

CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE BOARD OF APPEALS

The Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meeting was held on July 15, 2026, at 3:31 p.m., with Mr. Boggerty presiding. The members present were Mr. Neil, Mr. Rocha, Mr. Campana, and Mr. Martin. Staff members present were Mr. Kopp, Mr. England, Mr. Wood, Ms. Wheeler, and Ms. Martin.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Neil moved for approval of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and unanimously carried.

2009 Property Maintenance Code Violation (Chapter 22 - Buildings and Building Regulations, Article XII - Vacant Buildings, Section 22-403 - Registration and Registration Fee) - Appeal of Registration Fee – 558 North American Avenue Ext.

Mr. John England, Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed the case history for 558 North American Avenue Ext.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. England stated that there was minimal electricity and water usage.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Kopp stated that there was no provision under the Vacant Building Ordinance that would require them to check if the taxes or utilities were currently paid. He noted that the information would be irrelevant to the proceedings for the Vacant Building Ordinance; therefore, they do not have that information.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Kopp clarified that Ms. Mittens indicated that she was at the dwelling between January and February and was unable to physically return from Arizona. He noted that as far as property maintenance goes, there would be fees assessed for that.

Mr. Neil discussed concerns that vacant properties could become targets for unauthorized entry and illegal activity, which may result in damage to the property and negatively impact neighbors. He acknowledged the owner's request for compassion and the documentation provided but stated that the information did not provide enough clarity to decide at that time.

Mr. Kopp stated that based on Ms. Mittens' letter, there was no provision in code that would grant leniency or exemption as the code was written currently.

Mr. England stated that if Ms. Mittens was at the dwelling between January and February, there had not been any water usage since August of 2025 and throughout the current month of July 2026. He pointed out there was no usage in January and February, but it went all the way back to August of 2025.

Mr. Boggerty stated that one (1) of the lessons the Board had learned was that water usage levels alone should not trigger a vacant building designation. He explained that such an argument could be challenged, but in his opinion, it would need to be supported by additional evidence.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, via Webex, Ms. Denise Mittens stated that the grass was being taken care of and she was paying someone to have the grass cut.

Ms. Mittens asked the Board if the additional correspondence was received (**Attachment #1**). The Board had answered that they had received the additional correspondence. She stated that she was asking for compassion, and even though the water usage did not show, she was at the dwelling in September. She noted that she has come to the property every three (3) months. She concurred with Mr. Neil that her dwelling could be at risk, since she was not there, but noted that her sister went to the property once a week. She added that she used very little electricity and the usage did not register when she was there in January and February. She was unaware of what else to do until she could get off supplemental oxygen and come back to Dover, Delaware.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Mittens stated that her sister visited once a week at her property to check her mail and empty the dehumidifier. She noted that she did have friends stay at the property, so the dwelling was being checked on and the grass was being cut. She further stated that the ordinance provided leniency for individuals placed in a facilitated care facility due to age or other circumstances. She explained that she was unable to return from Arizona because she was on oxygen.

In response to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. England stated that the citation was Ms. Mitten's first notice of the violation.

Responding to Mr. Martin, Mr. Kopp stated that the first notice was just a notification and that the individual had 30 days to submit their registration form.

Responding to Mr. Martin, Mr. Kopp stated that there was a fee unless the individual was filing for an exemption.

Ms. Mittens stated that she was filing for an exemption, and she felt that the fee was high. She further stated that Mr. England advised her that once the property was entered into the system as a vacant building, the only way to have it removed would be by demonstrating substantial use of electricity or water. She explained that the taxes and insurance were paid, and the dwelling was well lived in.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Mittens stated that she was unable to return to Dover because she had respiratory failure in Arizona. She explained that her car was registered in Dover, and her driver's license was from Delaware. She added that she had retired, but still does some consulting, and loved to travel. She pointed out that she has been at the dwelling every three (3) months and was planning to come back in May.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Mittens stated that her home of residence was in Dover.

Mr. Kopp recommended to the Board that the property was vacant. He explained that he would be cautious to eliminate the vacant building registration, but he would not be amenable to granting an exemption for long-term care. The building would still be registered as vacant, and the fees would be exempt for the first year. He added that if the building was occupied within the year, the case would be closed.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Mittens acknowledged Mr. Kopp's recommendation and asked if the Board could help explain what the measure would be to know that the property was occupied. She noted that she would be back in Dover in the fall.

Responding to Ms. Mittens, Mr. Kopp stated that based on her testimony, the property was vacant. He explained that even if there was water usage, she had stated on the record that the property was vacant. Once she was back in Dover and updated Code Enforcement that she had returned, they would be able to close the case out. He added that they do not necessarily look at the utilities, but several factors are considered when it comes to being a vacant building.

Mr. Campana moved to uphold the Code Enforcement Officer's decision to declare the property a vacant building. The Board also granted the owner's request for a medical long-term care exemption, waiving the \$375 vacant building registration fee. The property was required to remain registered as a vacant building until the owner returned to reside at the property in Dover, Delaware. The medical long-term care exemption was granted for one (1) year and is set to expire on June 9, 2027. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin and carried unanimously.

Responding to Mr. Campana, Mr. Kopp stated that the exemption lasted one (1) year from the start of the case.

Mr. Neil stated that the city needed to ensure the party responsible was maintaining the grass, as it appeared the property was not being maintained. He explained that the returned mail from the Post Office indicated that no one (1) had received the mail at the property, which raised concerns that the property was vacant. He noted that overgrown grass and lack of maintenance could signal that a property was unoccupied and may make it a target for break-ins and damage.

Responding to Mr. Martin, Ms. Mitten stated that she has received the vacant building registration form and would email the form back to Mr. England. She noted she would ask further questions of Mr. England or Ms. Wheeler if need be.

2009 Property Maintenance Code Violation (Chapter 22 - Buildings and Building Regulations, Article XII - Vacant Buildings, Section 22-403 - Registration and Registration Fee) - Appeal of Registration Fee – 236 North Governors Avenue

Mr. John England, Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed the case history at 236 North Governors Avenue.

Responding to Ms. Good, Mr. Boggerty stated that, to explain their silence, the Board members were reviewing the photographs provided by Mr. England (**Attachment #2**).

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Good stated that she was not under the impression that the case concerned the hole in the roof but was strictly for the vacant building registration.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Kopp stated that the case was about the vacant building registration. He explained that the hole in the roof was one (1) of the factors in determining the dwelling being vacant, especially since the property owner was not aware there was a hole in the roof.

Via Webex, Ms. Lauren Good stated that the property was her primary residence and that she had lived there for nine (9) years. She explained that she had lost her job the previous year and had been unemployed since that time. She also stated that she had been diagnosed with major depressive disorder and was under a physician's care and taking medication. She questioned the utility usage records, stating that although she lived alone and used relatively little water, she had

remained on the property from March 2025 through July 2026 and regularly used water for her daily needs. She also clarified that the exterior porch lights were not working because the bulbs needed to be replaced, but lights inside the home were used regularly, including some that operated on timers. She stated that she did not know most of her neighbors because she rarely went outside but confirmed that she continued to reside at the property. She added that her lawn was being maintained.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Good clarified that she was living in her dwelling regularly and that she was present in her dwelling currently.

Mr. England stated that when the case opened on May 21, 2026, the water reading went until April 30, 2026, and that was four (4) months ago with no reading. In preparation for the case, he explained that on July 9, 2026, he ran and updated the numbers, and on July 1, 2026, the water reading registered at 1,000 gallons, but prior to that was five (5) months with no usage showing.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. England stated that the electric usage has been consistent around 559 and 690 kilowatts. He noted on July 1, 2026, that the electric usage registered at 1,500 kilowatts.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. England stated that the electricity usage was standard and consistent.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. England stated that the electric usage did not confirm that the property was occupied, as electricity could still be used while no one (1) was home, such as when an air conditioner was running. He explained that the water usage was a reliable indicator because it reflected usage, such as flushing toilets, washing hands, and showering.

Responding to Mr. Martin, Ms. Good stated that she has had no one (1) come look at the roof to make repairs. She explained that she had been to her attic and found no evidence of leakage. Until she spoke with Mr. England, she added that she was not aware of the hole in the roof. She noted that she had been sent pictures from Mr. England and did not believe him, since it was something that she typically did not look at. As she had mentioned, she was unemployed and realized that the issue does need to be taken care of, but currently was something that she was not able to correct.

Responding to Ms. Good, Mr. Neil expressed concern for her well-being and suggested that she should reach out to social services for help.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Ms. Good stated that she has reached out to her parents recently within the last few weeks and they have been coming to visit. She noted that she had been communicating more with her parents and was trying to get everything back on track. She further noted that the process had been taking time.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Kopp stated that the roof was a separate case that was being addressed separately. He explained that before the Board made its determination of the vacant building case, Code Enforcement believed that the property was vacant based on the evidence that was collected. The challenge before the Board was to decide whether they agreed with Code Enforcement's interpretation of the vacancy of the property or if the property was occupied.

Responding to Mr. Campana, Mr. Kopp stated that Ms. Good's case did not qualify for a medical exemption because there was no provision in the code allowing it. He noted that there was an exemption for long-term care.

Mr. Neil stated that Ms. Good appeared to need assistance beyond the vacant building issue. He encouraged her to seek help and suggested that someone verify whether she was living at the property. If she was, he recommended that she contact social services for assistance.

Mr. Boggerty stated that, while he agreed that Ms. Good might need assistance, the Board needed to remain within the boundaries of its appellate authority. He suggested that, outside of the appeal process, the city could provide information about available resources or organizations that might be able to assist her. He noted that, for the appeal, the Board should base its decision on the evidence presented, including the owner's testimony that she had continued to reside at the property despite her circumstances.

Responding to Mr. Martin, Mr. Kopp stated that the Board could make a motion to defer the case to the next Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meeting on July 29, 2026.

Mr. Martin moved to postpone final deliberation until July 29, 2026, so that Code Enforcement could verify that Ms. Good resides at the property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Campana.

Mr. Kopp stated that Ms. Wheeler expressed concern that the appeal would be outside the 30 days since the appeal had initially been presented to the Board within the 30 days. He explained that if the case was postponed until the next meeting, it could restart the timeline, but that would be the action from the Board.

Ms. Wheeler stated that they could not deviate from code and that the appeal had to be appealed within the 30 days and that it could not be deferred till next week because it would be outside the 30 days.

Mr. Kopp suggested that the Board hold the case in advance until the next Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meeting.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Wheeler stated that Ms. Good's case would add five (5) appeals to the Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meeting on July 29, 2026.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Kopp stated that it would be up to Ms. Good to pursue services from Habitat of Humanity. He noted that Milford Housing has resources available based on income. He added that they do not make promises to the residents, but they do make residents aware that there were resources available.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Kopp stated that they could send resources to Ms. Good as a courtesy.

Mr. Martin moved to defer the case until July 29, 2026, to allow Code Enforcement to verify the owner's residency at 236 North Governors Avenue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Campana and unanimously carried.

Mr. Neil stated that there would be a follow-up and that he urged Ms. Good to reach out to individuals and/or services for help because the Board did not want to see her lose her house. He noted that the Board wanted to see her receive the help to be taken care of.

Mr. Kopp stated that due to the influx of appeals, he recommended setting a particular date and day of the month to conduct appeals. He noted that this would come up as an agenda item and that would be the pleasure of the Board. He further noted that it would help Code Enforcement tremendously so they could schedule accordingly.

Ms. Wheeler stated that she had discussed the recommendation with Ms. Rivera; however, the code required that once an appeal was received, the City Clerk's Office was required to schedule the appeal after 10 within 30 days.

Mr. Kopp stated that if the Board was amenable to the recommendation, he would make a code amendment. He noted a code amendment would not be done unless the Board decided to move forward.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Kopp stated that if there were no appeals for that month, a cancellation of the meeting would be posted.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Wheeler stated that according to code, the appeal must be filed within 30 days. She explained that if the appellant was unable to attend the meeting, the matter would proceed based on the Board's decision. She further explained that the code required an appeal to be filed within 30 days of the date listed in the notice letter, and once the appeal was submitted to the City Clerk's Office, the appeal hearing had to be scheduled within the required 30-day timeframe.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Wheeler stated that once the appeal has been received, the appellant only has 30 days, and according to code, they could not deviate from that. She noted that she stressed to appellants that there was no rescheduling outside the 30-day timeframes.

Mr. Kopp stated that he would be concerned since there were several means for the appellants to attend the appeal meetings. He noted that they were pausing Code Enforcement on those cases that were being appealed.

Ms. Wheeler stated that they give the appellants several opportunities on how they could attend the appeal meetings.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Kopp stated that some items were being considered, including an ordinance that was being drafted and would be extensive, which would open some exemptions. He noted that, as far as the water usage, he was considering using vacant building door hangars. He explained that when the hangar was up for 30 days, when the registration was due, Code Enforcement would consider that property vacant.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Kopp stated he was considering doing voluntary registration, such as a vacation home; if a resident does not voluntarily register their property, they would be subject to the Vacant Building Ordinance.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Kopp stated that the proposed ordinance would include a provision that if a property owner received a fee exemption but failed to maintain the property, the exemption could become invalid, and the fee could be reinstated. He explained that the change was being considered because exemptions were sometimes granted, but the property was not being maintained.

Mr. Boggerty moved for an adjournment of the Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

The meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

Andre M. Boggerty
Chairman

AB/cw

Attachments

Attachment #1 – Denise Mitten’s Additional Correspondence by Email

Attachment #2 – 236 North Governors Avenue Property pictures provided by J. England

From: [Denise Mitten](#)
To: [Wheeler, Crystal](#)
Cc: [City Clerks Office](#)
Subject: EXTERNAL: Re: CORRESPONDENCE SENT TO DENISE MITTENS - NOTICE OF APPEAL HEARING DATE
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 6:41:28 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Gmail - to Dover officials re Denise Mitten's occupancy.pdf](#)
[Gmail - my mother and her Dover house.pdf](#)
[MITTEN May flight to Philly cancelled due to hospital.png](#)

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Crystal Wheeler,

Please find additional information attached for the Board members for my July 15 hearing.

Thank you very much for your work.

Best regards,

Denise

Denise Mitten
558 N. American Ave
Dover, DE 19901
denisemittenphd@gmail.com

RE: Appeal of Vacant Building Designation and Fee Assessment Property Address: 558 N. American Ave, Dover, DE 19901

Dear Board Members,

Please use this note to supplement my earlier letter of June 26, 2026. I have since become well enough to read the ordinance and supplement my appeal. I am formally appealing the recent determination by the Code Enforcement Officer designating my property at 558 N. American Ave, Dover, DE as a "vacant building" under Chapter 22, Article XII of the Dover Code of Ordinances. I respectfully request that this designation be overturned, as the home is actively maintained, secure, and routinely occupied. I purchased this home in 2014 for me, my sister, and my mother, who sadly passed away in 2020. While my mother was alive, my sister and I lived with her. After my mother died and I retired, I decided to keep the property and maintain my residence in Dover. The house is not abandoned. Instead, I follow a routine where I am at the property at least every three months. I visit my adult child and sister and brother-in-law who live in Magnolia as well as local friends from high school. I reside in the home, conduct routine maintenance, and ensure it remains a safe, secure anchor in the neighborhood. When I'm not there, my sister stops in to make sure the mail is in and the dehumidifier emptied. My neighbors know I am regularly there. When I was there in January in February, I had the neighbors across the street over. They were in the house with me. When I was at my Dover home in September, I bought a car from Tesla Motors PA in Devon, PA—one of the closest Tesla dealers to Dover.

The Code Enforcement officer told me he is relying on neighborhood statements, but at least one neighboring property owner has a direct financial interest in having this home declared vacant to pressure me into a sale so they can convert it into an Airbnb. Because of this explicit conflict of interest, their reports regarding my presence should be treated as biased and unreliable. I do not keep this house as a speculative investment or an abandoned property. I keep it because relatives and friends live in the area. This house serves as my local family

residence so I can regularly visit them and remain an active part of their lives. To disprove the neighbor's claims, I have submitted signed statements from my child, Lauren Mitten and a lifelong local friend, both confirming I was living in the home in January and February.

I am aware that the Code Enforcement Officer has used low electrical usage as a metric to declare the home vacant. However, I want to clarify that during my stays—including my visit in January and February—my footprint is minimal. I utilize very little electricity and water by personal habit. Low consumption should not be conflated with abandonment, as the home remains fully conditioned, functional, and structurally sound. My established sequence of at least three-month visits was only disrupted this spring due to an extreme, unforeseen medical crisis. I was in Arizona when I became ill. On May 23, 2006, I was hospitalized in Prescott, AZ. On May 31, I was moved by ambulance to St Joseph's Hospital (a lung and respiratory specialist hospital) in Phoenix, AZ. with life-threatening conditions, including sepsis, dual-strain pneumonia, severe anemia, and acute lung complications. Upon discharge June 8, 2006, I was placed on a grueling four-week course of high-dose antibiotics (Linezolid 600mg and Ciprofloxacin 750mg), which severely suppressed my immune system and compromised my red blood cell production, resulting in prolonged anemia. I am currently tethered to an oxygen concentrator and am temporarily convalescing at a friend's house in Prescott, Arizona. Due to these ongoing respiratory and anemia limitations, I cannot fly. I sent a photo of the cover of my official hospital discharge summaries to Mr. England, including nine medical diagnoses while in the hospitals. I cannot fly until I recover from anemia and am off supplemental oxygen. Hopefully I can travel by August or September 2006. This is a severe medical "force majeure. I am physically stranded in Arizona by medical necessity, not because I have abandoned my Dover home. I included my canceled ticket to the Philadelphia airport.

Per Section 22-405 of the Dover Code, the city explicitly recognizes waivers for individuals undergoing medical hardships or entering care. While I am not in a permanent long-term facility, this severe medical event functions as a "force majeure" that physically prevented me from traveling. Had I not been hospitalized, I would have been there in May and maintained my regular occupancy schedule, keeping the property safely outside the "three consecutive months" definition of vacancy. The property is not a blight, it is secure, the lawn is cared for (except the first cut of the season when I wasn't able to return as planned, and it is a beloved family home. Based on my routine occupancy and the medical documentation provided, I request that the Board overturn the vacant designation entirely, or grant a complete waiver from any registration requirements and associated fees. When I am able to travel back, I would be happy to report to Mr. England and he would then be able to compare my utility usage.

Thank you for your time, compassion, and consideration of my appeal.

Sincere regards,
Denise Mitten
Denise Mitten

Attachments:

- St Joseph's Hospital discharge showing 5.31 entrance
- Hospital discharge page 3—prescription medication start June 8
- Supplemental oxygen prescription
- May Flight cancellation to Philadelphia
- Email from Cynthia Holt about Feb
- Email from Lauren Mitten about Feb

Denise Mitten, PhD
Professor Emerita, Education for Sustainability Doctoral Program, Adventure
Education

ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Denise_Mitten

t. 231-598-7477

On Tue, Jul 7, 2026 at 2:01 PM Wheeler, Crystal <cwheeler@doverde.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon

The Construction & Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals Meeting will meet on July 15, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. to review your appeal for the property at 558 North American Avenue Ext.

Please see the attached Receipt of Appeal letter. A paper copy has been mailed to your address at 558 North American Avenue Ext., Dover, DE 19901.

Below is the Webex link to attend the meeting online:

Dial: 1-650-479-3208

Link: <https://tinyurl.com/2sxypryz>

Event number: 2536 904 0635

Event password: DOVER (if needed)

Thank you,

Crystal Wheeler

Assistant to the Director of Council Affairs and Constituent Services/FOIA
Coordinator

City Clerk's Office – City of Dover

15 Loockerman Plaza

P.O. Box 475

Dover, DE 19901

P: (302) 736-4462

cwheeler@dover.de.us



Thank you for your email. Please be advised that the City of Dover email domain has changed to @doverde.gov as part of our ongoing efforts to improve communications. Our new domain is part of a long-range initiative to increase security and by switching to a .gov domain it provides further assurance to the public that the communications received from @doverde.gov is official, trusted information. Messages sent to our old email addresses will still be received until the conversion is completed. Kindly update your records accordingly, we appreciate your attention to this update.

Your reservation has been canceled.

Save this email and your confirmation number in case you need them later.

You may also receive future flight credit as part of a refund. If you do, your credit can be applied at checkout when buying your next flight. All you'll need is your name and this trip's confirmation number.

Confirmation Number:

I5RH7G

Flight 1 of 5 UA6069

Class: United Economy (T)

Tue, May 26, 2026

11:05 AM

Prescott, AZ, US (PRC)

Tue, May 26, 2026

12:40 PM

Los Angeles, CA, US (LAX)

Flight Operated by SKYWEST DBA UNITED EXPRESS.

Flight 2 of 5 UA2487

Class: United Economy (T)

Tue, May 26, 2026

02:41 PM

Los Angeles, CA, US (LAX)

Tue, May 26, 2026

08:50 PM

Chicago, IL, US (ORD)

Flight 3 of 5 UA1884

Class: United Economy (T)

Tue, May 26, 2026

09:48 PM

Chicago, IL, US (ORD)

Wed, May 27, 2026

12:59 AM

Philadelphia, PA, US (PHL)

Home O2 Qualifying with Ambulation Continuous, LPM with Rest Rx: 2, LPM with Activity Rx: 3, Nasal Cannula, Inline Humidifier: Yes, **Portable Oxygen Type: Large E Tank**, Nurse began the tests with pt sitting at rest on room air. Pt measured 88% SpO2 at rest on room air. With ambulation, the pt dipped to 87% SpO2 room air. When we put the Nasal Cannula on her, pt needed 2 L O2 to recover to 93% SpO2 while ambulating.

Case Management Instructions

Patient Discharge Goal:

Home

Education Materials

Antibiotic Medicine, Adult

St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center
350 W. Thomas Rd
Phoenix, AZ 85013
(602) 406-3000

MITTEN, DENISE

DOB: 08/16/1953
MRN: 5674638(SJH)
Visit Date: 05/31/2026

6N17

Inpatient Discharge Instructions

Your Care Team

Admitting Physician - Simon, Sandy DO
Attending Physician - Simon, Sandy DO
Consulting Physician -
Cantrill, Benjamin N DO
Levi, Ayal MD
Mason, Joshua S MD
Shekhel, Tatyana A DO
Lifetime Physician(PCP) - PCP, Unknown
Referring Physician - Simon, Sandy DO

Discharge Vitals

Temperature 36.8 °C (Oral) **TMIN** 36.7 °C (Oral) **TMAX** 36.8 °C (Oral) **Heart Rate** 70 **Respiratory Rate** 20 **Blood Pressure** 110/70

Your Diagnosis

Sepsis
MRSA pneumonia
Multifocal pneumonia
Bronchiectasis
Abscess of left lung with pneumonia
Parapneumonic effusion
Acute respiratory failure with hypoxia
CKD (chronic kidney disease) stage 2, GFR 60-89 ml/min
Microcytic anemia



07/15/2026 10:20



07/15/2026 10:19



07/15/2026 10:19