

FILE NOW: FILING FEE AFTER MAY 1 IS \$225.00

CORPORATION
ANNUAL REPORT
1995



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
 Jeannette B. Mortimer
 Secretary of State
 Division of CONSERVATION

APPROVED
AND
FILED

05 MAY - 1 PM 11:25

STATE
FLORIDA

DOCUMENT # H21049 (2)
MELDISCO K-M MERRITT ISL., FL., INC. (3344)

750 E. MERRITT 1 CAUSEWAY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32952
US

903 MACARTHUR BLVD.
MAHWAH NJ 07430

$$1.27 \pm 0.04, 1.35 \pm 0.04, 1.43 \pm 0.04, 1.51 \pm 0.04, 1.59 \pm 0.04, 1.67 \pm 0.04, 1.75 \pm 0.04, 1.83 \pm 0.04, 1.91 \pm 0.04, 2.00 \pm 0.04$$

3. Date of completion of appraisal:	3a. Date of final report
09/14/1984	05/01/1994

4. <u>111 Regular</u>	Applicant Fee
22-2561074	Ind. Applicant

5. Creditors and Related Parties: **\$8.75 Additional Fee Required**

6. For the Campaign: Preparing Investment Application	\$5.00 May Be Added to Fees
--	--------------------------------

B. How often do you use the Internet for shopping the books you want to buy for your children?

9. Name and Address of Current Registered Agent

UNITED STATES CORPORATION COMPANY
1201 HAYS STREET
SUITE 105
TALLAHASSEE FL 32301

Bi *Bi*

82 "Grand Admiral," by Hans Rudolph von N. A. 1917-18

83

154

FI

•

DEI

— 2 —

100

• • •

• • •

1

1

11. The authors of the paper also consider the case of a non-convex function. In this case, the authors show that the algorithm is still able to find the global minimum, but the complexity of the algorithm is increased. The authors also show that the algorithm is able to find the global minimum of a function with a non-convex constraint set.

[illegible][illegible]

13. At the time of the hearing, the respondent was not present.

PD	ROBINSON, JOHN	933 MACARTHUR BLVD.	MAHWAH NJ	VST
FALKOFF, MARTIN	933 MACARTHUR BLVD.	MAHWAH NJ	AT	WEINFUSS, STEWART
933 MACARTHUR BLVD.	MAHWAH NJ	D	FALKOFF, MARTIN	933 MACARTHUR BLVD.
MAHWAH NJ	D	PALIZZI, ANTHONY	3100 W. BIG BEAVER	TROY MI
AT	KAKAR, MANOHAR	933 MACARTHUR BLVD.	MAHWAH NJ	

14. The Board ruled that the arbitrator complied with the duty of impartiality, fairness and equity for the reasons stated in the majority of the Board's decision. The Board ruled that the arbitrator's ruling in the second request for supplemental compensation was based on evidence and that the arbitrator did not abuse his discretion in finding that the employee was entitled to the requested wage increase. The Board ruled that the arbitrator's ruling in the second request for supplemental compensation was based on evidence and that the arbitrator did not abuse his discretion in finding that the employee was entitled to the requested wage increase. The Board ruled that the arbitrator's ruling in the second request for supplemental compensation was based on evidence and that the arbitrator did not abuse his discretion in finding that the employee was entitled to the requested wage increase.

SIGNATURE:

SIGNATURE AND TYPED OR PRINTED NAME OF SIGNING OFFICER OR DISTRIBUTION

MANOHAR KAKAR APR 26 1995 (201) 934-2000