#34EB3	200	14.00°	\$13.46	25417	
1962,28420 1955 194500,00 1125,40 11		ALLEGAMEN CAUSE I	300138120	26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 2	80.08	\$20 M 20	00,650	25.25	514 PM		
2001,200.00 1990		ACLENNAM COOKIN		9	\$6.500 Bt	#17548	11,803.14	\$48.46	8	SARE	
MACLARIES 1900 11,2810.00 12,7245 12,72461 1900 11,2810.00 12,7245 12,72461 1900 12,7245 12,72461 12,7246 12,72461		ACLEMENT COUNTY	Sectorate	1	\$7,470.00	M3513	20 martin	54834	24.5		
445C136HO 1909 RG,460.00 1,1253.89 \$146,696.59 \$346.51 \$88.45 \$18.45 \$1.253.89 \$1.253.		ACLIDICAMI COUNTY	340136130	28	112,310.00	27.28.66	13 300 17	5904e	5000	1007	
Section 1993 E1740.00 E6027 F4,961.09 E1742. E2120		CIENTAL COMPT	44C138HB0	89	160,690.00	\$1,263.58	\$46,69\$50	534891	488	2000	
DOCUMENTO 1997 POSTANCIO		COLEMNACOCONICY	480198D0	1930	11,530.00	14108E	54.951.09	213817	#31#b		
DECLINATION 1940 263,000.00 1417-129 21,724.04 245,41 148,41		CHRISTIAN	011361206	1980	28.20.00	00T00798	\$7.803.4B	1111	4344		
1502.35040 1590 25,850.00 12,82.00 12,500.16 157.01 177.01		CLBenkecoantr	5000,38000	1940	\$8,300.00	64.72.13	20.05	200	7.	Ģ	
1982 12,340,00 12,35 14,40,00 12,35 14,461,5 17,14 14,10 14,		ICLBMARCOSTT.	16239040	1983	25,850,00	0236.13	AL DESCRIPTION	197.53	\$7.40		
1902.3900 1993 \$7.500.00 \$100.00 \$2.001.85 \$209.44 \$5.00 \$201.3800 \$100.00 \$10		CORPORATE COCOUNT	190,38050	1983	12,000,00	203	\$84£48	村民	96		
20128990 1993 116,200.00 19950, 84,601.00 19950		CALEBRAIN COCUMY	182138080	1993	\$7,580,00	\$200.00	22,097,555	17624	10.2	100	
1912 1910 1910 1910 1910 1910 1910 1910		CCLERNAM COURTY	200138090	1983	F16,230.00	4505.m.	X-48L4X	100,30	\$19.65	178.4	
		ICLBRUM COUNTY	20233000	1941	360,00	23,53	\$379.02	S	1111	24 F2	

Omorgo Liquidating Russ Jöhn Ommilias Objectos - Remishing

## 1396 1996		MATERIAL PARTIES PARTIES	Catagogody
Maria Mari			
Mary			
Mark			
MAT		1	
Main		1	
The color of the			
Third	•	•	
Marcoloby, 100177 1733 1227,580.00 12346.21 12346.21 12346.20 1			
March Marc	-	3.0	
MATCH 13300000,10084 1733 \$1005,900.00 \$1,796.16	_		
Main			
March Marc	Ħ		
### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ##	1 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C		
MATCHORS 1777 1122996LOO 51,201.5.00			
DOCUMENT 1331 54490.00 54105.00	200.33		
December 1331	The section of the se	STATE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN	ริ
Marca Marc			
Figure 10002510 1284 111,000.00 111,000.00			
Mail			
MOTIONSHIT 1436	\$47.4T \$18.21		
Mail		50 \$242.67	
Mail	\$71.68		CHARLES CANADOM
FOLLOWER			
The control of the	•		Control of the Contro
Machinorary			BLOCKING GROOTE ISO
Management Man			
Machanomes			
CONTINUED CONTINUED CONTINUED CONTINUED			
TOTALOGES 1333 \$42, FRO.00 \$5053.50	-7	•	
MODIODORIS 1438 \$22,570.00 \$544.00 \$			
March Marc	1042,40	•	OSI OSSICIONE
DORSOLO DORS		34 18123	CORSIGNAL ISD
808940 202 5124,570,00 9804,44	\$58.48 \$12.16		
Separation Sep		•	
Second S		00 ST7.24	
100 100			
Security			
## 18942 272 \$52,000 00 \$171,31. ## 18944 272 \$52,000 00 \$129,39. ## 18944 272 \$52,000 00 \$29,39. ## 18944 272 \$12,000 \$129,39. ## 18944 272 \$12,000 \$129,39. ## 18944 272 \$12,000 \$129,39. ## 18944 272 \$12,000 \$129,39. ## 18944 272 \$12,000 \$129,39. ## 18944 272 \$12,000 \$12,000 ## 18944 272 \$17,000 \$12,000 ## 18942 272 \$17,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$12,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$1,000 \$1,000 \$1,000 ## 18942 272 \$1,000 \$1		•	
March 202 \$5,300,00 \$29,00 \$2	\$22.73		
100 100			
Bitshops 200 \$22,400,00 \$355,77 Bitshops 202 \$55,800,00 \$355,77 Bitshops 202 \$55,800,00 \$45,82 Bitshops 202 \$55,800,00 \$45,82 Bitshops 202 \$45,000,00 \$45,82 Chie of Stanford 202 \$43,000,00 \$45,82 Chie of Stanford 202 \$43,000,00 \$45,82 Bitshops 202 202 \$45,000,00 \$45,82 Bitshops 202 202 \$46,000 \$45,82 Bitshops 202 202 202 202 Bitshops 202 202 202 202 Bitshops 202 202 2	_		
Budget 202 Str. Str. Or. Bell 12			
Separation Sep	12000	50°CCF 00	
0009-44 200 42,440,00 44,720			
1702 2000-40 2002 245,000,00 245,000 245,000,			
Color of Sharthood 1702 \$702,000 \$2,050,000 \$2,			
1/102 500.000 42,000.000			
Chy of Sharthard 1705 56,186,100 186,531 Sharthard 1705 56,186,100 186,532 Sharthard 1705 56,186,100 186,533 Sharthard 1705 56,186,100 51,111.69 Need Phales Weiger 1705 562,340,100 51,111.69 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 52,587,102 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 52,587,102 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 518,077,200 67,218,49 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 1745 111,276,056 1745 174		20 TeS	
Seeding 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			
Section Sect	27 28	15.37	95
	11,064,72 6655.0		1
1112905 1745 516113 1112905 1745 518,077.00 52,017 1112905 1745 518,077.00 52,017 1112905 1745 518,094.00 52,017 11129059 1745 512,096.00 64,218,09	\$118.00 F73.54	***	
1112946 1745 218,077.00 22,92.07 111240105 1745 218,077.00 52,937.02 11124072 1745 2185,044.00 52,937.02 1124,050 1745 212,484.00 64,218.49 1745 527,726.00 5482.18			
11325070 1740 335,077,00 525,077 1132,070 1725,077 1725,0		1000000	
1111.050(8) 1745 \$185,044.00 152,857.02 1111.050(8) 1745 \$185,044.00 45,218.40 1111.050(8) 1745 \$187,218.00 \$481.18			
1255 \$255, 481,00 \$4,218.40 \$ 1745 \$27,256.00 \$481,18	•	•	
1745 \$22,216.00 Supply		٠	
1122 598 U45 5398,044,00 509.01 3479 783 60			
\$7.588.57	77.75.75	C-100	
Chapter SQ 111,180,00 4754 to contact		¥.	

Omega Liquidading Trust 1939 Omelius Oljados - Reserving

Part	ğ	1888 Omnibus Objustice - Represing									
	ļ		1		2003		2003 A.B.				
Princip Control Princip Co			Parces identifier	d w	Participate Springer;	2003 Patri Ter	Acceptance.	MAL TOY COOK	Pagments to Date	Ad. No. Tax Open	į
Pubming colored Pubming co		DISCOUNT				\$288.96		E1 943	07.849	1, 1, 1	
Particle Colorer Day view EGO 575 574,000 575,	۲	MANAGEN COCKATY	10-01140000-0100-01091	150	\$27.27.0.E.	987.53	\$17.610.21				
WICHER COUNTY TANAMENTO GRAS \$15,450,40 \$10,400,40<		PENANTUM COUNTY				S 15.5		20 (47)		10 CO	
Parcial Column Parc	Ĕ	PROPER COMMON	Chly Year 150	8	STANSOOM	1000	40.00				
### PROPRIES COUNTY		WICHING COMMIT	COM PARKET	Ž.	ST ALD OF	200		AT COLUMN	514.31	e s	GETY MEWSCHOOL
PROCESSION OF THE STATE OF THE STA		MICHIGA CORPUS	And Sales	7 7					##	14.62	FONDS, PARTY, CLED
VICTOR COMPTY VICTOR C		VONDER CYTHER		<u>.</u>		27072	1787	4796T#	だが	#5.7±24	
		MENTON CONTRA	2 4	7	2010-1840	13,032.20		80.00C#	\$200.5	87/193	CARLOS MECATA CALLA
TOTAL COLUMNY Factor C		The state of the state of	area a	T.	101441600	\$8,04243	多五金		15 St. 25	81.022.08	STATE OF THE PARTY
	٠.	WELLEN, CLEMIT	Electra City	e de	\$5,412,00	#48 4 4	\$1,985.39	38.36	2	4.45	THE STATE OF THE S
					452.848.00	1845.57	\$40,192.85	\$163.00	1	30 1043	AND THE COMMENT
WIGHTON MANIES CHUNY TOLIS WIGHTON CHUNY WIGHT		STORES COURSE	Electra Fiscon.	ž	\$52,752.00	1121.11	\$10.174.33	3	1916	0 4 5	dia voca in
Mark Column		WICHER COMPUT	Wildella County	#25 20.5	\$687,690.00	£1,521,13	9122.010.00	15493	1427.84		ELAC. TOUR HEGITAL
WISE COLNET 72M-041 1500 915,230.00 \$50,234 \$17,53 \$71,54 \$75,54 WISE COLNET 72M-041 1500 \$15,000.00 \$20,246 \$13,20 \$14,19 \$14,14 \$15,20 WISE COLNET 72M-041 1500 \$15,000.00 \$20,246 \$14,14 \$14,14 \$15,20 WISE COLNET 55,840 173,13 \$15,000.00 \$10,240.00 \$15,240.00 \$12,240.00 \$1		THOUSEN COMMITS				\$18,143.21		18 1 ER 64	M 080 PG	1 20 1	STATE OF THE PARTY
MISE COUNTY 7241-48 1607 81240.00 82420 94.79 94.79 94.34 94.84 94			724.62	野	\$15,320.BO	\$52734	\$3,627,66	13.55	2	20 224	,
MESECULIMIT 1284,84 1501			720-63	1604	\$3180.00	420.10	27.00 A	3	2	No. of	8
Maccounty 1261.344 1504 1504 1505.000 1151.246 1151.			7214.89	190	\$1420 m	25.49	C 280 B	3			
WEST COUNTY SABER 1731 \$588 at 1321 \$582 at 1321 \$588 at 1321 \$582 at 1322 at 13		MO-COMPA	1017L	16G	\$50,280.00	\$812.60	\$14,905.88	8782.48	4	000000	
State Couling State Stat				Ë	#38#30-B0	11993	# H H 43	SC 285	913.12	-075	
### COUNTY		West County		1731	\$5,870.80	\$155.14	(S 000 13)	12.00X	10.00		
State County		SC COUNCY	0780	173	80 P20 875	47£07	20 CT	21.13	Z.		
MARIE COUNTY SAG3 1731 S44,377.00 S756,33 S470,46 S756,34 S770,46 S7		ESCOUNT		1731	\$3,160,00	35.83	\$7.48.2	×	2		
		MORE COUNTY	7	1736	自己です	1236.23	150,760,29	***			
WINDERCOLURY S644 1731 \$54280.00 \$256.00 \$41.500.80 \$465.87 \$415.85		INSERSORIT	Eleji	1611	90003114	15 M		3 5		70'00'4	
WASE COLUMNY MODITOLIZES \$00,000-07/13/83 \$1,200.00 \$4,		MISE COULTY	5644	121	\$50,280,00	1251.62	M1.405.88			7 1	
VACOD COUNTY VACING 1158 1730 18280.00 1730 17						\$2,856,00		CS 19294		1000	
WOOD COURTY NATIONALISE PROCESSORY (FILED TAND) \$12,500.00 \$72,500.50 \$2,500.50		ALLEGO COOL	N20101125 9900020-0711363	17.30	\$4240.00	100	2,500.5	40.0			
WOOD COUNTY NATURATION STREAM 17.00 \$12,960.00 \$12,20.66 \$2,117.36 \$20.55 \$21.17 WOOD COUNTY NATION SECURITY NATION SECURITY \$20,00.00 \$1,00.00 \$1,00.00 \$1,00.00 \$20,00.00		WOOD COURTY	NOTICE SECTION OF THE PERSON O	1730	\$12,909.00	17254	25 781 55	10 113	9 3	7074	
WOOD COUNTY VACUATION AND COUNTINGS 17.30 94,020.00 \$1,22.64 \$666.06 \$10.04 \$10.		WOODCOURTY	N20102187 9900040-071380	17.00	\$12,960,80	\$125.0%	25 117 M	3			
WOOD COUNTY MATGRISO PROCESSOR 17:36 SCOLAROLO STATISTICS ST		Wood couldy	N201001188 9900610-0711851	3 7	36,120.00	\$122.84	20.00	3	To Ba		
WOOD COUNTY WARFOLD STATE 1734 172,70.00 \$14,192.0 \$14,196.59 \$14,166 \$17,20.5		MODE COMMY	#20101189 #9000BC0-0111988	3 0.7	160,440,80	TO WELL	19,044,76	59.83	53241		
WORD COURTY NATION (SEE PRODUCT) (VALUE) 1/39* \$46,000 \$40,000 \$46,000		WOOD CLASS	MATOSTAD #900#101184	2	\$72,730.00	\$1,479.13	#11. BRO.59	371.66	1 2		
### ### ### ### #### #################	1	WOOD COMEY	M204091291 0000250-0711.063	8	#54.750.00	\$30806	12 173 21	\$40.52	\$1894		
UNIVERSITY 1400 587 116,120 81,064.12 13,271.78 5215.94 90.00	_	Troop County	4 1			C1480/14		8424	117618	67 296	
1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1	_	THE PROPERTY.		100	316,123.00	F1001	53,273,78	121594	COTES	20,55	
	-	- Linkset Consulty		200	20 M 2 M 2	1	11.30.24	### 28	2018	86.28	

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:)	Chapter 11
)	
CABLE & WIRELESS USA, INC., et al.,)	Case No. 03-13711 (RB)
)	Substantively Consolidated
Debtors.)	·
)	Re: Docket Nos. 2150 and 2151

FINAL ORDER WITH RESPECT TO OPPOSITIONS TO THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH OMNIBUS OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN 2003 PROPERTY TAX CLAIMS

For the reasons set forth in the Court's Memorandum Opinion of this date, the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Omnibus Objections to Certain 2003 Property Tax Claims [Docket Nos. 2150 and 2151] are DENIED and each proof of claim filed by the taxing authorities will be allowed as filed.

DATED this 24th day of June, 2005.

BY THE COURT

HOM. JOHN L. PETERSON United States Bankruptcy Judge