SAINT PAUL
HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUAL
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS &
EQUAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY (HREEO)

15 Kellogg Boulevard West, 280 City Hall
Saint Paul, MN 55102
Tel: 651-266-8966

CASE: **#24-20**
Respondent: ST. PAWS LLC
Complainants' Names Are Withheld[1]

AMENDED DETERMINATION

The Department of Human Rights and Equal Economic Opportunity ("HREEO") for the City of Saint Paul (the "City") has finished its investigation of Case #24-20 and the Director of HREEO (the "Director") issued a Determination on June 1, 2026 (the "Original Determination"), which found based on a preponderance of evidence that:

1. The Respondent **VIOLATED** Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 233, the City's Earned Sick and Safe Time Ordinance (the "ESST Ordinance").[2]

2. The Respondent **VIOLATED** Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 224, the City's Minimum Wage Ordinance (the "MW Ordinance" and, together with the ESST Ordinance, the "Ordinances").[3]

3. After issuing the Original Determination, HREEO discovered that certain financial remedy calculations therein were inaccurate. HREEO has now corrected those calculations and issues this Amended Determination (the "Amended Determination" and, with the Original Determination, the "Determination"). Further information about those corrections is available on pages 9 and 10 herein.

Background

4. On July 25, 2024, Complainant filed a complaint (the "ESST Complaint") with HREEO alleging Respondent violated the ESST Ordinance. Specifically, Complainant alleged that Respondent: (i) did not allow employees to accrue ESST hours as required by §

[1] Saint Paul Administrative Code, § 11.03(d).
[2] The City of Saint Paul amended Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 233, effective November 16, 2025. All analysis provided in this Determination and all references made to the "ESST Ordinance" or Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 233, refer to the previously adopted version of Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 233, adopted October 18, 2023, and effective during the period noted in this Complaint.
[3] The City of Saint Paul amended Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 224, effective November 16, 2025. All analysis provided in this Determination and all references made to the "Ordinance" or Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 224, refer to the previously adopted version of Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 224, adopted November 14, 2018, and effective during the period noted in this Complaint.

233.03 of the ESST Ordinance, (ii) did not allow ESST use for ESST purposes pursuant to § 233.04 of the ESST Ordinance, and (iii) failed to provide covered employees with proper notice of their rights as required by § 233.07 of the ESST Ordinance.

5. On December 4, 2024, Complainant filed another complaint (the "MW Complaint" and, together with the ESST Complaint, the "Complaint") with HREEO alleging Respondent violated the MW Ordinance. Specifically, Complainant alleged that Respondent: (i) failed to pay the required minimum wage to covered employees pursuant to § 224.02 and § 224.03 of the MW Ordinance, and (ii) failed to provide covered employees with proper notice of their rights as required by § 224.08 of the MW Ordinance.

6. Based on the Complaint, HREEO had cause to believe that Respondent had potentially violated the Ordinances and opened an investigation. Respondent received a Notice of Investigation on August 8, 2024, related to the alleged violations of the ESST Ordinance, and an Amended Notice of Investigation on December 5, 2024, which included the alleged MW Ordinance violation, both via certified mail.

7. When HREEO investigates alleged violations of the Ordinances, HREEO reviews Respondent's records of all their covered employees, not just the records of the Complainant because reviewing the records of all covered employees at Respondent's business is reasonably related to determining whether Respondent violated the Ordinances.[4] For alleged violations of the ESST Ordinance, HREEO reviews three years of Respondent records going back from the date of the Notice of the Investigation.[5] For the purposes of this Determination, that time frame is August 8, 2021, to August 8, 2024, and is referred to as the "ESST Investigatory Period." For alleged violations of the MW Ordinance, HREEO reviews two years of Respondent records going back from the date of the Notice of the Investigation.[6] For the purposes of this Determination, that time frame is December 5, 2022, to December 5, 2024, and is referred to as the "MW Investigatory Period."

8. Respondent provided HREEO with position statements, denied violating the Ordinances, and provided documents to support its position. HREEO collected additional documents from Respondent, including its employee handbook, payroll summaries, employee base rates and earning records, and conducted investigatory interviews with Respondent.

[4] *See* Madison Equities, Inc. v. Off. of Att'y Gen., 967 N.W.2d 667, 673 (Minn. 2021), holding that the scope of an agency's investigation of alleged employment law violations (1) must be within the authority of the agency, (2) the information requested by the agency must be "reasonably relevant," and (3) the demand for documents must be "not too indefinite."
[5] *See* Saint Paul Legislative Code, §§ 233.09(a), 233.13(a).
[6] *See* Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 244.07(a).

9. HREEO considered all these materials, interviewed relevant witnesses, and collected additional paystubs as evidence.

10. Between September 16, 2025, and February 4, 2026, HREEO and Respondent engaged in pre-determination settlement negotiations in an attempt to resolve the matter but ultimately failed to reach an agreement.

Facts

11. Respondent is a dog daycare and boarding facility previously operating within the City of Saint Paul. Respondent met the definition of "employer" under the Ordinances.[7] During the MW Investigatory Period, Respondent had a total of approximately 71 employees and therefore meets the definition of a “small business,” as calculated pursuant to § 224.05 of the MW Ordinance.[8]

12. Pursuant to §§ 233.02 and 233.03 of the ESST Ordinance, covered employees who perform work within the geographic boundaries of the City for at least eighty (80) hours a year are entitled to accrue one hour of ESST for every thirty hours, up to at least forty-eight (48) hours per year.

13. Pursuant to the MW Ordinance, the minimum hourly wage rate for a small business was fourteen dollars ($14.00) from July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025.[9]

14. Complainants were employees of Respondent and worked over eighty (80) hours in a year.

15. On September 3, 2024, Respondent provided a position statement, a record of paid time off hours of current employees and copy of the updated employee handbook, that included an appendix containing information about the ESST Ordinance from the City of Saint Paul website. Respondent also included a copy of signatures from his current employees acknowledging the appendix and investigation.

16. In the position statement, Respondent stated “Our handbook did not specifically address sick time policy previously. It has been updated with an appendix containing The Earned Sick and Time policy from the city's website.”

17. On September 16, 2024, during a phone call between HREEO’s investigator and Respondent, Respondent admitted that the business did not provide any ESST to

[7] Saint Paul Legislative Code, §§ 224.01, 233.02.
[8] The MW Ordinance defines a “small business” as “all employers that employ one hundred (100) or fewer persons, calculated pursuant to section 224.05” of the MW Ordinance.
[9] Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 224.03.

employees during the ESST Investigatory Period because he was unaware that the ESST Ordinance had been in effect. For this reason, the Respondent did not have any ESST records to provide prior to 2024.

18. On October 15, 2024, Respondent provided a word document retroactively calculating and listing the ESST hours accrued for all employees during the ESST Investigatory Period.

19. Complainants' and witnesses' testimonies confirmed they had never heard of ESST, were unable to use and were not paid for ESST hours and had never received any notice of their rights to ESST and minimum wage at any time during their employment with Respondent.

20. Complainants' and witnesses' testimonies confirmed Respondent requires all employees to find a replacement worker to cover their hours if they are out sick (a violation of Section 233.04(f) of the ESST Ordinance), and employees did not get paid for any hours missed when they were sick.

21. On February 26, 2025, the investigator conducted a fact-finding meeting with the Respondent, where the Respondent admitted to only beginning to provide ESST hours to covered employees after receiving the notice of investigation in August 2024.

22. Respondent's payroll records, earning summaries, and paystubs show no evidence of providing available ESST hours or allowing accrual and use of ESST to its fifty-eight (58) covered employees during the ESST Investigatory Period.

23. On July 12, 2025, Respondent provided payroll records and summaries showing employees' base rate information for the MW Investigatory Period. The records show Respondent failed to pay the minimum wage required by the MW Ordinance to eight (8) covered employees from July 1, 2024, to on or around December 4, 2024.

24. Specifically, Complainant's paystubs show that from July 1, 2024 – July 14, 2024, they were paid thirteen dollars ($13.00) an hour (one dollar ($1.00) an hour below the required minimum wage), and from July 15, 2024 – July 28, 2024, they were paid thirteen dollars and fifty cents ($13.50) an hour (fifty cents ($00.50) an hour below the required minimum wage).

25. Shortly after the investigation started, four (4) out of eight (8) employees received a wage increase to the correct minimum wage at fourteen dollars ($14.00) and three (3) other employees resigned, however, one employee was paid thirteen dollars ($13.00) an hour throughout their employment with Respondent until on or around December 4, 2024.

Claim 1: Accrual of Earned Sick and Safe Time

26. Section 233.03 of the ESST Ordinance requires that employers must provide ESST to employees who work within the geographic boundaries of the City at least 80 hours in a year. Employers must provide employees a minimum of 48 ESST hours per year.

27. The ESST Ordinance sets the minimum requirement for the accrual of ESST; an employee must accrue a minimum of one (1) hour of ESST for every thirty (30) hours worked within the geographic boundaries of the City. Employees who have worked in the City for over a year must be allowed to carry over a minimum of 80 hours of accrued and unused ESST annually.

28. The Complaint alleged that the Respondent failed to allow Complainants to properly accrue and carry over ESST hours.

29. Respondent admitted that the business did not provide ESST to employees at all until after the investigation into the Complaint began in August 2024. For this reason, Respondent did not have any ESST records.

30. On October 15, 2024, Respondent provided a word document retroactively calculating and listing ESST hours accrued for all employees during the ESST Investigatory Period as proof of compliance. However, Respondent was unable to show any evidence that those hours were accrued and available to employees during that timeframe, or that employees were able to carry over accrued and unused ESST hours.

31. Complainants' and witnesses' testimonies confirmed they had never heard of ESST or, to their knowledge, accrued or used any ESST hours at any time during their employment with Respondent.

32. Respondent's payroll records, earning summaries, and paystubs show no evidence of accruing or providing ESST hours to the fifty-eight (58) covered employees during the ESST Investigatory Period.

Claim 2: Use of Earned Sick and Safe Time

33. Section 233.04 of the ESST Ordinance requires that covered employees are allowed to use ESST for the reasons specified in the ESST Ordinance.

34. The ESST Ordinance also specifies an employer may not require, as a condition of an employee's using ESST, that the employee find a replacement worker to cover the hours during which the employee uses ESST.[10]

35. The Complaint alleged that the Respondent failed to allow Complainants to use ESST hours and required employees to find a replacement worker to cover their hours if they are out sick.

36. As stated above, during multiple exchanges over the course of the investigation, Respondent admitted that he had also only begun to provide ESST hours to covered employees after the investigation started in August 2024.

37. Complainants' and witnesses' testimonies confirmed they had never used or were paid for ESST hours at any time throughout their employment.

38. Complainants' and witnesses' testimonies confirmed that if they are out sick or are unable to make it to their scheduled hours of work, Respondent required them to find a replacement worker to cover their shifts and did not pay them for missed work hours.

39. Respondent has not provided any evidence to show that they allowed use of ESST or paid out hours of ESST use to covered employees.

Claim 3: Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

40. The MW Ordinance sets the required minimum hourly wage based on business size; small businesses were required to pay covered employees a minimum hourly wage of no less than fourteen dollars ($14.00) from July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025.[11]

41. Employees are covered by the MW Ordinance for all time worked within the geographic boundaries of the City.[12]

42. Based on payroll records and earning summaries provided for the MW Investigatory Period, Respondent failed to pay the minimum wage in violation of the MW Ordinance because Respondent paid covered employees under fourteen dollars ($14.00) an hour between July 1, 2024, to on or around December 4, 2024.

43. Specifically, after the investigation started, four (4) out of eight (8) employees received a wage increase to the correct minimum wage at fourteen dollars ($14.00) and three

[10] Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 233.04(f).
[11] Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 224.03.
[12] *Id.* at §§ 224.01; 224.02(a).

(3) other employees resigned while making thirteen dollars ($13.00) an hour, and one employee remained getting paid thirteen dollars ($13.00) an hour throughout their employment with Respondent until on or around December 4, 2024.

Claim 4: Required Notice

44. The ESST Ordinance requires that employers give employees proper notice of ESST.[13]

45. The MW Ordinance requires that employers give employees annual notice of the minimum wage.[14]

46. The Complaint alleged that the Respondent failed to give Complainants proper notice of both ESST and minimum wage.

47. In the position statement that was dated September 3, 2024, Respondent stated "Our handbook did not specifically address sick time policy previously. It has been updated with an appendix containing The Earned Sick and Time policy from the city's website and included in this response."

48. As stated above, the evidence in the records demonstrates that Respondent had only begun to provide required notice of ESST to current employees on or after September 3, 2024, and not prior to that date.

49. Complainants' and witnesses' testimonies confirmed they had never received any notice of their rights to ESST and minimum wage at any time throughout their employment with Respondent.

50. Respondent did not provide any evidence that they gave required notice of minimum wage to covered employees. Pursuant to § 224.07(b)(2) of the MW Ordinance, this creates a rebuttable presumption of a violation of the MW Ordinance. Respondent has not provided any evidence to rebut this presumed violation.

HREEO Determination

51. HREEO finds that Respondent **violated** both Ordinances by failing to allow employees to accrue ESST hours or use said hours for ESST purposes as required by the ESST Ordinance, failing to pay covered employees the required minimum wage under the Minimum Wage Ordinance, and failing to provide covered employees with required notice of their ESST and minimum wage rights under the Ordinances.

[13] Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 233.07.
[14] Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 224.08.

Remedies

52. When it is determined that their employer has violated the Ordinances, covered employees may be entitled to back pay and liquidated damages.[15] Under the ESST Ordinance, liquidated damages per employee is the greater of the amount of ESST withheld from that employee multiplied by two (2) or $250.[16] Under the MW Ordinance, liquidated damages per employee is the greater of the amount of wages withheld from that employee or $250.[17] Penalties are recommended by the Director and imposed by the City Council of the City (the "City Council").

53. **Back Pay.**

   a. **ESST.** Respondent hired a total of approximately seventy-one (71) employees to perform work within the City during the ESST Investigative Period, and the investigation found that fifty-eight (58) of those employees were covered employees under the ESST Ordinance and had been denied of their ESST rights and did not accrue or have available ESST hours for use. The total ESST hours owned for the ESST Investigative Period are 852 hours and the employees are entitled to a total of **$11,174.87** in back pay. *See* Attachment A.
   b. **Minimum Wage.** From July 1, 2024, to on or around December 4, 2024, between one (1) and eight (8) employees were paid below the required hourly minimum wage. The total hours of underpaid work are 938.66 hours and the employees are entitled to a total of **$902.36** in back pay. *See* Attachment A.

54. **Liquidated Damages.** The Director recommends that the City Council orders the Respondent to pay the ESST Ordinance and MW Ordinance liquidated damages to impacted employees because Respondent has not shown that the violations were reasonable or done in good faith.[18]

   a. **ESST.** For ESST violations, thirty-three (33) out of fifty-eight (58) employees back pay multiplied by two (2) was less than $250, so $250 is determined as the liquidated damages amount for those employees. For the other twenty-five (25) employees, the amount of back pay multiplied by two (2) is greater than $250, so the liquidated damages per employee are equal to the back pay amount multiplied by two (2).[19] The recommended total amount of liquidated

---

[15] *Id.* at § 233.13(h)(2).
[16] *Id.* at § 224.07(h) and § 233.13(h)(2).
[17] *Id.* at § 224.07(h)(4).
[18] *Jarrett v. ERC Props., Inc.,* 211 F.3d 1078, 1084 (8th Cir.2000).
[19] The Original Determination failed to capture that liquidated damages under the ESST Ordinance are the amount of ESST withheld from an employee multiplied by two (2).

damages that the Respondent owes to employees for ESST Ordinance violations is **$26,124.00**.

b. **Minimum Wage.** For MW violations, all eight (8) employees back pay was less than $250, so $250 was determined as the total back pay amount for those employees. The recommended total amount of liquidated damages that the Respondent owes to employees for MW Ordinance violations is **$2,000.00**.

55. **Recommended Total Restitution.** The Director recommends that the City Council order the Respondent to pay $12,077.23 in back pay and $28,124.00 in liquidated damages to sixty-one (61) employees for a total restitution amount of **$40,201.23**.

<u>Respondent's Options</u>

56. Respondent can immediately pay the recommended restitution of $40,201.23 to the sixty-one (61) employees and provide proof of payment to HREEO. This option avoids this matter appearing on the City Council agenda.

57. Respondent can admit to the violation but contest the proposed restitution amount or the Respondent can deny the violation and dispute the facts of the violation outlined in this Determination. If Respondent disputes the facts or the proposed restitution amount, a hearing will be held before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). After receipt of the ALJ's report and recommendation (usually within 30 days), a City Council hearing will be scheduled. At that time, the City Council will decide whether to adopt, modify, or reject the ALJ's report and recommendation.

58. If Respondent does not contest the violation or the proposed restitution, the matter will be placed on the City Council agenda for imposition of the recommended restitution.

Andrea Ledger
Interim Director
Department of Human Rights &
Equal Economic Opportunity

Attachment A – ESST and Minimum Wage Financial Remedy Summary

**Section 233.13(h)(2) For the first violation, the payment of any earned sick and safe time unlawfully withheld, and the payment of an additional sum as liquidated damages to each employee whose rights under this chapter were violated. The dollar amount of earned sick and safe time withheld from the employee multiplied by two (2), or two hundred fifty dollars ($250.00), whichever amount is greater, may be included as the liquidated damages to be paid to the employee.*

***Section 224.13(i)(4) In addition to any administrative fine, for the first violation, the payment of any wages unlawfully withheld, and the payment of an additional sum as liquidated damages to each employee whose rights under this chapter were violated. The dollar amount of wages withheld from the employee, or two hundred fifty dollars ($250.00), whichever amount is greater, may be included as liquidated damages to be paid to the employee.*

Last Name	First Name	Total EEST Hours (2021-2024)[20]	Total ESST Back Pay Owed	*ESST Liquidated Damages Owed	MW Back Pay Owed (2024)	**MW Liquidated Damages Owed[21]	Total Owed Per Employee
Alger	Kolton	**28**	$400.50	$801.00	$-	$-	**$1,201.50**
Barriento	Juan	**11**	$143.00	$286.00	$65.28	$250.00	**$744.28**
Baugus	Dyamond	**2**	$22.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$272.00**
Beaird	Albi	**17**	$238.00	$476.00	$-	$-	**$714.00**
Berres	Gavin	**32**	$421.00	$842.00	$-	$-	**$1,263.00**
Brindle	Nicole	**4**	$48.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$298.00**
Brown	Ainsley	**5**	$60.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$310.00**
Bunyea	Rebecca	**14**	$182.00	$364.00	$77.07	$250.00	**$873.07**
Chagolla	Abigail	**6**	$72.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$322.00**
Chang	Chit M	**4**	$52.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$302.00**
Clark	Mark	**32**	$398.00	$796.00	$-	$-	**$1,194.00**
Connell	Oliver D	**6**	$78.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$328.00**
Corredor-Parker	Katherine	**40**	$562.50	$1,125.00	$-	$-	**$1,687.50**
Duffrin	Sadie	**3**	$36.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$286.00**
Esposito	Mya	**95**	$1,325.00	$2,650.00	$-	$-	**$3,975.00**
Fett	Cora	**9**	$117.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$367.00**
Flockencier	Lalayia O	**12**	$144.00	$288.00	$-	$-	**$432.00**

[20] "ESST accrues only in hour-unit increments; with no accrual of a fraction of any hour of earned sick and safe time." Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 233.03(b). The Original Determination rounded the ESST hours withheld to the nearest whole number. HREEO has reviewed this and determined that it is more appropriate to always round the withheld ESST hours down to the next lowest whole number. This ensures that employees are not accruing an hour that has not been fully earned.

[21] The Original Determination had a combined MW back pay and liquidated damages column that incorrectly listed the total restitution owed for minimum wage violations as the greater of $250 per underpaid employee or two times the back pay owed to each underpaid employee. The Amended Determination has split MW back pay and liquidated damages into two columns and the calculations have been corrected to comply with Saint Paul Legislative Code, § 224.13(i)(4).

Gustafsson	Sten J	**3**	$39.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$289.00**
Hanson	Corey	**0**	$-	$-	$73.18	$250.00	**$323.18**
Hardin	Evan	**3**	$39.00	$250.00	$209.36	$250.00	**$748.36**
Hare	Aubree	**18**	$222.00	$444.00	$-	$-	**$666.00**
Hinderaker	Ella	**13**	$156.00	$312.00	$-	$-	**$468.00**
Khamvongsouk	Chris	**8**	$104.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$354.00**
Klein	Anna	**4**	$52.00	$250.00	$172.36	$250.00	**$724.36**
Krieg	Brianna	**6**	$78.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$328.00**
Larson	Emily	**7**	$84.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$334.00**
Law	Melissa	**4**	$52.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$302.00**
Limin	Krysta	**0**	$-	$-	$64.16	$250.00	**$314.16**
Logan	Elisa	**27**	$357.00	$714.00	$-	$-	**$1,071.00**
Lyons	Francis A	**4**	$52.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$302.00**
Mattingly	Destiny	**8**	$104.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$354.00**
McGovern	Alex	**6**	$72.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$322.00**
Meany	Siena	**2**	$26.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$276.00**
Meza	Adrian	**41**	$547.00	$1,094.00	$-	$-	**$1,641.00**
Mora	Stephanie	**19**	$231.00	$462.00	$-	$-	**$693.00**
Morse	Shawntil	**3**	$48.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$298.00**
Nelson	Sophia	**20**	$282.00	$564.00	$-	$-	**$846.00**
Nguyen	Kevin	**11**	$132.00	$264.00	$-	$-	**$396.00**
Odegard	Brandi	**8**	$96.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$346.00**
Ortiz-Lara	Asia V	**5**	$55.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$305.00**
Osorio Nava	Rio	**4**	$52.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$302.00**
Parazoo	Sydney	**13**	$178.00	$356.00	$-	$-	**$534.00**
Parker	Hunter	**14**	$182.00	$364.00	$-	$-	**$546.00**
Pierre	Mekhi N	**9**	$112.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$362.00**
Pingolt	Cait	**10**	$120.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$370.00**
Plante	Annette	**45**	$582.00	$1,164.00	$-	$-	**$1,746.00**
Ranegan	Mariah	**58**	$788.00	$1,576.00	$-	$-	**$2,364.00**
Reeder	Mike	**0**	$-	$-	$230.43	$250.00	**$480.43**
Rennert	Maddie	**8**	$112.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$362.00**
Schaffer	Levi	**3**	$39.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$289.00**
Schweiss	Henry	**30**	$360.00	$720.00	$-	$-	**$1,080.00**
Story	Hannah F	**18**	$288.00	$576.00	$-	$-	**$864.00**
Stuhr	Marley	**8**	$104.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$354.00**
Tallman	Melissa	**11**	$143.00	$286.00	$-	$-	**$429.00**
Thao	Der	**8**	$104.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$354.00**
Todd	William	**36**	$435.00	$870.00	$-	$-	**$1,305.00**
Torres	Christina	**6**	$66.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$316.00**

Tragiai	Ellie	**3**	$42.87	$250.00	$10.52	$250.00	**$553.39**
Verner	Frances	**20**	$240.00	$480.00	$-	$-	**$720.00**
Wragge	Jacob	**4**	$48.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$298.00**
Xiong	Yanyoua	**4**	$52.00	$250.00	$-	$-	**$302.00**
Total		**852**	**$11,174.87**	**$26,124.00**	**$902.36**	**$2,000.00**	**$40,201.23**