

1 Patrick J. Kane
2 440 Stevens Ave., Suite 200
3 Solana Beach, California 92075
4
5
6
7

8 **BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD**

9 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10)	Case No.: 25SA0071
11	In the Matter of:)	
12	FITNESS FOR LICENSURE)	PROPOSED DECISION RE: PATRICK
13	PATRICK VALENZUELA)	VALENZUELA'S FITNESS FOR
14	Previous CHRB License No. 264397)	LICENSURE
	Appellant)	Hearing Date: June 3, 2025
)	Time: 9:30 a.m.

15 **I. INTRODUCTION**

16 This matter came for hearing on June 3, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., via video conference. Michelle
17 Derieg recorded all testimony presented during the proceeding. Pursuant to California Horse
18 Racing Board Rule 1414, Hearing Officer Patrick J. Kane ("Officer") presided over the Appeal.
19 Appellant Patrick Valenzuela ("Appellant") was present and represented himself. The California
20 Horse Racing Board ("CHRB") was present and represented by Jacquelyn Loyd, Esq.

21 This matter's record closed at the conclusion of the proceedings June 3, 2025, at
22 approximately 10:50 a.m.

23 **II. EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE**

24 **A. Exhibits the CHRB Entered into Evidence.**

25 The CHRB entered the following exhibits into evidence:

26 Exhibit "1" APPLICATION FOR LICENSURE BY PATRICK VALENZUELA
27 MAY 2, 2025;

28 Exhibit "2" NOTICE OF REFUSAL OF LICENSE FOR PATRICK VALENZUELA

1 MAY 2, 2025;

2 Exhibit “3” INVESTIGATIVE REPORT OF C.H.R.B. INVESTIGATOR
3 OCTAVIO VERGARA RE: NEW APPLICATION AND
4 CRIMINAL HISTORY OF PATRICK VALENZUELA, MAY 3,
5 2025;

6 Exhibit “4” STIPULATED AGREEMENT BETWEEN EXERCISE RIDER’S
7 LICENSE APPLICANT PATRICK ANGEL VALENZUELA
8 AND THE CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD, AUGUST
9 15, 2015;

10 Exhibit “5” DECISION AND PROPOSED DECISION RE: PATRICK
11 VALENZUELA’S FITNESS FOR LICENSURE, JULY 18, 2016;

12 Exhibit “6” DECISION AND PROPOSED DECISION RE: PATRICK
13 VALENZUELA’S FITNESS FOR LICENSURE, FEBRUARY
14 21, 2019; AND

15 Exhibit “7” NOTICE OF HEARING, DATED MAY 28, 2025.

16 **III. LIST OF TESTIFYING WITNESSES**

17 **A. Witnesses Testifying on Behalf of the CHRB.**

18 The CHRB called the following the witnesses:

- 19 • Patrick Valenzuela; and
20 • Octavio Vergara.

21 **B. Witnesses Testifying on behalf of Appellant.**

22 Appellant called the following witnesses:

- 23 • Darin Scharer.

24 **IV. FINDINGS OF FACT**

25 After admitting all exhibits and testimony into evidence, this Officer makes the following
26 findings of fact:

27 **A. Appellant’s 2016 Application for Licensure.**

28 **I.**

1 On March 18, 2016, Appellant presented an Application for License (the “2016
2 Application”) to the CHRB. (CHRB Ex. 5 at ¶ I.) The CHRB denied Appellant’s 2016
3 Application because Appellant: (1) committed acts of moral turpitude or acts that exposed others
4 to danger; (2) violated the rules of “Horse Racing Law”; and (3) failed to demonstrate
5 rehabilitation. (Id. at ¶ II.)

6 **II.**

7 Upon receiving notice that the CHRB denied his 2016 Application, Appellant timely
8 appealed the CHRB’s refusal of licensure. (CHRB Ex. 5 at ¶ II.) This Officer heard Appellant’s
9 appeal, Case No. SAC 16-0009, on April 27, 2016 (the “2016 Appeal”). (Id. at p. 1.)

10 **III.**

11 On June 13, 2016, this Officer issued a Proposed Decision denying Appellant’s 2016
12 Appeal (the “2016 Decision”). (CHRB Ex. 5.) Specifically, this Officer made the following
13 findings:

14 (1) Appellant failed to demonstrate an adequate record of rehabilitation in light of
15 Appellant’s substantial history of rule violations and criminal convictions; and (2)
16 Appellant’s six-month transgression free record failed to show the “rehabilitation”
necessary to permit Appellant to be licensed as a jockey in the State of California.
(Id. at p. 8-9.)

17 However, this Officer encouraged Appellant to reapply for licensure if he “continued to
18 maintain a clean record and attend meetings [that] assist[ed] with [his] substance abuse issues.”
19 (Id. at p. 8.)

20 **IV.**

21 On July 14, 2016, the CHRB adopted the 2016 Decision and provided the following
22 requirements Appellant must meet if he wished to reapply for a jockey license in the State of
23 California:

24 (1) Appellant Patrick Valenzuela may reapply for a Jockey License in one year
25 from the effective date of this Decision; (2) [s]hould Appellant Patrick Valenzuela
26 elect to reapply for a Jockey License one year from the effective date of this
27 Decision, Appellant Valenzuela is advised to present evidence of rehabilitation,
including, but not limited to, the results of alcohol and drugs testing performed on
28 a regular basis, not less than once a week, continuation of Appellant's work with
the Winner’s Foundation and the testimony of a representative of the Winner's
Foundation as to the extent of Appellant’s participation and involvement with the
Winner’s Foundation; and (3) [s]hould Appellant Valenzuela leave the State of

1 California during the one-year period from the effective date of this Decision,
2 Appellant Valenzuela is advised to present evidence of regular testing, not less than
3 once a week, for alcohol and drugs while outside of the State of California.
(CHRB Ex. 5.)

3 **B. Appellant’s 2018 Application for Licensure.**

4 **V.**

5 On October 2, 2018, Appellant gave the CHRB notice of his intention to reapply for a
6 Jockey’s License and requested a hearing on whether said license should be issued (“2018
7 Application”). On November 7, 2018, the CHRB set the 2018 Application for hearing on
8 November 28, 2018, at the Del Mar Thoroughbred Club (the “2018 Hearing”). (CHRB Ex. 6 at
9 X.)

10 **VI.**

11 On February 8, 2019, this Officer issued a Proposed Decision denying Appellant’s 2018
12 Application (the “2019 Decision”). (CHRB Ex. 6.) Relevant to this Appeal, the 2019 Decision
13 made the following findings:

14 Because Appellant failed to submit a license application, the CHRB could not deny
15 Appellant’s license application as a matter of law. Accordingly, this Appeal is
16 procedurally improper and must be denied. (See e.g. *Richards v. Department of*
17 *Alcoholic Beverage Control* (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 304, 309 [“We conclude that
[plaintiff’s] failure to apply for a transfer of the license or for an original license
was a failure to exhaust an administrative remedy and is a complete defense to this
action.”].)

18 ...

19 Here, the nature and severity of Appellant’s regulatory offenses as well as his
20 criminal past are unquestionably severe. Indeed, since this Officer’s 2016
21 Decision, Appellant was convicted concerning the Domestic Abuse Incident and
22 was separately arrested while possessing drug paraphernalia. These criminal acts
are in addition to Appellant’s fifteen separate rule violations and/or criminal
convictions as detailed in the 2016 Decision.

23 The fact Appellant pled guilty to a domestic abuse charge and was arrested while
24 possessing a used methamphetamine pipe in the last eighteen months evidences
25 Appellant’s total disregard for the law while simultaneously calling his character
into serious question. It must be noted that Appellant was supposed to focus on
rehabilitating his image and demonstrating an overall fitness for licensure
subsequent to the 2016 Decision. Unfortunately, Appellant wholly failed to do so.

26 ...

27 ///

28 ///

1 Nor has Appellant complied with the terms the CHRB set forth in the 2016
2 Decision. Indeed, Appellant presented no evidence: (1) that he participated in drug
3 and alcohol tests, much less submitting to such tests once a week; or (2) of his
4 continued participation with the Winner's Foundation. In fact, a Winner's
5 Foundation representative testified to having only sporadic communication with
6 Appellant since 2018 and that Appellant has not attempted to contact the
7 representative since his domestic abuse conviction.

8 Additionally, this Officer finds no evidence of rehabilitation. Instead, the record
9 demonstrates that Appellant: (1) is associating with individuals who are obvious
10 drug users, at the very least; (2) entered a plea deal concerning charges of spousal
11 abuse; and (3) infrequently sought treatment for drug and alcohol abuse despite this
12 Officer, the Winner's Foundation, and the CHRB instructing Appellant otherwise.

13 Because of Appellant's substantial history of rule violations and criminal
14 convictions, and because Appellant made the same rehabilitation claims during the
15 2016 Appeal only to subsequently pled guilty to spousal abuse charges, Appellant
16 cannot meet Section 1489.2's rehabilitation criteria as a matter of law.
17 (CHRB Ex. 6 at p. 7, lns. 9-14, p. 8, lns. 1-12, 16-23, p. 9, lns. 8-11.)

18 VII.

19 On February 21, 2019, the CHRB adopted the 2019 Decision. (CHRB Ex. 6.)

20 C. Appellant's Criminal Charges Since the 2019 Decision.

21 VIII.

22 On February 10, 2019, Appellant was arrested for spousal abuse, including violating a
23 restraining order stemming from a previous conviction for spousal abuse (the "Restraining
24 Order"). (Hearing Transcript ("H.T.") at p. 8, lns. 12-21.)

25 IX.

26 On April 25, 2020, Appellant was again arrested for violating the Restraining Order. (H.T.
27 at p. 9, lns. 1-8.) On May 14, 2020, and on July 24, 2020, Appellant was separately arrested for
28 violating the Restraining Order. (Id. at p. 9.) Appellant stated that: (1) he was living in his car
with his significant other during these arrests; and (2) his significant other was the individual the
Restraining Order concerned. (Id.)

X.

On April 17, 2022, Appellant was again arrested for violating the Restraining Order. (H.T.
at p. 15-16.) Importantly, Appellant testified he was no longer living with his ex-girlfriend at the
time of the April 2022 arrest. (Id. at p. 10.)

XI.

1 On May 24, 2024, Appellant violated the Restraining Order once again resulting in
2 Appellant serving a brief jail sentence. (H.T. at p. 17.) Upon being released, Appellant moved
3 into a sober living facility located in Pasadena, California. (Id.) However, Appellant apparently
4 failed to provide his probation officer his contact information for at least 6 months. (Id. at p. 17,
5 33.) Thus, Appellant violated his probation resulting in an arrest warrant being issued for
6 Appellant. (Id.)

7 **D. Appellant’s Rehabilitation Attempts.**

8 **XII.**

9 Upon being released from jail, Appellant testified he checked himself into a sober living
10 facility, which where he currently resides. (H.T. at p. 17, 25.) Appellant separately joined the
11 Winners’ Foundation. (Id. at p. 23.)

12 **XIII.**

13 Concerning his Winners Foundation attendance, it has been consistent for about five
14 months, as of June 3, 2025. (H.T. at p. 23-24.) Appellant is also subject to regular drug/alcohol
15 testing, with the last “relapse” occurring approximately seven and a half (7.5) months ago. (Id.
16 at p. 25.) Appellant states he intends to continue working: (1) with the Winners’ Foundation; and
17 (2) through “[his] 12 steps and the principles of the program to have a good life.” (Id. at p. 38.)

18 **E. Procedural History.**

19 **XIV.**

20 On May 2, 2025, Appellant applied for a Jockey’s License. (CHRB at Ex. 1.) Importantly,
21 Appellant declared the following on his application (the “Application”): (1) Appellant had been
22 convicted of a criminal offense; and (2) Appellant’s license to participate in racing had previously
23 been revoked or suspended for more than 5 days. (Id.)

24 **XV.**

25 On May 2, 2025, the CHRB denied the Application because Appellant had previously
26 been “convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment in the State or Federal prison, or have
27 been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude.” (CHRB Ex. 2.) The CHRB informed
28 Appellant of the necessary steps to appeal the decision denying the Application. (CHRB Ex. 3.)

1 Appellant informed the CHRB representative that he would provide further elaboration
2 concerning the “circumstances of his criminal history” no later than May 3, 2025. (Id.)

3 **XVI.**

4 On May 3, 2025, Appellant contacted the CHRB and provided a Department of Justice
5 printout containing the following criminal charges:

6 (1) May 29, 1986, Los Angeles, CA, 12025(A)-PC- Carrying concealed weapon in
7 vehicle, 12025(B)-Carrying concealed weapon on person-convicted-misdemeanor-
8 1 year probation, fine; (2) October 31, 1996, Arcadia, CA, 594(A)(2)-PC-
9 Vandalism-Damaged property-dismissed; (3) November 01, 1996, Arcadia, CA,
10 11550(A)- HS-Use/Under the influence of a controlled substance- 24 months
11 diversion; (4) April 29, 1997, Monrovia, CA, 11550 (A)-HS-Use/Under the
12 influence of a controlled substance, 24 months, diversion; (5) July 18, 1997,
13 Monrovia, CA, 594(A)(2)-PC-Vandalism-Damaged property-dismissed; (6)
14 October 17, 1997, Arcadia, CA, 273.5(A)-PC-Inflict corporal injury to a
15 spouse/cohab; (7) January 11, 1999, Monrovia, CA, 273.5(A)-PC-Inflict corporal
16 injury to a spouse/cohab-dismissed/FOJ/plea to other charges, 243(E)(1)-PC-
17 Battery spouse/ex/date/etc-dismissed/FOJ/plea to other charges, 236-PC-False
18 imprisonment-dismissed/FOJ/plea to other charges, 242-PC-Battery-convicted-
19 misdemeanor-3 years’ probation and 7 days in jail. Temple city, CA, Bench
20 Warrant- 242-PC-Battery; (8) February 26, 1999, Temple city, CA, 211-PC-
21 Robbery-dismissed; (9) April 9, 1999, Pasadena, CA, 211-PC-Robbery-dismissed;
22 (10) January 6, 2001, Temple City, CA, 273.5-PC- Inflict corporal injury to a
23 spouse/cohab. Prosecution has rejected the other charge. Probation violation in lieu
24 of filing. 236-PC-False imprisonment with violence etc. Prosecution has rejected
25 the other charge. Probation violation in lieu of filling; (11) December 20, 2007,
26 Rancho Cucamonga/San Bernardino, CA, 23152(A)-VC-DUI Alcohol and drugs-
27 dismissed, 23152(B)VC-DUI Alcohol/0.08 percent-convicted-misdemeanor. 36
28 months’ probation, 2 days in jail, fine, license Suspension; (12) March 2, 2013,
Pasadena, CA, 4463(A)(1)-VC-Forge/Alter vehicle registration etc.-Dismissed;
(13) March 10, 2014, Pasadena CA, 14601.2(A)-VC-Driving with license
suspended/DUI/etc. Dismissed. 4463(A)(1)-VC-Forge/Alter vehicle
registration/etc-dismissed, 12500(A)-VC-Driving without license-convicted-
misdemeanor, 1 year of probation, 3 days in jail, license suspended; (14) January
27, 2014, San Bernardino, CA, *Warrant* #PAS3PS006860-14601.2(A)-VC-
driving with suspended license/etc./DUI. *Warrant* PAS3PS006860-4463(A)(1)-
VC-Forge/Alter vehicle registration etc; (15) May 12, 2016, Claremont, CA,
Warrant ALH2AH0057001 14601.1(A)-VC-Driving while license
suspended/etc. arrested, detained, and cited; (16) October 04, 2018, San Diego, CA,
273.5(A)PC-Inflict corporal injury to spouse/cohab. Arrest relief granted per
851.93-PC; (17) February 10, 2019, San Diego, CA, 273.5(A)PC-Inflict corporal
injury to spouse/cohab. Arrested. 273.6(A)- PC-violation of restraining orders or
protective orders. 243(E)(1)-PC-Battery to spouse/ex/date/etc; (18) April 25, 2020,
San Diego, CA, 273.6(A)PC-violation of restraining orders or protective orders;
(19) May 14, 2020, San Diego, CA, 166(C)(1)-PC- Contempt of violence protective
order. Arrested relief granted per 851.93-PC; (20) July 24, 2020, San Diego, CA,
166(C)(1)-PC- Contempt of violence protective order. Arrested. (21) August 5,
2020, San Diego, CA, 273.6(A)PC- violation of restraining orders or protective
orders. Arrested relief granted per 851.93-PC; (22) August 10, 2022, San Diego,
CA, 166(C)(1)-PC- Contempt of violence protective order. Dismissed. 14601.2(A)-
VC- Driving with license suspended/DUI/etc. Arrested relief granted per 851.93-

1 PC; (23) December 8, 2022, San Diego, CA, 166(C)(1)-PC-Contempt of violence
2 protective order. Arrested relief granted per 851.93-PC. 273.5(A)-PC-Inflict
3 corporal injury to a spouse/cohab. 243(E)(1)-PC- Battery to spouse/ex/date/etc.
4 Arrested relief granted per 851.93-PC; (24) April 14, 2022, San Diego, CA,
5 166(C)(1)-PC- Contempt of violence protective order. Arrested relief granted per
6 851.93-PC; (25) July 28, 2022, San Diego, CA 273.5(A)PC-Inflict corporal injury
7 to spouse/cohab, 166(C)(1)-PC-Contempt of violence protective order.
8 14601.2(A)-VC-Driving with license suspended/DUI/etc.; and (26) May 24, 2024,
9 San Diego, CA 166(C)(1)-PC-Contempt of violence protective order. Arrested,
10 cited and jail. (CHRB Ex. 3.)

11 XVII.

12 On May 28, 2025, the CHRB set this Appeal for hearing on June 3, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. via
13 Microsoft Teams. (CHRB Ex. 7.)

14 V. ISSUES ON APPEAL AND CONTROLLING LAW

15 When considering the denial of a license on the grounds that the applicant committed a
16 “bad act” act or has been convicted of a crime, the following criteria are relevant in evaluating
17 Appellant’s rehabilitation and fitness for licensure:

18 (1) The nature and severity of the act(s) and/or offense(s), including its relation to
19 horse racing or pari-mutuel wagering and the protection of the public; (2) the total
20 criminal record, including evidence of any act(s) and/or offense(s) committed
21 subsequent to the act(s) or offense(s) under consideration as grounds for denial,
22 suspension or revocation which also could be considered grounds for denial,
23 suspension, or revocation under Business and Professions Code sections 480 or
24 490; (3) the time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s); (4)
25 the extent to which the person seeking licensure or the licensee has complied with
26 any terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed
27 against the person or licensee; (5) the credibility of the person seeking licensure or
28 the licensee, and his or her acceptance of responsibility and remorse for the
conduct; and (6) evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the person seeking
licensure or by the licensee. (Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 4 § 1489.2.)

Appellant must demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he meets the
necessary licensure requirements. (See, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 4 § 1764 [“The burden shall be on
the appellant to prove the facts necessary to sustain the appeal.”], Cal. Evid. Code § 115, *Hughes*
v. Board of Architectural Examiners (1998) 17 Cal.4th 763, 784, *Owen v. Sands* (2009)176
Cal.App.4th 985, 989.)

“Preponderance of the evidence means evidence that has more convincing force than that
opposed to it.” (*Glage v. Hawes Firearms Co.* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d 314, 324.) “Preponderance
of the evidence means what it says, viz., that the evidence on one side outweighs, preponderates
over, is more than, the evidence on the other side, *not necessarily in number of witnesses or*

1 *quantity*, but in its effect on those to whom it is addressed.” (*Glage v. Hawes Firearms Co.* (1990)
2 226 Cal.App.3d 314, 325 [citations omitted].)

3 Because this Appeal concerns the denial of a license due to previous “bad acts,” Appellant
4 must provide sufficient evidence of rehabilitation and overall fitness for licensure.

5 VI. DISCUSSION

6 A. Appellant Fails to Establish Rehabilitation or Overall Fitness for Licensure.

7 Unfortunately, Appellant failed to meet the rehabilitation criteria set forth in Cal. Code
8 Regs. Tit. 4 § 1489.2 (“Section 1489.2”) meaning Appellant cannot make the requisite showing
9 of “rehabilitation” permitting Appellant to be licensed as a jockey in the State of California.

10 As discussed above, Section 1489.2. provides the following relevant criteria in evaluating
11 Appellant’s rehabilitation and fitness for licensure:

12 (1) The nature and severity of the act(s) and/or offense(s), including its relation to
13 horse racing or pari-mutuel wagering and the protection of the public; (2) the total
14 criminal record, including evidence of any act(s) and/or offense(s) committed
15 subsequent to the act(s) or offense(s) under consideration as grounds for denial...;
16 (3) the time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s); (4) the
17 extent to which the person seeking licensure or the licensee has complied with any
18 terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed
19 against the person or licensee; (5) the credibility of the person seeking licensure or
20 the licensee, and his or her acceptance of responsibility and remorse for the
21 conduct; and (6) evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the person seeking
22 licensure or by the licensee...

18 Here, the nature and severity of Appellant’s regulatory offenses as well as his criminal
19 past are unquestionably severe. Indeed, since this Officer’s 2019 Decision, Appellant has been
20 arrested numerous times for violating the Restraining Order and separately served jail time.
21 Importantly, these charges and jail time are less than eighteen (18) months old. These criminal
22 acts are in addition to Appellant’s seventeen separate criminal charges and/or convictions that
23 occurred prior to the 2019 Decision, as discussed above. This Officer separately notes that
24 Appellant violated the terms of his parole less than last 24 months from the date of the
25 Application.

26 Because Appellant’s previous regulatory violations and criminal history are undoubtedly
27 severe, and because Appellant has been charged with eight separate criminal violations since the
28 2019 Decision, including serving jail time, Appellant fails to demonstrate the necessary fitness to

1 be licensed as a jockey.

2 Concerning Appellant's rehabilitation, this Officer notes Appellant has at least put forth
3 evidence of rehabilitation. Specifically, Appellant provided: (1) evidence of residing at a sober
4 living facility; (2) evidence of enrolling in the Winners' Foundation while regularly attending
5 meetings for approximately five (5) months; (3) evidence of regularly being tested for drugs
6 and/or alcohol, with Appellant's a single "relapse" occurring seven and half (7.5) months ago; (4)
7 testimony from Darin Scharer stating he has seen a positive change in Appellant since his most
8 recent enrollment with the Winners' Foundation; and (6) evidence of acceptance and remorse for
9 Appellant's past conduct, to some extent. (H.T. at p. 20-21.)

10 Due to Appellant's recent criminal transgressions and jail time as well as Appellant's
11 severe criminal history, this Officer finds that Appellant falls short of meeting the rehabilitation
12 criteria set forth in Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 4 § 1489.2. Specifically, the short amount of time that
13 has lapsed since Appellant's latest criminal transgression, coupled with Appellant's twenty-six
14 (26) criminal charges, is too much to overcome at this time.

15 However, this Officer notes Appellant has, for the first time in nearly a decade, shown
16 evidence of rehabilitation. Appellant is therefore encouraged to reapply for licensure in 2026
17 while continuing to demonstrate an intent to rehabilitate in accordance with Code Regs. Tit. 4 §
18 1489.2.

19 VII. CONCLUSION

20 Because of Appellant's substantial history of rule violations and criminal charges, and
21 because Appellant's latest criminal charge recently occurred resulting in jail time, Appellant
22 cannot meet Section 1489.2's rehabilitation criteria at this time.

23 However, as discussed above, Appellant has demonstrated a willingness to improve and
24 accept responsibility for his past transgressions, and this Officer encourages Appellant to continue
25 down this path of rehabilitation in order reapply for a jockey's license in 2026. Indeed, a longer
26 history of rehabilitation would likely result in Appellant being granted a jockey's license, with
27 numerous conditions as the CHRB deems necessary.

28 WHEREFORE, and for the reasons set forth above, it is hereby recommended that the

1 CHRB deny Appellant's Appeal, and deny Appellant's Application for Licensure.

2 Dated: September 8, 2025



3 _____
4 Patrick J. Kane, Esq.
5 Hearing Officer

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28