

1 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
County of Santa Barbara  
2 By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094)  
Senior Deputy District Attorney  
3 GORDON AUCHINCLOSS (State Bar No. 150251)  
Senior Deputy District Attorney  
4 GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171)  
Senior Deputy District Attorney  
5 1112 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
6 Telephone: (805) 568-2300  
FAX: (805) 568-2398

**FILED**  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

JAN 18 2005

GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer  
BY *Carrie L. Wagner*  
CARRIE L. WAGNER, Deputy Clerk

\* *Unsealed pursuant  
to 6/16/05 court order*

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA  
10 SANTA MARIA DIVISION

RECEIVED  
05 JAN 18 AM 10:14

12 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

16 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,

17 Defendant.

No. 1133603

IN LIMINE MOTION RE:  
ADMISSION OF EXPERT  
TESTIMONY ON "BATTERED  
WOMEN'S SYNDROME"

DATE: January 28, 2005  
TIME: 8:30 a.m.  
DEPT: SM 2 (Melville)

~~FILED UNDER SEAL~~

20 INTRODUCTION

21 Janet Arvizo is the victim known as Jane Doe in Count One of the indictment. Ms.  
22 Arvizo married David Arvizo on July 3, 1985. She was 16 years old at the time. By the time  
23 she was 21, Ms. Arvizo had three children. Ms. Arvizo filed for dissolution of the marriage on  
24 October 15, 2001.

25 During their 16-year marriage, David Arvizo committed multiple acts of domestic  
26 violence against his wife, including hitting different parts of Janet's head and body, pulling her  
27 hair and forcing her head under water. For example, on September 29, 2001, Mr. Arvizo  
28 arrived home and proceeded to grab Mrs. Arvizo by the hair as she was talking on the phone.

1 He punched her in the head as he often had done in the past. Mrs. Arvizo ran outside to get  
2 away from Mr. Arvizo's assault. Mr. Arvizo caught up to her and began beating her on the  
3 chest. The battering continued until the police arrived. As a result of this assault, David  
4 Arvizo plead guilty to spousal abuse, a violation of Penal Code section 273.5, and was  
5 sentenced to 60 days in the Los Angeles County Jail. Mrs. Arvizo's application for a  
6 protective order against Mr. Arvizo was issued on November 6, 2001. On June 25, 2002  
7 another protective order was issued against him in connection with his conviction for child  
8 abuse, stemming from an incident on November 11, 2001. Janet Arvizo's daughter Davellin  
9 was the victim in that case.

10 During their marriage Mr. Arvizo also engaged in a pattern of threats and emotional  
11 abuse against Mrs. Arvizo. On more than one occasion he forced Mrs. Arvizo to stand outside  
12 naked. He prevented her from wearing make-up or shaving her legs. He constantly taunted her  
13 with derogatory comments. He threatened to kill her if she told anyone of the abuse. David  
14 Arvizo was the sole breadwinner and assumed economic control over Mrs. Arvizo and their  
15 family. He consistently abused Mrs. Arvizo's pets. He killed her pet ferret and violently threw  
16 her small dog against the wall. The children witnessed much of Mr. Arvizo's abuse of their  
17 mother and suffered acts of domestic violence themselves.

18 Janet Arvizo has been humiliated and embarrassed about allowing this abuse to  
19 herself and her children. She is a classic victim of long-term domestic violence.

20 The People seek to introduce expert testimony on the subject of domestic violence  
21 and Battered Women's Syndrome. This witness is necessary in this case to disabuse jurors of  
22 commonly held misconceptions about domestic violence victims. Such expert testimony is  
23 admissible to enable jurors to objectively evaluate conduct of victim's of Battered Women's  
24 Syndrome free from the restraints of popular myths and misconceptions. This expert testimony  
25 will encompass general information about domestic violence and the typical actions, reactions  
26 and reasoning of victims of domestic violence which may be counter-intuitive to the average  
27 lay juror. Pursuant to Evidence Code section 1107, this testimony will not be offered to prove  
28 that the specific charged offenses in fact occurred but rather to help the jury understand the

1 victim's behavior in the context of the stressful and threatening environment she experienced  
2 while under the control of the defendant and his co-conspirators. Battered Women's  
3 Syndrome is a stress disorder. While this case does not directly involve charges of domestic  
4 violence, the fact that one of the victims in this case is a long-term victim of domestic violence  
5 is highly relevant to understanding her conduct when she was confronted by common domestic  
6 violence stressors such as: death threats to herself and her family, false imprisonment, child  
7 abduction, emotional abuse, economic dependency, personal verbal attacks, isolation and  
8 hopelessness. This important evidence will be imperative for the jury to properly evaluate  
9 Janet Arvizo's credibility at trial.

10  
11 **I.**  
12 **UNDER EVIDENCE CODE SECTIONS 801 AND 1107**  
13 **EXPERT TESTIMONY ON THE ISSUE OF BATTERED**  
14 **WOMEN'S SYNDROME IS ADMISSIBLE TO ASSIST**  
15 **THE JURY IN UNDERSTANDING THE CONDUCT OF**  
16 **A VICTIM OF BATTERED WOMEN'S SYNDROME**

17 Expert testimony has been widely accepted as a means to help jurors understand the  
18 counter-intuitive behavior of victims of stress disorders. "Evidence that explains rape trauma  
19 syndrome, child sexual abuse accommodation syndrome and Battered Women's Syndrome  
20 informs the finder of fact that how they think the average reasonable person would behave  
21 and/or how they think they personally would behave are not necessarily the same way that  
22 people who have been raped, molested or battered in fact behave . . . . [W]e have difficulty  
23 accepting what we do not understand. Depriving the finder of fact of such understanding may  
24 well lead to a conclusion based on misconceptions held in good faith. That such conceptions  
25 are held in good faith in no way lessens the magnitude of the error and the injustice that may  
26 result." (*People v. Day* (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 405, 419; disapproved on other grounds in  
27 *People v. Humphrey* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1088-1089.)

28 Lenore E. Walker, a clinical and forensic psychologist who is nationally recognized  
as an authority on battered women and who is largely responsible for the development of  
"Battered Woman Syndrome," has defined a "battered woman" as "one who has been, on at

1 least two occasions, the victim of physical, sexual, or serious psychological abuse by a man  
2 with whom she has an intimate relationship.” She further defined Battered Women’s  
3 Syndrome as “a pattern of psychological symptoms that develop after somebody has lived in a  
4 battering relationship.” (*People v. Aris* (1989) 215 Cal.App.3d 1178, 1194 disapproved on  
5 other grounds in *People v. Humphrey, supra*, 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1088-1089.)

6 In the trial of *People v. Aris (supra)*, Dr. Walker testified that Battered Women’s  
7 Syndrome is recognized as a type of post-traumatic stress disorder, which is listed and defined  
8 in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III), and which happens to  
9 anyone exposed to the degree and kind of trauma, such as a natural disaster or combat, that  
10 would be expected to cause psychological problems.” (*People v. Aris, supra*, 215 Cal.App.3d,  
11 at p. 1194.)

12 The rules regarding the admissibility of expert testimony are well settled:

13 First, the decision of a trial court to admit expert testimony “will not be  
14 disturbed on appeal unless a manifest abuse of discretion is shown.”  
15 (*People v. Kelly* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 24, 39, and cases cited.) Second, “the  
16 admissibility of expert opinion is a question of degree. The jury need not  
17 be wholly ignorant of  
18 the subject matter of the opinion in order to justify its admission; if that  
19 were the test, little expert opinion testimony would ever be heard.  
20 Instead, the statute declares that even if the jury has some knowledge of  
21 the matter, expert opinion may be admitted whenever it would ‘assist’  
22 the jury. It will be excluded only when it would add nothing at all to the  
23 jury’s common fund of information, i.e., when ‘the subject of inquiry is  
24 one of such common knowledge that men of ordinary education could  
25 reach a conclusion as intelligently as the witness’” (*People v. McDonald*  
26 (1984) 37 Cal.3d 351, 357).(*People v. McAlpin, supra*, 53 Cal. 3d 1289  
27 at pp. 1299-1300.)

28 In 1991 the Legislature enacted Evidence Code Section 1107 to specifically  
authorize the courts to admit evidence of Battered Women’s Syndrome in any case in which it  
is relevant. Evidence Code Section 1107 provides in pertinent part:

(a) In a criminal action, expert testimony is admissible by either the

1 prosecution or the defense regarding Battered Women's Syndrome,  
2 **including the nature and effect of physical, emotional, or mental**  
3 **abuse on the beliefs, perceptions, or behavior of victims of domestic**  
4 **violence, except when offered against a criminal defendant to prove the**  
5 occurrence of the act or acts of abuse which form the basis of the  
6 criminal charge.

7 (b) **The foundation shall be sufficient for admission of this expert**  
8 **testimony if the proponent of the evidence establishes its relevancy**  
9 **and the proper qualifications of the expert witness.** Expert opinion  
10 testimony on Battered Women's Syndrome shall not be considered a  
11 new scientific technique whose reliability is unproven. (Emphasis  
12 added.)

13 Even before the Legislature specifically made evidence of Battered Women's  
14 Syndrome admissible under Evidence Code section 1107, the Court of Appeal upheld the  
15 admissibility such evidence under Evidence Code Section 801. (*People v Aris, supra*, 215  
16 Cal.App.3d 1178.)

17 Evidence Code Section 801 provides:

18 If a witness is testifying as an expert, his/her testimony in the form of an  
19 opinion is limited to such an opinion as is

20 (a) related to a subject that is sufficiently beyond common experience  
21 that the opinion of an expert would assist the trier of; and

22 (b) Based on matter (including his special knowledge, skill,  
23 experience, training, and education) perceived by or personally known  
24 to the witness or made known to him at or before the hearing, whether  
25 or not admissible, that is of a type that reasonably may be relied upon by  
26 an expert in forming an opinion upon the subject to which his testimony  
27 relates, unless an expert is precluded by law from using such matter as a  
28 basis for his opinion.

Since the Legislature enacted section 1107, courts have admitted expert testimony  
of Battered Women's Syndrome under both sections 1107 and 801. (*People v. Humphrey,*  
*supra*, 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1088.)

It is important to note that courts have routinely recognized the relevance of

1 Battered Women's Syndrome in cases in which domestic violence was *not* charged. For  
2 example, in the case of *People v. Day, supra*, 2 Cal.App.4th 405, 415-417, the Court of Appeal  
3 held in a trial before the enactment of Evidence Code section 1107 that defense counsel was  
4 incompetent *for not* presenting expert testimony on the behavior of victims of domestic  
5 violence to defend against the charge of murder.

6 II.

7 THE ADMISSION OF EXPERT TESTIMONY ON  
8 BATTERED WOMEN'S SYNDROME WILL ASSIST  
9 THE TRIER OF FACT IN UNDERSTANDING THE  
10 BEHAVIOR OF, AND IN EVALUATING THE  
11 CREDIBILITY OF, THE VICTIM, JANET ARVIZO

12 Perhaps the most difficult and confounding evidence this jury will be required to  
13 consider and make sense of is the behavior of Janet Arvizo during the progress of the alleged  
14 conspiracy.

15 The defense has made it abundantly clear that it will employ demagoguery and  
16 hyperbole to attack Mrs. Arvizo's credibility in any way they can. It is certain that whatever  
17 anomalous behavior she may have exhibited during the operative timeframe will be placed  
18 under the microscope. The truthfulness of Mrs. Arvizo's testimony will be substantially  
19 corroborated by other evidence. Still, the jury must ponder the following questions:

- 20 -- Why did she return to her abusers at Neverland?
- 21 -- Why didn't she go to the police?
- 22 -- Why didn't she make greater attempts to leave?
- 23 -- Why was she so susceptible and gullible?
- 24 -- Why was she so easily controlled and manipulated by these men?
- 25 -- Why did she continue to trust those who had proven themselves to be untrustworthy?
- 26 -- Why did she act so helpless?
- 27 -- Why did she continue to have hope and belief in Jackson?
- 28 -- Why did she prevaricate on the "rebuttal video" about what a "father figure" Jackson was?

1 The answers to these questions may be found in expert testimony on the subject of  
2 Battered Women's Syndrome.

3 The common characteristics of Battered Women's Syndrome are distinctive.  
4 Battered women tend to stay in the abusive relationship, they are trained to be the  
5 peacekeepers, they feel they are responsible to make relationships work. They generally are  
6 taught to be optimistic and hopeful, terminating the relationship usually has adverse economic  
7 consequences. Leaving the relationship may be very dangerous, and the battered woman is  
8 aware of the danger. Threats to kill the battered woman or to abscond with the children if she  
9 leaves are typical. The woman loses self-esteem, is fearful, and does not have the  
10 psychological energy to leave, resulting in "learned helplessness" and "a kind of psychological  
11 paralysis." (See *People v. Brown* (2004) 215 Cal.4th 892, 899; *People v. Aris*, *supra*, 215  
12 Cal.App.3d 1178, 1194.) Virtually all of these characteristics are present in Janet Arvizo's  
13 relationship with defendant.

14 Janet Arvizo's is a 16-year victim of domestic violence. Her marriage finally broke  
15 apart *during the period of time* that Mrs. Arvizo and her family were acquainted with  
16 defendant. Defendant was well aware that Mrs. Arvizo was a divorced, single mother from an  
17 indigent background with sole custody of her children at the time of the charged offenses. The  
18 acts of power, isolation and control that constituted the charges alleged in Count One depended  
19 significantly on the fact that Mrs. Arvizo had just left a violent sixteen-year marriage.  
20 Defendant and his coconspirators preyed upon Mrs. Arvizo's vulnerability and this  
21 vulnerability enabled them to control her in the manner they desired.

22 Defendant and his co-conspirators obtained power over Janet Arvizo by exploiting  
23 her vulnerabilities. Virtually every act of control over Janet Arvizo involved behavioral issues  
24 she had been forced to cope with during her violent marriage. Defendant began by becoming  
25 the surrogate patriarch of the Arvizo family. He insisted that Gavin call him "Daddy" and  
26 Gavin complied. Next, defendant obtained control over all three children by spoiling them  
27 with gifts and every possible indulgence teenage children could ever imagine at Neverland. A  
28 private amusement park, zoo, an elaborate video arcade, movie theatre, swimming pool,

1 private chefs, sweets and every toy imaginable were at the Arvizo children's disposal. The  
2 Arvizo boys were then welcomed into the world of the forbidden with no school, late nights,  
3 alcohol, profanity and pornography. All of this worked to drive wedge between the children  
4 and their mother which was used to control her.

5 Economic control followed. While at Neverland, the Arvizos lived in luxury and all  
6 expenses were paid. To leave Neverland was to leave a financial security this family had never  
7 experienced. Defendant insured the Arvizos could not leave his realm of by taking the  
8 children out of school, ending the lease on their apartment and placing all their worldly  
9 possessions in storage at a hidden location. The Arvizos now had no place to live and were  
10 forced to go where the defendant wanted them to go.

11 Removing the family from the country was next. Trips to Calabasas to obtain visas  
12 and passports for Brazil manifested defendant's control at this point. New clothes and luggage  
13 were purchased by defendant for the Arvizos, making them even more financially beholden to  
14 him. At this point the family was completely under his control.

15 When the Los Angeles Department of Child and Family Services intervened after  
16 concerned citizens reported defendant's alarming declaration that he sleeps with little boys in  
17 the Martin Bashir's *Living with Michael Jackson* television special, defendant further  
18 manipulated Janet Arvizo by telling her she would have her children taken away if she did not  
19 convince the social workers that Michael Jackson was a wonderful man who posed no threat to  
20 the family.

21 The underlying control feature of this entire chronology was fear. From the very  
22 first time defendant contacted the Arvizos on February 4, 2003 until the Arvizo children finally  
23 escaped from Neverland in March, defendant and his coconspirators were continually telling  
24 Janet Arvizo that there were people who wanted to kill her and her family. These fictitious  
25 threats were contrived by defendant and his co-conspirators. They were generally vague and  
26 over time expanded to include her parents. At one point the threats came from the  
27 coconspirators themselves, who claimed they could kill Mrs. Arvizo's family. These co-  
28 conspirators denigrated Ms. Arvizo, calling her "stupid" and a "stupid woman" when she was



1 at all uncooperative. Janet Arvizo did not like what was going on at Neverland but she did not  
2 want to take her children away from its perceived safety. Even the rebuttal video in which Ms.  
3 Arvizo and the children prevaricated about Jackson being “family” was made on the premise  
4 that public praise of Jackson would appease the “killers.” Throughout the film defendant had  
5 the entire family to refer to him repeatedly as a “father” to all the children.

6 Just as she was trapped so long in her violent marriage, Janet Arvizo was trapped by  
7 defendant. Fear and stress were once again controlling her, and defendant held all the strings.  
8 Just like the battered woman, hope that things would improve was all she had. She could not  
9 leave the protection of the defendant because defendant and his staff were protecting her from  
10 the fictitious “killers.” Even when the threat appeared to come from the co-conspirators  
11 themselves, she could not leave because defendant had assumed economic control over her  
12 life. Also, the threats from the fictitious “killers” outside Neverland never diminished. She  
13 could not tell the authorities because the threats were too vague. What would the authorities be  
14 able to do? Meanwhile defendant not only threatened the lives of her and her children but he  
15 threatened the State would take the children away from her if she did not do his bidding.

## 17 CONCLUSION

18 Janet Arvizo was placed in a box that defendant constructed out of lies, threats and  
19 bits and pieces of her troubled past. Economic control, death threats, threats to take the  
20 children away, put-downs and forced isolation are all classic features of domestic violence and  
21 Battered Women’s Syndrome. These are also the features of this case. Janet Arvizo had a  
22 peculiar vulnerability to defendant’s manipulations because of her history as a victim of  
23 domestic violence. In order for the jury to properly evaluate Janet Arvizo’s behavior under the  
24 stressors presented by defendant, it is imperative that they understand the stress disorder that  
25 directly affected this behavior.

26 This expert testimony will be general in nature and will not be fact-dependent. It  
27 will be used solely to de-bunk general myths and misperceptions about the behavior of victim’s  
28 of domestic violence. A proposed instruction for the jury’s guidance in this area (CALJIC


1 9.35.1) is attached.

2 The People respectfully request that expert testimony on Battered Women's  
3 Syndrome be admitted at trial.

4  
5 DATED: January 17, 2005

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY

8  
9  
10 BY:   
11 GORDON AUCHINCLOSS  
12 Senior Deputy District Attorney  
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA ) SS

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and I am not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is: District Attorney's Office; Courthouse; 1112 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101.

On January 14, 2005, I served the within IN LIMINE MOTION RE: ADMISSION OF EXPERT TESTIMONY ON "BATTERED WOMEN'S SYNDROME" on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ROBERT SANGER, and BRIAN OXMAN, his counsel of record, by personally delivering a true copy thereof to Mr. Sanger's office in Santa Barbara, by transmitting a facsimile copy thereof to Attorney Mesereau, and by causing a true copy thereof to be mailed to Mr. Mesereau, first class postage prepaid, at the addresses shown on the attached Service List.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 18 day of January, 2005.

[Handwritten signature]
Cris Linz

1  
2 **SERVICE LIST**  
3

4 THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.  
5 Collins, Mesereau, Reddock & Yu, LLP  
6 1875 Century Park East, No. 700  
7 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
8 FAX: (310) 284-3122  
9 Attorney for Defendant Michael Jackson

10 ROBERT SANGER, ESQ.  
11 Sanger & Swysen, Lawyers  
12 233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C  
13 Santa Barbara, CA 93001  
14 FAX: (805) 963-7311  
15 Co-counsel for Defendant

16 BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ.  
17 Oxman & Jaroscak, Lawyers  
18 14126 E. Rosecrans Blvd.,  
19 Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000