UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 2

In the Matter of:	*	Docket No. :
Aurito Gómez López	*	FIFRA-02-2009-5301
Finca Aurito Gómez López	*	
Carr. 917 Km 2.2	*	Proceeding under Section 14(a) of the
Las Piedras, PR	*	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and
	*	Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended,
RESPONDENT	*	7 USC § 136*l*(a).

****

ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT

Aurito Gómez López (from now on Respondent), is returning an Answer to the Complaint for alleged violation of Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, 7 USC § 136*l*(a) and the proposed civil penalty for the alleged violation.

Respondent is not responsible of any of the violations alleged in the Complaint, and should not be object of any civil penalty.

I- CONTROVERTED FACTS

In the complaint, the findings of facts and conclusions of law are mixed; Respondent is answering the facts alleged in the Complaint. The number of each item below corresponds to the number of the item in the Complaint.

4. Admitted.

6. Denied. Respondent has not a possessory interest in the present or had any possessory interest in the past over the farm object of this complaint.

7. Respondent used to produce agricultural plants in the past, but since August 2008 he stopped working and sold the crops.

8. Respondent engaged in the outdoor production of agricultural plants in the past, before August 2008.

11. Denied. Respondent is not the owner of the "agricultural establishment" and hasn't owned the property object of this complaint. at any time. Respondent operated the farm because he borrowed it from the owner.

12. Respondent hired and compensated persons to perform activities related to the production of agricultural plants until August 2008.

15. Denied. Respondent has never employed persons to mix, load, transfer & apply pesticides, or to handle opened containers of pesticides or to assist with the applications of pesticides. Respondent made an agreement with the office of the Agricultural Services and Development Administration of Puerto Rico (ASDA) for the application of pesticides.

16. Denied. Respondent has not employed handlers at any time.

17. Denied. Respondent is not a "handler employer" and has never been a "handler employer".

20. Denied. The inspectors did not present their credentials to Respondent or explained the purposes of the inspection. Instead, they came in a harsh manner. Inspectors didn't present any notice form and Respondent didn't refused to sign any document.

23. The inspectors entered the farm without consent or permission of the owner of the farm or the Respondent of this Complaint. When Respondent arrived, inspectors were there already. Inspectors came in a harsh manner and their behavior was unjustified.

25. Denied.

26. Denied.

27. Denied.

28. Denied. At the time of the second inspection on December 13, 2007, Respondent didn't acknowledge in any interview that any workers or handlers have not received any training.

31. Denied. The son of the Respondent is not a pesticide handler and has never been a pesticide handler.

32. Denied. The employees of the Respondent didn't handle or applied pesticides at any time. Respondent made an agreement with the office of the Agricultural Services and Development Administration of Puerto Rico (ASDA) for the application of pesticides.

44. Denied. Inspection took place on August 23, 2007 not on August 13, 2007 as the complaint states. During the August 23, 2007 inspection there were no workers present at the property. The workers were working on other farms.

45. Inspection took place on August 23, 2007 not on August 13, 2007 as the complaint states.

47. Denied. During the December 13, 2007 inspection there were no workers present at the property, that property was next to be returned to its owner.

49. Denied.

50. Denied.

51. Denied.

61. Denied. Inspection took place on August 23, 2007 not on August 13, 2007 as the complaint states. During the inspection of August 23, 2007 there was no handler because Respondent has not employed handlers at any time.

62. Inspection took place on August 23, 2007 not on August 13, 2007 as the complaint states.

64. Denied. During the inspection of December 13, 2007 there was no handler because Respondent has not employed handlers at any time and none of the employees of the Respondent were handlers of pesticides.

66. Denied.

67. Denied.

68. Denied.

77. Denied. During the August 23, 2007 inspection no worker was present. At that time, the workers were working on other farm operated by Respondent.

78. Denied. During the December 13, 2007 inspection no worker was present or at any time near that day. There was no activity taking place on the property because the property was about to be returned to its owner.

79. Denied. At the time of the second inspection on December 13, 2007, Respondent didn't acknowledge in any interview that any workers or handlers have not received any training.

84. Denied. During the inspection of August 23, 2007 there was no handler because Respondent has not employed handlers at any time. Respondent contracted ASDA for those purposes.

85. Denied. During the inspection of December 13, 2007 there was no handler because Respondent has not employed handlers at any time. Respondent contracted ASDA for those purposes.

86. Denied. Respondent has not employed handlers at any time. Respondent contracted ASDA for those purposes.

87. Denied.

94. Denied.

95. Denied.

96. Denied.

104. Denied. Respondent has not employed handlers. Instead, he made a service contract with ASDA for the application of pesticides.

105. Denied. Respondent has not employed handlers at any time. Respondent contracted ASDA for those purposes.

106. Denied.

114. Denied. During the August 23, 2007 inspection no worker was present. The employees were working on other farm. The property object of this complaint was not the only property where Respondent produced agricultural plants.

115. Denied. During the December 13, 2007 inspection no worker was present or at any time near that date. There was no agricultural activity taking place on the property because the owner of the farm required its return.

118. The decontamination supplies were not in the field but right next to it, and were reasonably accessible to the agricultural workers.

133. Denied. Respondent has not employed handlers at any time.

134. Denied. Respondent has not employed handlers at any time.

136. Denied.

COUNTS 1 & 2: FAILURE TO PROVIDE WORKERS WITH SPECIFIC INFORMATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS

Subpart B of the WPS, requires that when workers are on an agricultural establishment and, within the last 30 days, a pesticide covered by the WPS has been applied on the establishment or a restricted-entry interval (REI) has been in effect, the agricultural employer shall display specific information about the pesticide in accordance with the WPS regulations. (40 CFR § 170.122)

ASDA applied the pesticide, MOCAP, to the plantain crop on the property on July 24, 2007. The inspection took place on August 23, 2007 that is 31 days after the application of the pesticide. According to 40 CFR § 170.122, when a pesticide covered by WPS has been applied the agricultural employer shall display specific information about the pesticide within 30 days. At the moment of the inspection there were no workers present at the property and the inspection took place on day 31, Respondent didn't had the obligation of displaying specific information about the pesticide at the moment that the inspection took place. Respondent was not in violation of 40 CFR § 170.122.

ASDA applied the pesticide, TILT, to the plantain crop on the property on November 20, 2007. A second inspection at the property took place on December 13, 2007. During that inspection and after more than 1 month of the application of the pesticide there were no workers at the property because the property was next to be returned to its owner. Due to that fact Respondent didn't had to display any information about the pesticide applied. Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.122.

FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G) prohibits the use of registered pesticides in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.

The inspection of August 23, 2007 took place 31 days after the application of the pesticide known as MOCAP and during that inspection there were no workers near the property object of this complaint. The employees of Respondent were working on other farms. When the second inspection took place on December 13, 2007 there were no workers on the property either. At that time the property object of this complaint was about to be returned to its owner. Respondent didn't fail to display specific information

about the application of the pesticides MOCAP and TILT. Respondent did not use a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling. In consequence, Respondent denies responsibility under FIFRA § 12 (a)(2)(G).

COUNTS 3 & 4: FAILURE TO PROVIDE HANDLERS WITH SPECIFIC INFORMATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS

Respondent didn't hire any "agricultural handler" and has never employed an "agricultural handler". On August 23, 2007 and December 13, 2007 inspections there was no "handler" because respondent has never employed an "agricultural handler". Instead, Respondent made an agreement with the office of the Agricultural Services and Development Administration of Puerto Rico (ASDA) for the application of pesticides. ASDA is a commercial applicator of pesticides.

Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.222 due to the inexistence of the "agricultural handler".

In consequence, there's no use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling and there's no violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 5: FAILURE TO ASSURE THAT WORKERS HAVE RECEIVED PESTICIDE SAFETY TRAINING

Under 40 CFR § 170.130, agricultural employers are required to assure that workers on an agricultural establishment have received pesticide safety training, including general pesticide safety information, before a worker enters any area on the agricultural establishment and within the last 30 days a pesticide subject to the WPS has been applied on the establishment or the restricted entry interval for such pesticide has been in effect.

ASDA applied the pesticide, MOCAP, to the plantain crop on the property on July 24, 2007. The inspection took place on August 23, 2007 that is 31 days after the application of the pesticide. According to 40 CFR § 170.130, when a pesticide covered by WPS has been applied the agricultural employer has to assure that workers receive pesticide safety training before any worker enters any area within 30 days a pesticide has been applied. At the moment of the inspection there were no workers present at the property because the employees were working on other farm, and the inspection took place on

day 31, Respondent didn't had the obligation of assurance that workers received the pesticide safety training at the moment that the inspection took place. Respondent was not in violation of 40 CFR § 170.130.

ASDA applied the pesticide, TILT, to the plantain crop on the property on November 20, 2007. A second inspection at the property took place on December 13, 2007. During that inspection and after more than 1 month of the application of the pesticide there were no workers at the property because the property was about to be returned to its owner. Due to that fact Respondent didn't had to assure that workers received pesticide safety training. Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.130.

FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G) prohibits the use of registered pesticides in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.

The inspection of August 23, 2007 took place 31 days after the application of the pesticide known as MOCAP and during that inspection there were no workers near the property object of this complaint. When the second inspection took place on December 13, 2007 there were no workers on the property either due to the requirement of return of the property made by the owner. Respondent didn't fail to assure that workers had received pesticide safety training. Respondent did not use a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling. In consequence, Respondent denies responsibility under FIFRA § 12 (a)(2)(G).

COUNT 6: FAILURE TO ASSURE THAT HANDLERS HAVE RECEIVED PESTICIDE SAFETY TRAINING

Respondent didn't hire any "agricultural handler" and has never employed an "agricultural handler". On August 23, 2007 and December 13, 2007 inspections there was no "handler" because respondent has never employed an "agricultural handler". Instead, Respondent made an agreement with the office of the Agricultural Services and Development Administration of Puerto Rico (ASDA) for the application of pesticides. ASDA is a commercial applicator of pesticides.

Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.230 due to the inexistence of the "agricultural handler".

In consequence, there's no use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling and there's no violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G).

COUNTS 7 & 8: FAILURE TO DISPLAY PESTICIDE SAFETY INFORMATION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE INFORMATION FOR WORKERS

According to 40 CFR § 170.135, when workers are on an agricultural establishment and within the last 30 days, a pesticide has been applied on the establishment or a restricted-entry interval has been in effect, the agricultural employer shall display pesticide safety information, including a pesticide safety poster and emergency medical care information.

ASDA applied the pesticide, MOCAP, to the plantain crop on the property on July 24, 2007. The inspection took place on August 23, 2007 that is 31 days after the application of the pesticide. According to 40 CFR § 170.135, when a pesticide covered by WPS has been applied the agricultural employer shall display pesticide safety information within 30 days. At the moment of the inspection there were no workers present at the property or near the property because they were working on another farm, and the inspection took place on day 31 since the application of the pesticide, Respondent didn't had the obligation of displaying pesticide safety information the day that the inspection took place. Respondent was not in violation of the WPS at 40 CFR § 170.135.

ASDA applied the pesticide, TILT, to the plantain crop on the property on November 20, 2007. A second inspection at the property took place on December 13, 2007. During that inspection and after more than 1 month of the application of the pesticide there were no workers at the property because the farm was next to be returned to the owner of the property. Due to that fact Respondent didn't had to display pesticide safety information. Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.135.

FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G) prohibits the use of registered pesticides in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.

The inspection of August 23, 2007 took place 31 days after the application of the pesticide known as MOCAP and during that month there were no workers near the property object of this complaint. When the second inspection took place on December 13, 2007 there were no workers on the property either because the farm was about to be returned to the owner. Respondent didn't fail to display pesticide safety information about MOCAP and TILT. Respondent did not use a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling. In consequence, Respondent denies responsibility under FIFRA § 12 (a)(2)(G).

COUNTS 9 & 10: FAILURE TO DISPLAY PESTICIDE SAFETY INFORMATION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE INFORMATION FOR HANDLERS

Respondent didn't hire any "agricultural handler" and has never employed an "agricultural handler". On August 23, 2007 and December 13, 2007 inspections there was no "handler" because respondent has never employed an "agricultural handler". Instead, Respondent made an agreement with the office of the Agricultural Services and Development Administration of Puerto Rico (ASDA) for the application of pesticides. ASDA is a commercial applicator of pesticides.

Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.235 due to the inexistence of the "agricultural handler".

In consequence, there's no use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling and there's no violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G).

COUNTS 11 & 12: FAILURE TO PROVIDE DECONTAMINATION SUPPLIES TO WORKERS

The WPS at 40 CFR § 170.150(a) & (b), requires that agricultural employers provide decontamination supplies for workers to wash off pesticides and pesticide residues during their performance of any activity within 30 days of a pesticide application.

ASDA applied the pesticide, MOCAP, to the plantain crop on the property on July 24, 2007. The first inspection took place on August 23, 2007. At the moment of the inspection there were no workers present at the property or near the property because they were working on another farm but Respondent had decontamination supplies available for its workers and anyone who needed it.

ASDA applied the pesticide, TILT, to the plantain crop on the property on November 20, 2007. A second inspection at the property took place on December 13, 2007. During that inspection and after more than 1 month of the application of the pesticide there were no workers at the property because the farm was next to be returned to the owner of the property, anyways Respondent had decontamination supplies available for its workers or anyone who needed it.

When Respondent operated the property subject of this complaint, he had decontamination supplies **reasonably accessible to workers**. The decontamination supplies were not in the farm but next to it, were the workers used to get settled to begin

the work every day and were the workers changed before and after work. There was a first aid kit, plenty of water, soap, single use towels and available clothing in case of contamination. All that in compliance with 40 CFR § 170.150(a),(b) & (c).

There is no violation of the WPS at 40 CFR § 170.150(b)(1), (3) & (4) and 170.150(c) because the agricultural employer had the decontamination supplies available and reasonably accessible to the workers. The decontamination supplies available were plenty of water, soap, single use towels and clothing.

FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G) prohibits the use of registered pesticides in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.

Respondent had the decontamination supplies available and reasonably accessible to workers in case of contamination, clearly in compliance with WPS. Respondent did not use a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling. In consequence, Respondent denies responsibility under FIFRA § 12 (a)(2)(G).

COUNTS 13 & 14: FAILURE TO PROVIDE DECONTAMINATION SUPPLIES TO HANDLERS

Respondent didn't hire any "agricultural handler" and has never employed an "agricultural handler". On August 23, 2007 and December 13, 2007 inspections there was no "handler" because respondent has never employed an "agricultural handler". Instead, Respondent made an agreement with the office of the Agricultural Services and Development Administration of Puerto Rico (ASDA) for the application of pesticides. ASDA is a commercial applicator of pesticides.

Respondent denies responsibility under 40 CFR § 170.250(b)(1),(3) & (4) and 170.250(c) due to the inexistence of the "agricultural handler".

In consequence, there's no use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling and there's no violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G).

COUNTS 15, 16 & 17: FAILURE TO FOLLOW PESTICIDE LABEL

FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G) prohibits the use of registered pesticides in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.

The plastic containers found on the farm were not property of Respondent and he didn't authorize the presence of those containers on the farm. Before the inspection, Respondent had not seen those containers. Respondent and the agricultural workers didn't handle any pesticide. Instead, Respondent has contracted services for that purposes.

Respondent denies responsibility under FIFRA § 12 (a)(2)(g).

II- RELEVANT INFORMATION:

1. Respondent doesn't speak or understands English and the inspectors came talking in English. Thus, the Respondent didn't understand anything that the inspectors said in any of the inspections.
2. The inspectors came in a harsh manner. The Respondent felt threatened by their behavior and didn't understand the reasons of it.
3. Respondent had a small business dedicated to the production of plantains until August 2008.
4. Respondent dedicated all his productive life to the agriculture.
5. Respondent had to stop the business because of the overcome of a disability and other health issues, and because of the increase of production related costs. In addition, ASDA stopped the credit because respondent could not pay for the services offered by that agency. In consequence, the services offered by ASDA were no longer offered. Actually, Respondent has a debt with ASDA of $4,331.13[1] and has not been able to pay that debt.
   Due to all those circumstances, Respondent had to stop the agricultural business.
6. Since August 2008 Respondent doesn't engage in any agricultural activities and he has not received any economic benefits since then. At that time, he had to sell the plantain crop and the money received from that business transaction was used to pay part of the debts. Due to that he has nothing earned.
7. Respondent can't work, isn't receiving any income, doesn't have any savings left, doesn't have bank accounts, and he has not any property left. As a consequence, he's encountering serious economical issues. The only things that Respondent has left are debts.

[1] View ATTACHMENT 1 at the end of the document.

III- CONCLUSION

As exposed, Respondent has not incurred in any violation of the Worker Protection Standard (WPS) regulations or the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Thus, Respondent is not responsible of any of the violations alleged in the Complaint, and should not be object of any civil penalty.

In case that Respondent is found responsible for any of the counts alleged in the Complaint, although Respondent has not incurred in any violation of the WPS regulations or FIFRA, Respondent respectfully requests that his economic insolvency is taken into account and therefore significantly decrease any penalty.

Respectfully,



Aurito Gómez López

IV- ATTACHMENTS:

1. Detail of services and payments to account emitted by ASDA
   (DETALLE DE SERVICIOS Y PAGOS REALIZADOS A SU CUENTA)

ATTACHMENT 1

ESTADO LIBRE ASOCIADO DE PUERTO RICO

Administración de Servicios y Desarrollo Agropecuario

PROT. CULTIVOS-CONTROL GARRAPATAS

REGION DE CAGUAS

27 de Agosto de 2009

Aurito Gómez López
Apartado 1205
Las Piedras

DETALLE DE SERVICIOS Y PAGOS REALIZADOS A SU CUENTA

A petición suya detallo los servicios prestados y pagos realizados a partir del 16 de enero del 2004. Además detallo la deuda existente con Nuestro Programa.

Servicios Prestados 2004

• 16 enero 2004	Cert. 50001	$625.00
• 13 febrero 2004	Cert. 50024	$140.00
• 24 marzo 2004	Cert. 34208	$140.00
• 31 marzo 2004	Cert. 34215	$250.00
• 14 abril 2004	Cert. 34225	$625.00
• 27 abril 2004	Cert. 34235	$140.00
• 18 mayo 2004	Cert. 34905	$140.00
• 20 mayo 2004	Cert. 34907	$625.00
• 7 junio 2004	Cert. 34920	$450.00
• 12 julio 2004	Cert. 34945	$500.00
• 14 julio 2004	Cert. 34946	$400.00
• 10 agosto 2004	Cert. 34410	$140.00
• 31 agosto 2004	Cert. 34429	$140.00
• 4 octubre 2004	Cert. 34450	$500.00
• 8 octubre 2004	Cert. 34705	$152.00
• 29 octubre 2004	Cert. 34719	$450.00

Las facturas detalladas fueron pagadas con los recibos que detallo a continuación:

• 3 agosto 2005	Rec. 228464	$967.75
• 20 junio 2006	Rec. 64984	$1,204.43
• 23 agosto 2006	Rec. 69494	$2,283.59
• 22 septiembre 2006	Rec. 72563	$693.08

Todos los pagos fueron por Descuentos de Nóminas.

Continuación Servicios 2004

• 1 noviembre 2004	Cert. 34720	$750.00
• 4 noviembre 2004	Cert. 34721	$140.00
• 15 noviembre 2004	Cert. 34729	$140.00
• 22 noviembre 2004	Cert. 34733	$140.00

Servicios Prestados 2005

• 18 enero 2005	Cert. 59717	$600.00
• 19 enero 2005	Cert. 59718	$400.00
• 25 abril 2005	Cert. 59331	$750.00
• 28 abril 2005	Cert. 59334	$140.00
• 29 abril 2005	Cert. 59335	$140.00

Las facturas detalladas fueron pagadas con los recibos que detallo a continuación:

• 8 agosto 2005	Rec. 228602	$805.70
• 27 octubre 2005	Rec. 228671	$1,531.73
• 22 septiembre 2005	Rec. 72564	$993.72

Todos los pagos fueron por Descuentos de Nóminas.

Continuación Servicios 2005

• 3 mayo 2005	Cert. 59338	$140.00
22 septiembre 2006	Rec. 72566	Desc. Nóminas
• 9 mayo 2005	Cert. 59342	$1,000.00
22 septiembre 2006	Rec. 72565	Desc. Nóminas
• 17 agosto 2005	Cert. 51971	$625.00
22 septiembre 2006	Rec. 72567	Desc. Nóminas
• 9 septiembre 2005	Cert. 51981	$800.00
22 septiembre 2006	Rec. 72568	Desc. Nóminas
27 septiembre 2007	Rec. 101263	Desc. Nóminas
• 28 octubre 2005	Cert. No. 52258	$140.00
25 agosto 2006	Rec. 251294M	Desc. Nóminas
• 31 octubre 2005	Cert. No. 52259	$400.00
25 agosto 2006	Rec. 251294M	Desc. Nóminas
27 septiembre 2007	Rec. 101264	Desc. Nóminas
• 4 noviembre 2005	Cert. 52264	$250.00
Rec. 101265	Rec. 101265	Desc. Nóminas
• 20 diciembre 2005	Cert. 52296	$800.00
• 21 diciembre 2005	Cert. 52297	$400.00
27 septiembre 2007	Rec. 101266	Desc. Nóminas
	Rec. 101277	Desc. Nóminas

Servicios Prestados 2006

• 31 enero 2006	Cert. 36012	$114.00
27 septiembre 2007	Rec. 101278	Desc. Nóminas
• 24 febrero 2006	Cert. 36024	$625.00
27 septiembre 2007	Rec. 101279	Desc. Nóminas
• 28 marzo 2006	Cert. 36045	$600.00
• 29 marzo 36046	Cert. 36046	$100.00
27 septiembre 2007	Rec. 101280	Desc. Nóminas
• 7 abril 2006	Cert. 43803	$120.00
5 diciembre 2007	Rec. 105834	Desc. Nóminas
• 15 mayo 2006	Cert. 43822	$625.00
5 diciembre 2007	Rec. 105835	Desc. Nóminas
• 23 mayo 2006	Cert. 43831	$120.00
5 diciembre 2007	Rec. 105836	Desc. Nóminas
• 23 junio 2006	Cert. 44056	$800.00
5 diciembre 2007	Rec. 105837	Desc. Nóminas
• 4 agosto 2006	Cert. 44270	$800.00
5 diciembre 2007	Rec. 105830	Desc. Nóminas
3 marzo 2008	Rec. 111084	Desc. Nóminas
• 23 agosto 2006	Cert. 44287	$112.00
3 marzo 2008	Rec. 111085	Desc. Nóminas
• 15 septiembre 2006	Cert. 44353	$112.00
3 marzo 2008	Rec. 111087	Desc. Nóminas
• 18 septiembre 2006	Cert. 44354	$112.00
3 marzo 2008	Rec. 111088	Desc. Nóminas
• 22 septiembre 2006	Cert. 44361	$500.00
3 marzo 2008	Rec. 111090	Desc. Nóminas
17 junio 2008	Rec. 119910	Desc. Nóminas
• 3 octubre 2006	Cert. 44370	$362.00
17 junio 2008	Rec. 119911	Desc. Nóminas
• 18 octubre 2006	Cert. 44379	$625.00
• 20 octubre 2006	Cert. 44381	$352.00
17 junio 2008	Rec. 119915	Desc. Nóminas
11 agosto 2008	Rec. 275925	Pago a Recaudador Las Piedras
26 agosto 2008	Rec. 125038	Desc. Nóminas
• 30 octubre 2006	Cert. 44388	$900.00
26 agosto 2008	Rec. 125039	Desc. Nóminas
• 10 noviembre 2006	Cert. 60704	$960.00
26 agosto 2008	Rec. 125040	Desc. Nóminas

Servicios Prestados 2007

• 1 febrero 2007 26 agosto 2008	Cert. 60747 Rec. 125041	$960.00 Desc. Nóminas

De esta factura se debe la cantidad de $518.13

• 21 marzo 2007	Cert. 61184	$112.00
• 24 mayo 2007	Cert. 69529	$112.00
• 5 junio 2007	Cert. 69539	$112.00
• 7 junio 2007	Cert. 69542	$450.00
• 9 junio 2007	Cert. 61211	$960.00
• 24 junio 2007	Cert. 61220	$375.00
• 13 agosto 2007	Cert. 61231	$140.00
• 21 septiembre 2007	Cert. 69712	$480.00
• 27 septiembre 2007	Cert. 69715	$720.00
• 5 octubre 2007 17 octubre 2007	Cert. 69724 Rec. 255866	$156.00 Desc. Nóminas
• 23 octubre 2007 2 noviembre 2007	Cert. 69738 Rec. 251160	$120.00 Desc. Nóminas
• 30 octubre 2007 23 enero 2008	Cert. 69744 Rec. 251161	$114.00 Desc. Nóminas
• 20 noviembre 2007 4 diciembre 2007	Cert. 69811 Rec. 251168	$108.00 Desc. Nóminas

Servicios Prestados 2008

• 20 febrero 2008 4 marzo 2008	Cert. 69923 Rec. 251203	$120.00 Desc. Nóminas
• 30 julio 2008	Cert. 84277	$120.00
• 31 julio 2008	Cert. 84279	$120.00
• 11 agosto 2008	Cert. 44382	$112.00

Información adicional acerca de su cuenta comuníquese a nuestra oficina al 787-744-1921 ó 787-743-8731. El balance adeudado al momento de este informe el $4.331.13.

Certifico correcto,

Agro. Modesto Vázquez Rosario
Coordinador Servicios Agropecuarios
Prog. Protección de Cultivos-Control Garrapatas
Región de Caguas