

FILED  
Clerk  
District Court

JUN 30 2017

for the Northern Mariana Islands  
By   
(Deputy Clerk)

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS**

OBAYDUL HOQUE BHUIYAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

Case No.: 14-cv-00013

**DECISION AND ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This is a civil case brought by Plaintiff Obaydul Hoque Bhuiyan (“Bhuiyan”) against the United States pursuant to the Federal Torts Claims Act (“FTCA”), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671-2680 and a claim for declaratory relief, 28 U.S.C. § 2201. Bhuiyan alleges that the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (“USCIS”) negligently granted his I-360 application and later revoked it, and that he relied on the grant to his detriment as he did not timely seek any other immigration status in order to establish lawful presence in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. (First Amended Complaint (FAC) ¶¶ 33-34, ECF No. 16.) He further seeks a declaration that he was lawfully present in the CNMI during the period of federal immigration control. (*Id.* at 11, ¶ 2.) Presently before the Court is the Government’s motion to dismiss the entire

FAC for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The matter has been fully briefed.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons set forth below, the motion is granted.

## II. BACKGROUND

Bhuiyan is a citizen of Bangladesh who first came to the CNMI in 1996. (FAC ¶¶ 2, 4.) At that time, U.S. immigration laws did not apply in the CNMI. Instead, the CNMI Government administered and enforced its own immigration laws. From 1996 to 2004, Bhuiyan's immigration status under CNMI law was that of a nonresident worker. (FAC ¶ 5.) On or about March 5, 2004, Bhuiyan married Ana Atalig, a U.S. citizen residing in the CNMI. (FAC ¶ 6.) After his marriage, Bhuiyan applied for and was issued an Immediate Relative of a Citizen ("IR") permit by the CNMI government, which he renewed in 2005 and 2006. (FAC ¶ 7.) On July 7, 2006, approximately two years and three months after their marriage, Bhuiyan's wife Ana died. (FAC ¶ 8.) Following Ana's death, Bhuiyan continued to lawfully reside in the CNMI under his IR permit from 2007 to 2009. (FAC ¶ 9.) In 2009, Bhuiyan received an umbrella permit<sup>2</sup> from the CNMI government based on his IR status, which conferred upon him lawful immigration status through November 27, 2011. (FAC ¶ 9; Ex. A, ECF No. 16-1.)

In 2008, the U.S. Congress enacted Title VII of the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 ("CNRA"), *see* Pub. L. No. 110-229, which provided that federal immigration laws would apply in the CNMI beginning on November 28, 2009 and that federal law, including the CNRA's

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 18; Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss ("Memo"), ECF No. 19; Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss ("Opposition"), ECF No. 22; Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss ("Reply"), ECF No. 25; Plaintiff's Surreply to New Issues Raised in Reply Brief ("Surreply"), ECF No. 32.

<sup>2</sup> During the last weeks of immigration control by the CNMI government, the CNMI Department of Labor issued two-year conditional permits to alien workers to allow them to stay and work in the CNMI until November 27, 2011. These permits were commonly referred to as "umbrella permits."

1 transitional provisions, would “supersede and replace all laws, provisions, or programs of the  
2 Commonwealth relating to the admission of aliens and the removal of aliens from the  
3 Commonwealth.” *Id.* sec. 702(a), § 6(f). Under the CNRA’s grandfather provisions, an alien  
4 lawfully present under the CNMI immigration laws as of the program’s effective transition date  
5 may remain in the CNMI until the expiration of the alien’s authorized period of stay or until  
6 November 27, 2011, whichever is earlier. *See* 48 U.S.C. § 1806(e)(2).

8 Before his umbrella permit expired, Bhuiyan filed a Form I-360 (Petition for Amerasian,  
9 Widow(er), or Special Immigrant) seeking immigrant classification as a widower of a U.S. citizen.  
10 (FAC ¶ 16; Ex. C, ECF No. 16-3.) On or about September 27, 2011, USCIS approved Bhuiyan’s  
11 Form I-360 petition. (FAC ¶ 17; Ex. D, ECF No. 16-4.) About a month later, Bhuiyan filed a Form  
12 I-485 Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status. (FAC ¶ 18.) On November  
13 27, 2011, Bhuiyan’s umbrella permit expired. (FAC ¶ 9.) In reliance on the approval of his Form  
14 I-360, Bhuiyan did not apply for CW-1 transitional worker nonimmigrant status or any other  
15 federal immigration status which would allow him to lawfully reside in the CNMI. (FAC ¶ 19.)

18 On or about August 17, 2012, USCIS revoked Bhuiyan’s previously approved Form I-360,  
19 stating that it had been “inadvertently approved” because Bhuiyan was statutorily ineligible on  
20 two separate grounds: (i) he had been married for more than two years on the date he became a  
21 widower, and (ii) he had not filed the Form I-360 within two years of his wife’s death. (FAC ¶ 20;  
22 Ex. E, ECF No. 16-5.) Following the revocation, USCIS denied Bhuiyan’s Form I-485 application  
23 and denied his application for humanitarian parole. (FAC ¶¶ 21-22; Ex. F, ECF No. 16-6; Ex. H,  
24 ECF No. 16-8.) USCIS immediately issued a notice to Bhuiyan to appear for removal proceedings  
25 for failing to possess a valid unexpired immigrant visa. (FAC ¶ 23; Ex. I, ECF No. 16-9.) On or  
26 about May 8, 2013, USCIS filed a motion to administratively close removal proceedings against  
27  
28

Bhuiyan for a period of six months but reserved the right to reopen the matter at any time. It never did so. (FAC ¶ 24; ECF No. 16-10.) USCIS then granted Bhuiyan humanitarian parole-in-place in the CNMI for a period of one year through December 1, 2015. (FAC ¶ 28.)

### III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 6, 2014, Bhuiyan commenced the instant action, and after a series of status reports over a period of two years due to settlement negotiations, filed his First Amended Complaint on June 27, 2016, invoking this Court's jurisdiction pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1). (FAC ¶ 1.) Bhuiyan seeks damages for negligence, a declaration that his presence in the CNMI was lawful from November 28, 2009, through November 3, 2015, and a prohibitory injunction barring the Government and its agents from asserting in any context that he had accrued unlawful presence during that time period. (FAC at 11, Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1-3.) USCIS reopened Bhuiyan's previously revoked I-360 visa petition, and the pending removal proceeding was terminated without prejudice. (Memo at 4; Ex. L, Order of the Immigration Judge, ECF No. 16-12.) On November 14, 2014, USCIS also reopened Bhuiyan's Form I-485 petition. (Memo at 4; Ex. 1, Screenshot of Case Status re I-485, ECF No. 19-1.) Bhuiyan administratively appealed the revocation of his Form I-360 to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). (Memo at 4; Ex. 2, Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA Decision"), ECF No. 19-2.) On November 3, 2015, Bhuiyan departed the CNMI to return to his country of citizenship, Bangladesh. (FAC ¶ 29.) Following his departure, the BIA dismissed Bhuiyan's appeal of the DHS Director's decision revoking the previously approved Form I-360 visa petition as meritless. (*See* BIA Decision.)

### IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Government moves to dismiss pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. When a party files a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter

jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1), the non-moving party bears the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction. *Leite v. Crane Co.*, 749 F.3d 1117, 1121 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Harris v. Rand*, 682 F.3d 846, 851 (9th Cir. 2012)). A motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1) for lack of jurisdiction may be facial or factual. In a facial attack, the defendant accepts the truth of a plaintiff's allegations but asserts that they are insufficient to invoke federal jurisdiction. See *White v. Lee*, 227 F.3d 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000). In reviewing a facial attack, the court accepts the plaintiff's allegations as true and draws all reasonable inferences in plaintiff's favor in determining whether the allegations are sufficient to invoke the court's jurisdiction. *Pride v. Correa*, 719 F.3d 1130, 1133 (9th Cir. 2013).

On a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), the Court will dismiss a claim if the plaintiff fails to plead "enough facts to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). The Court must construe the allegations and facts in the complaint in the plaintiff's favor, but "courts are not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555-56 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

## V. DISCUSSION

### A. Bhuiyan's FTCA Claim

The Government seeks dismissal of Bhuiyan's FTCA claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, and failure to state a claim pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1),

12(b)(3), and 12(b)(6), respectively. (Reply at 2.)<sup>3</sup> The court will address each of the arguments below.

*I. Sovereign Immunity and the Private Person, Local Law Analog Requirement*

The United States maintains sovereign immunity, except to the extent that it consents to be sued, and the terms of its consent are within a court's jurisdiction to hear the suit. *Hornbeck Offshore Transp., LLC v. United States*, 563 F. Supp. 2d 205, 209 (D.D.C. 2008) (citing *Lehman v. Nakshian*, 453 U.S. 156, 160 (1981) (internal citations omitted)); *Hodge v. Dalton*, 107 F.3d 705, 707 (9th Cir. 1997). One instance where the United States consents to be sued is in the FTCA that provides a limited waiver of sovereign immunity under which individual citizens can sue the United States for certain tort claims. The FTCA subjects the United States to liability only "in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances." 28 U.S.C. § 2674; *see id.* § 1346(b)(1) (conferring exclusive jurisdiction on federal district courts for FTCA damages claims "under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred"). The FTCA "does not create a cause of action against the United States; it allows the United States to be liable if a private party would be liable under similar circumstances in the relevant jurisdiction." *Hornbeck Offshore Transp., LLC v. United States*, 569 F.3d 506, 508 (D.C. Cir. 2009); *see also Woodbridge Plaza v. Bank of Irvine*, 815 F.2d 538, 543 (9th Cir. 1987) ("the FTCA applies only if state law would impose liability on private persons under similar circumstances"). While the

---

<sup>3</sup> The Government's motion to dismiss initially addressed the original complaint, not the FAC. Bhuiyan's opposition was therefore mainly based on clarifying the Government's misunderstanding of his claims. The Government's reply contains its actual arguments to the FAC, and Bhuiyan's surreply contains his rebuttal to said arguments.

private person analog need not be exact, the court’s job in applying the standard is “to find the most reasonable analogy.” *LaBarge v. Mariposa Cty.*, 798 F.2d 364, 367 (9th Cir. 1986); *see also Westbay Steel, Inc. v. United States*, 970 F.2d 648, 650 (9th Cir. 1992). When there is no analogous private tort liability, the district court must dismiss the action for lack of jurisdiction. *See e.g., Akutowicz v. United States*, 859 F.2d 1122, 1125-26 (2d Cir. 1988) (affirming the district court’s dismissal of the FTCA claim for failure to satisfy the private analog requirement with respect to the government’s allegedly wrongful revocation of citizenship).

## 2. Local Law Requirement as Applied to Bhuiyan

Here, the specific Government action that underlies Bhuiyan’s putative claim is “the negligent approval of his [I-360] application.” (FAC ¶ 35.) Bhuiyan alleges that the Government: (1) had a duty to exercise reasonable care in the processing and determination of applications for benefits and (2) breached that duty. (FAC ¶¶ 31-32.) This is the only Government action to which Bhuiyan’s claim extends.

The Second Circuit’s opinion in *Akutowicz v. United States* is particularly instructive in evaluating the Government’s motion to dismiss the instant case. *Akutowicz* involved a citizen challenging the Department of State’s wrongful revocation of his U.S. citizenship. *Akutowicz*, 859 F.2d at 1124. The Department of State initiated a five-year investigation into whether Akutowicz had expatriated himself under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. *Id.* at 1123. It determined that he did, and therefore revoked his U.S. citizenship. *Id.* When Akutowicz appealed the revocation, the Department’s Board of Appellate Review reversed the Department’s decision and reinstated Akutowicz’s citizenship. *Id.* at 1124. Akutowicz then filed suit pursuant to the FTCA alleging, *inter alia*, that the Department “wrongfully fabricated and distorted information relevant to his case, enabling it negligently to deprive him of his citizenship.” *Id.*

1 Applying the requisite FTCA standard, the Second Circuit found that “the withdrawal of a person’s  
2 citizenship constitutes a quasi-adjudicative action for which no private analog exists.” *Id.* at 1126.  
3 Furthermore, the Second Circuit pointed out that neither party raised any analogous private cause  
4 of action. *Id.*

5  
6 Similarly, this Court is unable to find a duty under CNMI or Vermont law—and Bhuiyan’s  
7 brief likewise fails to submit one—that is analogous to the Government’s alleged duty to  
8 accurately process immigration benefits. Both jurisdictions are mentioned because the  
9 Government claims that Vermont is “the place where the act or omission occurred” pursuant to 28  
10 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1) since USCIS granted Bhuiyan’s visa petition there. (Reply at 3.) On the other  
11 side, Bhuiyan received notice in the CNMI of his visa petition’s approval and subsequent  
12 revocation. (Approval Notice for I-360, ECF No. 16-4; USCIS Letter Revoking Approval, ECF  
13 No. 16-5.) Bhuiyan has not pointed to CNMI or Vermont state law where the court imposed a duty  
14 of care on a private person analogous to the Government’s duty of care to accurately process  
15 applications for immigration benefits. *See Butt v. United States*, 714 F. Supp. 2d 217, 218-219 (D.  
16 Mass. 2010) (FTCA claim dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because “plaintiff has pointed to no  
17 Massachusetts law which imposes a duty of care on a private person in a situation that is analogous  
18 to the government’s failure to timely process a visa application.”). Without a private analog under  
19 CNMI or Vermont law, such a claim must fail.

20  
21  
22  
23 Bhuiyan cites to three cases from other jurisdictions in which the courts have recognized a  
24 duty of care in the processing of applications, but these cases cite to the negligence law of the  
25 respective states and highlight state case law recognizing when a duty of care arises in a negligence  
26 action. Bhuiyan cannot simply state that the United States owed him a duty; he must demonstrate  
27 that a similar situation, under state law, would confer an analogous duty. The government action  
28



1 challenged by Bhuiyan does not have a reasonable private analog, under CNMI or Vermont law,  
2 such that the United States may be held liable under the FTCA. Accordingly, the Court lacks  
3 subject matter jurisdiction to hear Bhuiyan's FTCA claim.<sup>4</sup>

4  
5 *B. Bhuiyan's Claim for Declaratory Relief Regarding the Accrual of Unlawful*  
6 *Presence in the CNMI from November 28, 2009 through November 3, 2015*

7 The Government seeks dismissal of Bhuiyan's claim for declaratory relief regarding the  
8 accrual of unlawful presence in the CNMI as moot. (Reply at 10.) The Government argues that the  
9 time is not ripe for Bhuiyan to seek judicial relief relating to a future determination of unlawful  
10 presence in the CNMI. (Memo at 9.) The Government points to the fact that Bhuiyan has not filed  
11 any immigration application with USCIS that has resulted in a finding of unlawful presence, and  
12 that USCIS does not pre-adjudicate applications that may be filed at some point. (*Id.*) Bhuiyan  
13 contends that his claim is ripe for adjudication in order "to resolve a looming issue *before* it comes  
14 to a head in this way." (Opp'n at 4-5.) Bhuiyan further argues that ripeness in the declaratory  
15 judgment context means looking at "whether the facts alleged, under all the circumstances, show  
16 that there is a substantial controversy, between parties having adverse legal interests, of sufficient  
17 immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment." (Opp'n at 6) (internal  
18 citations omitted). Bhuiyan points to the removal proceedings as evidence of the adversity of  
19 interest, and the administrative termination of such proceedings without prejudice as evidence that  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

---

25 <sup>4</sup> The Court further acknowledges the Government's other arguments for dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6), including  
26 how Bhuiyan could not now seek a grant of humanitarian parole-in-place nor an adjustment of status via his Form I-  
27 485 since his voluntary departure from the CNMI during the pendency of this case automatically terminated both  
28 proceedings by operation of law. (Memo at 7-8.) However, Bhuiyan later clarified that he seeks neither form of  
relief in the FAC. (Opp'n at 2-4.) Both arguments are therefore denied. Absent subject matter jurisdiction, the Court  
need not address the Government's motion to dismiss Bhuiyan's FTCA claim for improper venue or failure to state  
a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

1 the issue of unlawful presence remains an open one. (Opp’n at 6.) For the following reasons, the  
2 Court disagrees and grants the Government’s motion to dismiss.

3 Under Article III, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, an action must present a live “case or  
4 controversy” in order to be reviewable by a federal court. *See Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7  
5 (1998). To satisfy this requirement, a litigant must have suffered some actual injury that can be  
6 redressed by a favorable judicial decision. *Iron Arrow Honor Society v. Heckler*, 464 U.S. 67, 70  
7 (1983) (citing *Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Organization*, 426 U.S. 26, 38 (1976)).  
8 The case or controversy must exist at all stages of federal court proceedings. *U.S. Parole Comm’n*  
9 *v. Geraghty*, 445 U.S. 388, 397 (1980).  
10  
11

12 Here, Bhuiyan fails to present any live claim or controversy regarding accrual of unlawful  
13 presence. At no point during his presence in the CNMI did Bhuiyan suffer some actual injury as a  
14 result of a determination by USCIS or its appellate board that he had accrued unlawful presence.  
15 When Bhuiyan appealed the February 4, 2015 decision by USCIS revoking his previously  
16 approved visa petition, the BIA dismissed the appeal on other, unrelated grounds.<sup>5</sup> (BIA Decision  
17 at 2-3, ECF No. 19-2.) Furthermore, when Bhuiyan departed the CNMI on November 3, 2015  
18 while still holding humanitarian parole status, his reopened and pending Form I-360 and Form I-  
19 485 petitions were deemed abandoned by operation of law. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245.2(a)(4)(ii)(A)  
20 (“Except as provided in paragraph (a)(4)(ii)(B) and (C) of this section, the departure of an applicant  
21 who is not under exclusion, deportation, or removal proceedings shall be deemed an abandonment  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

<sup>5</sup> The BIA concluded that the publication upon which Bhuiyan relied merely provided general information about the recently enacted amendment. The BIA further concluded that the amendment was not applicable to Bhuiyan, who could have filed a Form I-360 prior to the amendment but lost the ability to do so by failing to file any time before July 7, 2008. (BIA Decision at 2-3.)

1 of the application constituting grounds for termination of any pending application for adjustment  
 2 of status”); 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e)(1) (“Parole shall be automatically terminated without written notice  
 3 (i) upon the departure from the United States of the alien.”). Bhuiyan therefore fails to point to any  
 4 decision or order, pending or otherwise, resulting in a finding of unlawful presence that has  
 5 triggered a ground of inadmissibility for which this Court can review and provide any relief. In  
 6 addition, the issue of accrual of unlawful presence did not trigger until Bhuiyan left the CNMI; it  
 7 remained a non-issue from the time he initiated this action up until his departure. The Government  
 8 makes further arguments in favor of dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) due to Bhuiyan being statutorily  
 9 ineligible for the immigration benefit he sought. (Memo at 10.) However, because Bhuiyan  
 10 clarifies that he does not dispute USCIS properly revoking his petition, the Court rejects such  
 11 arguments as inapplicable to the FAC. (Opp’n at 4.) Accordingly, the Court dismisses the claim  
 12 for declaratory relief regarding the accrual of unlawful presence in the CNMI for lack of subject  
 13 matter jurisdiction.

## 14 VI. CONCLUSION

15 For the foregoing reasons, the Court grants the Government’s motion to dismiss the entire  
 16 FAC for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1). The Clerk of Court  
 17 is directed to close the case.

18 SO ORDERED this 30th day of June, 2017.

19 

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