

APPROVED

00715 000215

1. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CORPORATION
ANNUAL REPORT
1995



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Sandra B. Morfitt
Secretary of State
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS

DOCUMENT # **P94000002889** (1)

1. Corporation Partners:

ROBERT DAVIE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Principal Place of Business	Mailing Address
3319 PLANTATION DRIVE SARASOTA FL 34231	3319 PLANTATION DRIVE SARASOTA FL 34231

Copyright © 2004 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

		3. Date of completion of Candidate		3a. Date of Last Report	
		01/01/1994			
2. Donor's Full Name (Last, First, Middle)		2a. Mailing Address		4. F.F. Number	
21		26		65-0478083	
22		27		Applied For Not Applicable	
23		28		5. Certificate of Status Desired ☐ \$8.75 Additional Fee Required	
24		29		6. Election Campaign Financing Trust Fund Contribution ☐ \$5.00 May Be Added to Fees	
25		30		8. Are contributions tax deductible for charitable purposes? Federal Substantive ☒ Yes ☐ No	

9. Name and Address of Current Registered Agent		10. Name and Address of New Registered Agent	
DAVIE, ROBERT W JR 3319 PLANTATION DRIVE SARASOTA FL 34231	81	Name	
	82	Street Address - P.O. Box Number or Not Applicable	
	83		
	84	City	FL

11. In support of the proposed change to the "Other" category, the above-mentioned respondent suggested the substitution of the proposed "Other" category with a new category, "Other, except for the above-mentioned respondent." The respondent suggested that this new category be used to report the information requested by the above-mentioned respondent.

16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 42 44 46 48 50 52 54 56 58 60 62 64 66 68 70 72 74 76 78 80 82 84 86 88 90 92 94 96 98 100

[illegible]

14. The Court said that the Government's argument with the timing substantially resembled that advanced by the respondents in *United States v. Hays*, 403 U.S. 581 (1971), where the Government argued that the defendant's conviction on the criminal aspect of a supplemental grand jury indictment was not reversible error and that its appeal should have the same legal effect as a de novo appeal. That argument, the Court found, was not supported by the reasons of the Supreme Court in *Hays*, which were based on the timing of the appeal, not the timing of the indictment, and that its proper effect was to require a new indictment, not a new trial.

SIGNATURE:

SIGNATURE, AND TYPED OR PRINTED NAME OF SIGNER ON FILE OR TELETYPE