



District Court - Sixth Division
One Dorrance Plaza
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 458-5400

LORRAINE ALFONSO
ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR

CASE # _____

RECEIPT FOR SEIZURE & FORFEITURE WARRANT

DATE: 5-22-08

RECEIVED FROM:

RI State Police
Police Department

Sgt. John Lemont
Officer/Trooper

CLERK
MAY 22 2008 11:18

SEIZURE & FORFEITURE COMPLAINT RE:

Shire Corporation alias John/Jane Doe

7 Starline Way

Cranston, RI

Ausela Buiptre
CLERK

Search Warrant

State Ex rel	Member of the Rhode Island State Police Sergeant John D. Lemont	County: Providence
vs. Respondent Shire Corporation, a white cement, one story industrial business building with a green front located at 7 Starline Way in Cranston, RI		TO: An Officer authorized by law to execute the within warrant, _____

Complaint and affidavit having been made to me under oath, Sergeant John D. Lemont and as I am satisfied that there is probable cause for the belief therein set forth that grounds for issuing a search warrant exist, you are hereby commanded diligently to search the place or person herein described for the property specified and to bring such property or articles, and to summon the owner, or keeper thereof, if any be named in the complaint, if to be found by you, to appear before the District Court in the district where such property shall have been seized, namely the 6th Division of the District Court of Rhode Island.

Place or person to be searched **Shire Corporation, 7 Starline Way, Cranston, RI**

Property or articles to be searched for: : **Evidence related to the unauthorized electronic access and unauthorized activity perpetrated upon computer systems owned by the State of Rhode Island and maintained by Plexus Corporation including but not limited to records, communications, logs and data ; records related to the ownership, control, and use of the place of business and/or computer system(s).**

Additionally, refer to Attachment "A" attached hereto and made a part thereof which further defines articles to be searched for and/or seized

Name of owner, or keeper, thereof if known to complainant: : **Shire Corporation, Cranston, RI**

Said warrant shall be served in the daytime within seven (7) days from the issuance hereof, **AND IF NOT SERVED WITHIN SAID TIME TO BE RETURNED FORTHWITH TO A JUDGE SITTING IN THE ABOVE NAMED COURT.**

Property seized by you hereunder shall be safely kept by you under the direction of the Court so long as may be necessary for the purpose of being used as evidence in any case. As soon as may be thereafter, if the same be subject to forfeiture, such further proceedings shall be had thereon for forfeiture as is prescribed by law.

Hereof fail not and **MAKE TRUE RETURN PROMPTLY OF THIS WARRANT TO A JUDGE THERE SITTING** with your doings thereon, accompanied by a written inventory of any property taken to a judge sitting in the above named court.

Issued at Providence in the county of Providence this 12th day of May, A.D. 2008.

at 2:25 PM

Walter Gorman

Judge of the District Court

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RETURN

Warrant received on the 22nd day of May, 2008, from Sgt. Lemont at 6th District

Angela Sposito

Judge Clerk

SUPPLEMENTAL AFFIDAVIT

Your affiant upon oath supplements his prior affidavit dated May 12, 2008 in support of a request for a search warrant in this matter with the following information also, together with the information in the original May 12, 2008 affidavit, he has reason to believe and does believe that grounds for the search warrant continue to exist and states the following facts on which such belief is founded on the following affidavit:


I, John D. Lemont, do say under oath:

I am a member of the Rhode Island State Police and have been continuously employed in that capacity for the past sixteen (16) years. I am currently a member of the Financial Crimes Unit and my duties include the investigation of violations of the General Laws or the State of Rhode Island.

This supplemental affidavit supports a Petition for a Court Order extending the seven (7) day execution time frame set forth in Rule 41 of the Superior Court Rules of Criminal Procedure for a period of one week for the search warrant that was issued in this matter on May 12, 2008, thereby allowing the Rhode Island State Police until May 26, 2008 to execute the search.


I reaffirm the contents of my Affidavit dated May 12, 2008, attached herewith, and supplement the information therein as follows:

Since May 12, 2008, your affiant conferred with David Giardino, President of Plexus Corporation, the Project Management Portal ("PMP") system manager, regarding the subject matter of this investigation and was informed by Mr. Giardino that DOT's PMP system continues to be accessed unlawfully from the same IP address referenced in my Affidavit of May 12, 2008. These additional incidents of unlawful access took place on May 5, 8, and 9 of 2008.



John D. Lemont
Sergeant
Rhode Island State Police
Financial Crimes Unit

In Providence this 19th day of May 2008 before me personally came Sergeant John D. Lemont and made oath to the truth of the foregoing.



Judge of the District Court
5/19/08

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

PROVIDENCE, SC

DISTRICT COURT

In Re: Search Warrant

PETITION TO EXTEND DATE FOR EXECUTION OF SEARCH WARRANT

Now comes the State of Rhode Island, by and through its attorneys, Patrick C. Lynch, Attorney General, and Emily Maranjian, Special Assistant Attorney General, and petitions this Honorable Court to extend the seven (7) day execution time frame for the search warrant issued on May 12, 2008 by Judge Gorman by an additional seven (7) days, for the purpose of allowing the Rhode Island State Police until May 26, 2008 to execute said search warrant. The State provides the following in support of this request:

1. Grounds for issuing a search warrant continue to exist as is evident from the Affidavit of John Lemont dated May 12, 2008 and the Supplemental Affidavit of John Lemont dated May 19, 2008 (attached hereto).
2. The Rhode Island State Police detective most experienced with executing search warrants on computer systems was unavailable for all or most of the past seven days.
3. The detective referenced in paragraph 2 will be available to assist with the execution of the search warrant during the coming week.
4. The State believed it would be significantly more efficient and effective (including in terms of minimizing the potentially disruptive impact on the entity to be searched), to delay the execution of the search warrant until the detective referenced in paragraph 2 was available.

The State therefore respectfully requests that, as to the attached search warrant issued on May 12, 2008 by Judge Walter Gorman, this Honorable Court extend the seven (7) day execution time frame set forth in Rule 41 of the Superior Court Rules of Criminal Procedure

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Complaint to Search and Seize Property / or Person

TO WALTER GORMAN Justice of the Supreme, Superior Court, or Judge of the District Court of the State of Rhode Island.

- a) Sergeant John D. Lemont, Member of the Division of State Police.
- b) _____ a person authorized by law to bring complaints for violation of the law which it is my responsibility to enforce/a person who has a right to possession of the property stolen, embezzled, or obtained by false pretense or pretenses:

ON OATH COMPLAINS THAT:

- (1) Certain property has been stolen or embezzled, or obtained by false pretenses, or pretenses, with intent to cheat or defraud within this state or elsewhere.
- (2) Certain property has been kept, suffered to be kept, concealed, deposited, or possessed in violation of law, or for the purpose of violating the law;
- (3) Certain property is designed or intended for use, or is or has been used in violation of law, or as a means of committing a violation of law;

and prays that a warrant to search for and seize said property/person be issued and if the same be subject to forfeiture, that the property be forfeited.

The person/property or articles to be searched for and/or seized is described as follows:

Evidence related to the unauthorized electronic access and unauthorized activity perpetrated upon computer systems owned by the State of Rhode Island and maintained by Plexus Corporation including but not limited to records, communications, logs and data ; records related to the ownership, control, and use of the place of business and/or computer system(s).

Additionally, refer to Attachment "A" attached hereto and made a part thereof which further defines articles to be searched for and/or seized to include: hardware, software, computer related documentation, records, documents and materials, passwords and data security devices.

The name of the owner or keeper, thereof (if known) is: **Shire Corporation, 7 Starline Way, Cranston, RI**

The place or person to be searched is described as follows: **Shire Corporation, a white cement, one story industrial business building with a green front located at 7 Starline Way in Cranston, RI**

Subscribed and sworn to before me:

Date 12 MAY 2008


Walter Gorman
Judge/Justice

[Signature]
Complainant

by an additional seven (7) days, for the purpose of allowing the Rhode Island State Police until May 26, 2008 to execute said search warrant.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

**PATRICK C. LYNCH
ATTORNEY GENERAL**

By 
Emily Moranjian
Special Assistant Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 274-4400

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

PROVIDENCE, SC

DISTRICT COURT

In Re: Search Warrant

ORDER

The above-entitled matter came on to be heard before Judge _____ of the District Court of the State of Rhode Island on May 19, 2008, and after due consideration thereon, it is hereby:

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED

Probable cause for the attached search warrant continues to exist.

The seven (7) day execution time frame for the attached search warrant is extended by an additional seven (7) days, thereby allowing the Rhode Island State Police until May 26, 2008 to execute the search warrant.

ENTERED:



JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT

5/19/08

PER ORDER:

CLERK

Presented by:



Emily Maranjian
Special Assistant Attorney General

Dated: May 19, 2008

AFFIDAVIT

Your affiant upon oath states that he has reason to believe and does believe that grounds for such warrant exist and states the following facts on which such belief is founded on the following affidavit

I, John D. Lemont, do say under oath:

I am a member of the Rhode Island State Police and have been continuously employed in that capacity for the past sixteen (16) years. I am currently a member of the Financial Crimes Unit and my duties include the investigation of violations of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island.

This affidavit supports a search warrant pertaining to a violation of RIGL 11-52-2, Unlawfull Access to a Computer System.

Involved Parties / Definitions

Shire Corporation is a contractor currently performing construction services for the Barrington Bridge project under a State of Rhode Island, Department of Transportation contract. Laura Gammino is the President of Shire Corporation. Anthony Mesiti is the Construction Manager for Shire Corporation

Plexus Corporation is a vendor fulfilling a State of Rhode Island, Department of Transportation (DOT) contract to provide computer software development and computer database management services located at 434 Smith Street in Providence, RI. David Giardino is the President of Plexus Corporation. Mark Fondi is a computer programmer for Plexus Corporation.

Project Management Portal (PMP) is the computerized propriarty software developed by Plexus Corporation under a State of Rhode Island, Department of Transportation contract. PMP is a computer system which organizes and tracks DOT construction projects throughout the State of Rhode Island. PMP was tested in November of 2005 and placed into full use in January of 2006.

The PMP system was developed and is maintained by Plexus Corporation under a State of Rhode Island contract. PMP is utilized by the Department of Transportation to maintain, control, monitor, and supervise all ongoing construction projects within the State of Rhode Island. PMP is designed to have different levels (or tiers) of access.

Outside contractors, performing construction work under a state contract would have limited access to the PMP system in order to monitor *their own* projects, submit requests for information, document change orders, and monitor progress payments.

DOT employees and engineers are authorized a more global access to monitor *all* construction projects ongoing within the State, regardless of the contractor. Further, DOT employees can engage in confidential communications concerning construction projects with inside and outside engineers through the PMP system.

A limited number of Plexus employees have complete access and edit authority within the system.

One more specific use of the PMP system is that outside contractors can access and utilize part of the system to submit a Request for Information (RFI) to a DOT project manager. This RFI can be to request a change order or clarify or resolve a construction issue. DOT project managers can then take that question and respond directly to the contractor or forward that question to the DOT engineers or design department employees who can respond confidentially to the DOT project manager. These internal communications between the DOT employees and engineers are meant to be confidential and can only be accessed through the PMP system by a properly authorized DOT employee. The PMP system is designed specifically so that contractors would not have access to DOT internal communications regarding any project.

Initial Complaint

On April 24, 2008, Attorney Lisa Martinelli, Executive Counsel for the Department of Transportation (DOT), contacted the State Police to report an unlawful access to a DOT Database. Attorney Martinelli stated that several of their employees had become concerned over certain private information having been obtained by an outside contractor doing construction work under a Rhode Island State DOT contract.

Mike Swift is a Resident Engineer and project manager for the Barrington River Bridge Project and the Warren River Bridge Project. Mike Swift's job duties include monitoring the bridge projects through the use of the PMP system. Swift routinely receives questions submitted through the PMP by Anthony Mesiti of the Shire Corporation. Swift has routinely answered these questions or forwarded them to DOT design engineers for further discussion and clarification prior to replying to Shire / Mesiti.

Prior to the events of April 2008 Swift, and others within DOT, believed that Anthony Mesiti and Shire Corporation were obtaining inside information regarding other construction projects within the State. This suspicion was based in part on two specific examples.

The first involved a request by Anthony Mesiti of the Shire Corporation for additional payments for grout work at the Barrington Bridge Project. Mike Swift in his initial response stated that he felt the grout work was included in the initial contract specifications and was not an additional expense. Mesiti responded by providing two examples of other existing construction projects where grout work was accepted by DOT as an additional expense (although the circumstances were not identical). Swift wondered how Shire was able to obtain this very specific payment / change order information from other contractors on other construction sites. Initially Swift believed that this information was given to Shire by the other contractors or that a DOT employee was providing the information to Shire.


The second suspicious incident occurred when Mesiti submitted two separate Requests for Information (RFI) identical to previous RFIs submitted by Aetna Bridge. Aetna Bridge is a construction company currently working on the Warren River Bridge Project. The Warren River Bridge Project is the construction of a bridge in close proximity to the Barrington River Bridge Project and of a very similar nature. The Warren River Bridge is closer to completion than the Barrington River Bridge. According to Swift when Aetna submitted the RFIs there was detailed attached information in support of the issue to be resolved. When Mesiti (on behalf of Shire Corporation) submitted RFIs on the same topics as Aetna there was no attached documentation.

It was the opinion of Swift that Mesiti (Shire Corporation) was merely attempting to propagate delays in the construction process by submitting as many RFIs as possible. Swift cited as evidence the lack of documentation and further that the question posed in the first RFI (#36) was in direct conflict with their own (Shire's) schematic drawings. According to Swift, Shire's own drawings showed no conflict.

The second RFI (#65), authored by Mesiti, questioned the use of a certain metal hanger. When this particular issue arose previously in the Aetna project, the engineers reviewing the plans for DOT provided the solution of using a shorter hanger. This response by the design department had been submitted to Swift then forwarded to Aetna in writing through the use of the PMP system. Swift stated that he was later contacted by Aetna and told that the manufacturer of the hangers did not make a shorter hanger. A second design change was made to alter the angle of the pipe connected to the hangers. This subsequent design change was made over the phone and not recorded in the PMP system.

Your affiant further requests that a member of the Rhode Island State Police Computer Crimes Unit and/or a qualified designee be allowed to conduct an off-site forensic analysis and search on the seized evidence. This request is due to the complex nature of computer forensics as noted in Attachment "B" which is attached hereto and made apart thereof.

Additionally, your affiant requests to search for and seize certain documents related to other contractors working on projects under existing state contracts which should be available only to authorized DOT employees to include but not limited to RFIs submitted to the State by Aetna Bridge. Other documents to be searched for include change orders of other contractors, billing information, RFIs, project projections.



John D. Lemont
Sergeant
Rhode Island State Police
Financial Crimes Unit

In Providence this 12th day of May 2008 before me personally came **Sergeant John D. Lemont** and made oath to the truth of the foregoing.



Walter Gorman
Judge of the District Court

RETURN OF SERVICE

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS


Providence, SC.

At CRAWSTON (place), 5-22-08, (date) A.D. 2008, pursuant to the within warrant I have made search during the -- daytime -- as commanded and submit herewith a written inventory of property taken :

SEE ATTACHED INVENTORY OF ITEMS SEIZED

I have also summoned _____ named in said Complaint, as commanded to appear before the _____ Division of the District Court in _____ at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon, on _____ A.D. _____.

I have also given to Shire Corporation / _____ the person from whom -- from whose premises said property was taken -- a copy of the within warrant -- I have left a copy of the within warrant at -- on the place from which said property was taken -- but I did not find the person from whose premises said property was taken but left a copy of said warrant -- on the place from which the property was taken.



Authorized Officer

ATTACHMENT "A"

The following terms and definitions are provided in support of the application to search for and seize evidence:

Computer Hardware consists of all equipment, which can collect, analyze, create, display, convert, store, conceal, or transmit electronic, digital, magnetic, optical or similar computer impulses or binary data. Hardware includes, but is not limited to, portable data-processing devices – such as central processing units, memory typewriters and self-contained “laptop” or “notebook” computers – internal and peripheral storage devices – such as fixed disks, external hard disks, flash memory, random access memory, USB storage devices, cell phones, personal digital assistants, HD recorders, video production/editing equipment, digital video recorders, digital cameras, web cameras (webcams) portable MP3 players, floppy disk drives and diskettes, tape drives and tapes, printer cartridges, optical storage devices, transistor-like binary devices and other memory storage devices, peripheral input/output devices – such as keyboards, printers, scanners, plotters, video display monitors and optical readers as well as related communications devices – such as modems, cables, and connections, recording equipment, RAM or ROM units, routers, switches, gateways, acoustic couplers, automatic dialers, speed dialers, programmable telephone dialing or signaling devices and electronic tone-generating devices – as well as any devices, mechanisms or parts that can be used to restrict access to computer hardware, such as physical keys, biometric security devices and locks.

Computer Software is digital information or files, which can be interpreted by a computer and any of its related components to direct the way they work. Software is stored in electronic, magnetic, optical or other digital form. It commonly includes programs to run operating systems, applications like word-processing, graphics or spreadsheet programs, utilities, compilers, interpreters and communications programs.

Computer-related Documentation consists of written, recorded, printed or electronically stored material, which explains or illustrates how to configure or use computer hardware, software or other related items.

Records of ownership of computer hardware, software and data and control of those articles seized.

Records, Documents and Materials include all items of evidence in any form including hard copy and binary and/or electronic format such as: electronic data, digital images and video, photographs, drawings, internet accounts, books and ledgers, correspondence and notes, electronic mail, communications, text messages, files, internet browser history, user activity data, trace digital forensic evidence, system and chat logs, processes, services, electronic code, written documents or materials and their drafts or modifications, system generated data, deleted and trace data and information.

Evidence which may lead to the identification of victims.

Documentation related to the identification of persons or entities which have control and possession of the place to be searched

Passwords and other Data Security Devices consists of passwords, encryption keys, hardware devices and software programs, and biometric devices designed to effectuate authentication, and/or hide disguise and prevent viewing or otherwise limit access to data, and written records.

ATTACHMENT "B"

Computer hardware, computer software, records, documents and materials, computer related documentation, passwords, and data security devices may be important to a criminal investigation in two distinct and important respects: (1) the objects themselves may be instrumentalities, fruits or evidence of crime and/or (2) the objects may have been used to collect and store information about crimes in the form of electronic data.

Based upon your affiant's knowledge, training and experience as well as consultations with law enforcement officers in the area of computer forensics and investigations, it is known that searching and seizing information from computers often requires agents to seize most or all electronic storage devices, along with related peripherals, to be searched later by a qualified computer expert in a laboratory or other controlled environment. This is true because of the following:

Volume of Evidence. Computer storage devices, like hard disks, diskettes, tapes and laser disks, can store the equivalent of thousands of pages of information. Additionally, a suspect may try to conceal criminal evidence; he or she may store it in random order with deceptive file names. This may require searching authorities to examine all the stored data to determine which particular files are evidence or instrumentalities of a crime. This sorting process may take weeks or months depending on the volume of data stored and it would be impractical to attempt this kind of data search on site.

Technical Requirements. Searching computer systems for criminal evidence is a highly technical process requiring expert skill and a properly controlled environment. The vast array of computer hardware and software available requires even computer experts to specialize in some systems and applications, making it difficult to know before a search which expert is qualified to analyze the system and its data. Data search protocols are exacting scientific procedures designed to protect the integrity of the evidence and to recover even "hidden", erased,

compressed, password-protected or encrypted files. Computer evidence is extremely vulnerable to inadvertent or intentional modification or destruction, both from external sources or from destructive code imbedded in the system as a "booby trap", necessitating a controlled environment for complete and accurate analysis. Additionally, the nature of computer forensics is extremely time consuming process which can take weeks or months.

Searching computerized information for evidence or instrumentalities of crime commonly requires seizure of most or all of a computer system's input/output peripheral devices, related software, documentation and data security devices, including passwords, so that a qualified computer expert can accurately retrieve the system's data in a laboratory or other controlled environment. This is true because of the following:

The peripheral devices, which allow users to enter or retrieve data from the storage devices, vary widely in their compatibility with other hardware and software. Many system storage devices require particular input/output (I/O) devices in order to read the data on the system. It is important that the analysts be able to properly reconfigure the system as it now operates in order to accurately retrieve the evidence listed above. Additionally, the analyst needs the relevant system software - operating systems, interfaces and hardware drivers, any application software which may have been used to create the data, whether stored on hard drives or external media, as well as related instruction manuals or other documentation and data security devices.

In order to fully retrieve data from a computer system, the computer forensic analyst needs all or most of a computer system's equipment, and may be required to seize hardware, peripherals, software, documentation, security devices and passwords and run that data in its native environment in order to most effectively identify relevant evidence. In addition, the analyst needs all the system software (operating systems or interfaces, and hardware drivers) and any applications software which may have been used to create or display the data (whether stored on hard drives or on external media). Instruction manuals for any hardware and software, and passwords, are also helpful to retrieve data/information."

Typed bulleted notes
Candidate Pool Spreadsheets
Engineers Estimate/All Bidder Comparison 2008CT025
Engineers Estimate/All Bidder Comparison 2008CH034
Contracts/Low Bid Figures
Shire Corp. Fax to Kazem Farhoumand re: 2003CB045 Barrington River

ROOM 4

Meseti Desktop

Letter dated 5/6/08 to Michael Swift from Robert V. Atcherly re: RI Cont. No. 2005CB057

Engineer's Worksheet RI Cont. No. 2003CB045

Progress Payment Worksheet RI Cont. No. 2003CH058 (21 pages)

I 195 Reconstruction Contract 7 Providence River Bridge 2003CB011 Cardi Corp. Schedule and Issues Meeting (8 pages)

Funding Obligations to Date for RI Contract 2003CH009 dated 4/14/08 (29 pages)

Funding Obligations to Date for RI Contract 2002CH035 dated 1/5/07 (15 pages)

DOT Report of Change State Contract 2003CB011 (3 pages)

I 195 Reconstruction Contract 7-Providence River Bridge 2003CB011 Cardi Corp. Schedule and Issues Meeting (7 pages)

DOT RFI Tracking Sheet #28 2003CH058

Siegmund and Assoc. Letter dated 5/16/08 to David Fish, DOT re: 2005CB057 Warren Bridge

Letter dated 3/28/08 to Michael Swift DOT from Robert V. Atcherley, Aetna Bridge re: 2005CB057 (2 pages)

Siegmund and Assoc. Letter dated 4/29/08 to David Fish DOT re: 2005CB057 RFI#52

Email to Mike from David Fish re: RFI#63

Siegmund and Assoc. Superstructure Details Sheet No. 2 Warren Bridge No. 124

Siegmund and Assoc. Letter dated 5/5/08 to David Fish re: 2003CB045 RFI#70

Letter dated 5/15/08 to Michael Swift from Robert Atcherley Aetna Bridge re: 2005CB057 RFI#067

Warren Bridge Faxed Blueprints (3 pages) dated 5/14/08

DOT RFI Tracking Sheet #74 re: 2003CB045 Barrington Bridge

Siegmund and Associates Letter dated 5/19/08 to David Fish re: 2005CB057 RFI#55

M4.04.0 Mortar for Prestressed Concrete Deck Beams Guidelines

Tilcon Gammino Job Sheet w/handwritten names and figures

One Dell Inspiron 9300 #HLDJ391

Meseti Desk Drawer

Aetna Fax dated 4/13/07 to Construction Industries re: Section 108.03 Prosecution and Progress Draft Scheduling Specification with DOT Letter dated 4/9/07 to Henry Sherlock and General Requirements

Shire Corp. Blank Unit Cost Work Sheet

Blank Contractor Notice of Claim

Blank Shire Corp. Daily Report of Extra Work

Meseti Credenza Top Left Drawer

Anthony J. Mesiti, PE Resume

Meseti Table Top

Aetna Letter dated 12/14/07 to Mike Swift re: 2005CB057 Warren Bridge with Winter Work 2007-08 and Aetna Bridge Co./Warren Bridge Estimate of Potential Delay Costs (4 pages)

Shire Corp. Letter dated 12/12/06 to Mike Swift re: 2003CB045 Barrington Bridge

ROOM 8

Laura Gammino Desktop

Letter dated 5/15/08 to Kazem Farhoumand DOT re: 2003CB045 Barrington River Bridge from Laura Gammino

DOT Letter dated 4/16/08 to Shire Corp. re: 2003CB045

Chronology of Events of Barrington Bridge Issues

Laura Gammino Bookshelf

Folder Marked "Barrington Grout Box Beams" with documents

ROOM 10

One Maxtor 160GB Hard Disk Drive Serial No. L3B33D2G

ROOM 5

From Desk Area

4 Computer Backup Tapes