

---

The original instrument and the following digest, which constitutes no part of the legislative instrument, were prepared by Alden A. Clement, Jr.

---

## DIGEST

Present law defines "bail" as the security given by a person to assure his appearance before the proper court whenever required.

Proposed law deletes present law and defines "bail" as an order of the court establishing the amount, type, and conditions of bond for the release of the defendant from jail.

Present law defines "surety" as a legal suretyship pursuant to the provisions of present law.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that a personal surety must be a natural person domiciled in this state who owns property in this state that is subject to seizure and is of sufficient value to satisfy, considering all his property, the amount specified in the bail bond.

Proposed law retains present law and further provides that no attorney, judge, or ministerial officer of a court may act as a personal surety for a bail bond, and no person may charge a fee or receive anything of value to act as a personal surety.

Proposed law provides that any defect in the sufficiency or qualifications of the surety are not a defense to an action to forfeit or revoke a bail bond, nor to an action to enforce a judgment.

Present law provides that the defendant and personal surety signing a bail bond must write the address at which each can be served under their respective signatures and the last four digits of their social security numbers. Present law further provides that a bail bond cannot be set aside because of the invalidity of this information or for the failure to include this information. Present law further provides that by signing the bail bond, the defendant and his surety waive any right to notice.

Proposed law retains present law and adds that by signing the bail bond, the defendant and his surety also waive any objection to the jurisdiction of the court in an action to forfeit the bond.

Present law provides that in lieu of a surety the defendant may furnish his personal undertaking, secured by a deposit with an officer authorized to accept the bail, which deposit can consist of cash, certified or cashier's check, bonds of the U.S. government, the state, or any political subdivision thereof negotiable by delivery, U.S. postal money orders or money orders issued by any state or national bank.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that the security required for a secured personal bond must be a promissory note in the amount of the bond, due on demand to the state or

prosecuting municipality, and paraphed for identification with an act of mortgage recorded in favor of the state or prosecuting municipality and duly recorded in the parish where the mortgaged immovable is located.

Proposed law provides that every bail order must permit the defendant to post a cash bond, commercial surety bond, or secured personal surety bond. Proposed law further provides that a bail order may, except as provided in proposed law, permit the defendant to post an unsecured personal surety bond or a recognizance bond, or may specify a combination of the types of bonds permitted for a single charge.

Proposed law provides that, except as otherwise provided by proposed law, a person in custody may be released by bail order on a recognizance bond without the necessity of furnishing a surety.

Present law provides that the courts in the parishes of St. John the Baptist and St. Charles, by written rule, may alter the percentage amount of bail to be deposited with the officer authorized to accept the bond and authorize the officer to charge an administrative fee, not to exceed \$15, for processing the bond.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that upon final disposition of all cases in which a deposit of money, checks, bonds, or money orders has been made pursuant to present law, and said deposits have remained unclaimed for a period of one year from the date of the final disposition, the officer authorized to accept said bail is to apply and use one-half of such funds for the operation and maintenance of the office of the clerk of court, or the office of the clerk of the criminal district court, or the office of the clerk of the criminal district court in Orleans Parish, and one-half to the local governing authority, after advertising his intention to so utilize the funds by publication once within 30 days of final disposition of the case in the official parish journal and notice to each defendant.

Proposed law retains present law as to cash bonds on deposit after final disposition of a case.

Present law provides that after the publication and mailing of notice by certified mail, the clerk of court, or the clerk of the criminal district court in Orleans Parish, is to petition the court of proper jurisdiction for permission to utilize the funds for the use, operation, and maintenance of the office of the clerk of court or the clerk of criminal district court in Orleans Parish.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that when bail has been given in conformity with present law, the money, check, bond, or money order is not subject to garnishment, attachment, or seizure under any legal process.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that when money, checks, or money orders have been given for bail in conformity with present law, those funds may be deposited by the officer authorized to accept bail into an interest-bearing account established exclusively for the deposit of such funds, and interest earned on the deposits in the account can be used solely for the operation and maintenance of the office of the clerk of court.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that a person in custody may be released by order of the court on his personal bail undertaking without the necessity of furnishing a surety.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that the condition of the bail undertaking in district, juvenile, parish, and city courts is that the defendant will appear at all stages of the proceedings to answer the charge before the court in which he may be prosecuted, will submit himself to the orders and process of the court, and will not leave the state without written permission of the court.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that the obligation of a bail bond is that the defendant will appear in court as notified pursuant to proposed law.

Present law provides that the surety assumes all risks that the defendant may not appear.

Proposed law retains present law.

Proposed law provides that the obligation of the bond runs from the execution of the bond contract, and terminates by written order of conviction, acquittal, modification of bail, or revocation of the bond. Proposed law further provides that the obligation terminates upon either dismissal of the charge by the prosecution, unless within three days the defendant is charged with the same crime or another crime of the same or lesser class arising out of the same incident or matter, or surrender of the defendant.

Present law provides that a bail undertaking must be in writing, state the court before which the defendant is bound to appear, be entered into before an officer who is authorized to take it, and state a single amount of bail for each charge.

Proposed law deletes present law as to a bail undertaking, and further provides that a bail bond must be in writing, be entered into before an officer who is authorized to take it, and state a single amount of bail for each charge.

Proposed law defines "bail bond" as a contract under private signature between the defendant and his sureties as solidary obligors and the state of Louisiana as obligee.

Proposed law deletes additional provisions of present law relative to a bail undertaking.

Present law provides that if an order is issued for the purpose of preventing violent or threatening acts or harassment against, or contact or communication with or physical proximity to, another person for the purpose of preventing domestic abuse, stalking, or dating violence, the judge is to cause to have prepared a Uniform Abuse Prevention Order as provided for in present law.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the defendant or his surety may, at any time before a breach of the bail undertaking and with approval of the court, substitute another form of security authorized by present law.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that a contract to indemnify a surety against loss on a bail bond is valid and enforceable.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that a person in custody charged with the commission of an offense is entitled to be admitted to bail except under certain circumstances set forth in present law.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the court is to require as a condition of release on bail that any person who is charged with a second or subsequent violation of certain present law crimes relative to operating a vehicle while intoxicated or vehicular homicide to install an ignition interlock device on any vehicle which he operates.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that bail can be denied before conviction if the defendant is charged with a crime of violence as defined by present law or with certain violations of the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Law, and after a contradictory hearing the judge or magistrate finds by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant may flee or poses an imminent danger to any other person or the community.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that, upon motion of the prosecutor, the judge or magistrate may order the temporary detention of the defendant, for a period of not more than five days, exclusive of weekends and legal holidays, pending the conducting of a contradictory bail hearing.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that following the contradictory hearing, upon proof by clear and

convincing evidence either that there is a substantial risk that the defendant might flee or that the defendant poses an imminent danger to any other person or the community, the judge or magistrate may order the defendant held without bail pending trial.

Proposed law retains present law and further provides that, upon proof by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant failed to appear at his criminal proceedings as notified, there is a presumption that the defendant is a substantial flight risk.

Present law provides that a person charged with the commission of a capital offense cannot be admitted to bail if the proof is evident and the presumption great that he is guilty of the capital offense.

Proposed law retains present law and further provides that for purposes of the bail hearing, the return of a true bill of indictment creates a presumption of guilt.

Present law provides relative to bail hearings for certain sex offenders.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that a person is to be remanded to jail to await sentence unless he is allowed to remain free on a bail obligation posted prior to conviction and the bail previously fixed is in accordance with all applicable provisions of present law or he is released by virtue of a bail obligation posted after conviction fixed in accordance with present law.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides relative to bail after conviction and before sentence, and bail pending sentence, based on the maximum sentence of imprisonment that may be imposed or that has been imposed.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that a defendant is entitled to bail after conviction if the maximum sentence that may be imposed is imprisonment for five years or less, or if a sentence of five years or less has actually been imposed, and may be allowed if the maximum sentence that may be imposed is imprisonment exceeding five years, or if the sentence actually imposed exceeds imprisonment for five years.

Present law provides that the following magistrates, throughout their several territorial jurisdictions, have the authority to fix bail:

- (1) District courts having criminal jurisdiction, in all cases.
- (2) City or parish courts and municipal and traffic courts of New Orleans having criminal jurisdiction, in cases not capital.
- (3) Mayor's courts and traffic courts in criminal cases within their trial jurisdiction.

- (4) Juvenile and family courts in criminal cases within their trial jurisdiction.
- (5) Justices of the peace in cases not capital or necessarily punishable at hard labor.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the amount of bail must be such that, in the judgment of the court, commissioner, or magistrate, it will insure the presence of the defendant, as required, and the safety of any other person and the community, having regard to:

- (1) The seriousness of the offense charged, including but not limited to whether the offense is a crime of violence or involves a controlled dangerous substance.
- (2) The weight of the evidence against the defendant.
- (3) The previous criminal record of the defendant.
- (4) The ability of the defendant to give bail.
- (5) The nature and seriousness of the danger to any other person or the community that would be posed by the defendant's release.
- (6) The defendant's voluntary participation in a pretrial drug testing program.
- (7) The absence or presence of any controlled dangerous substance in the defendant's blood at the time of arrest.
- (8) Whether the defendant is currently out on bond on a previous felony arrest for which he is awaiting institution of prosecution, arraignment, trial, or sentencing.
- (9) Any other circumstances affecting the probability of defendant's appearance.
- (10) The type or form of bail.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the court cannot release any defendant who has been arrested for a felony offense, an element of which is the discharge, use, or possession of a firearm on his personal undertaking without security or with an unsecured personal surety. Present law further provides that any defendant who has been arrested for domestic abuse battery or for a crime of violence as defined in present law cannot be released by the court on his own recognizance or on the signature of any other person.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that no person released on bail or released on the signature of any other person where bail has been revoked, or is subject to forfeiture, may be readmitted to bail or released on the signature of any other person on those same charges if that person did not voluntarily surrender following the revocation or forfeiture. Present law further provides that any person who voluntarily surrenders following revocation or forfeiture of bail may be released only on bail with a commercial surety and in an amount higher than the original bail.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law enumerates various crimes for which a defendant's release on his own recognizance is prohibited.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that the court cannot release any defendant on an unsecured personal surety bond or recognizance bond if the defendant is arrested for or charged with a crime of violence as defined in present law or certain violations of the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Law.

Present law provides relative to the reinstatement of bail following dismissal of a case by the prosecution.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that Orleans Parish district judges with criminal jurisdiction sitting en banc may adopt rules effectuating telephonic communication and verification of bonds and releases.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the court may impose any additional condition of release that is reasonably related to assuring the appearance of the defendant before the court.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides relative to bail for offenses against a family or household member or dating partner including provisions for forfeiture, arrest, and modification, and relative to conditions for release relative to a charge of stalking, aggravated rape, or operating a vehicle while intoxicated.

Proposed law deletes present law specific to bail and conditions of release for certain present law offenses, and instead provides that the court is to consider whether the defendant poses a threat or danger to a victim of the criminal offense, and if the court determines that the defendant poses such a threat or danger, it is to require as a condition of bail that the defendant refrain further contact with the victim. Proposed law further provides that if the victim is a family member, household member, or dating partner of the defendant, the court is to issue and transmit a Uniform Abuse Prevention Order in accordance with present law. Proposed law further requires that the court may order the defendant to be equipped with a global positioning monitoring system as a condition of bail and assess the cost of the defendant's participation and monitoring

to the defendant.

Proposed law provides that the court is to require any person indicted for the crime of aggravated rape to wear an electronic monitoring device and to be placed under active electronic monitoring under conditions set by the court.

Present law provides that every person arrested for a violation of the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Law or a crime of violence as provided in present law is required to submit to a pretrial drug test. Present law further provides that a person arrested for these present law crimes who tests positive for the presence of one or more designated substances or any person arrested for a violation of the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Law is required as a condition of bail to participate in a pretrial drug testing program.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the court may, and in all municipalities with a population of 300,000 or more persons must, implement a pretrial drug testing program that provides for:

- (1) Mandatory participation for all persons arrested for violations of state law.
- (2) Drug testing to determine the presence of phencyclidine (PCP), opiates (heroin), cocaine, methadone, amphetamines, or marijuana, prior to first court appearance and random testing thereafter.
- (3) Restrictions on the use of any and all test results to ensure that they are used only for the benefit of the court.
- (4) Reasonable testing procedures to ensure the fair administration of the test and protection for the chain of custody.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that no person can be released under the provisions of the pretrial drug testing program unless he agrees to submit to continued random testing and to refrain from the use or possession of any controlled dangerous substance or any substance designated by the court.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that implementation of any pretrial drug testing program is contingent upon receipt by the court of sufficient funding to conduct the testing program.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that no elected official who is in any way connected with the administration



of the pretrial drug testing program can have any financial interest in any drug testing company participating in such pretrial drug testing program.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that all contracts awarded to any drug testing company authorized to conduct the pretrial drug testing program must be awarded in accordance with present law governing public bids.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that for purpose of fixing bail, a magistrate may make a written request of any juvenile court for an abstract containing only the delinquent acts of a defendant currently before the requesting magistrate, which records cannot be copied, duplicated, or otherwise reproduced.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that an order fixing bail must be in writing, set the type and a single amount of bail for each charge, designate the officer or officers authorized to accept the bail, and be signed by the magistrate.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that unless the bail is fixed by a schedule in accordance with present law, the amount of bail in felony cases is to be specifically fixed in each case. Present law further provides that schedules of bail according to the offense charged in misdemeanor cases may be fixed by the district, parish, and city courts.

Proposed law deletes present law so as to eliminate the distinction between felonies and misdemeanors, and provides that unless the bail is fixed by a schedule in accordance with proposed law, the amount of bail in criminal cases is to be specifically fixed in each case. Proposed law provides that a schedule of bail according to the offense charged in non-capital cases may be fixed by a district court, and that the bail schedule may be revised or rescinded at any time. Proposed law further provides that a copy of the schedule is to be sent to all jails, sheriff's offices, and police stations within the jurisdiction of the court.

Present law provides that the type or form of bail cannot be set in the bail schedule.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Proposed law provides that a person charged with a crime for which bail is fixed by a schedule may give bail according to the schedule, and if such a person has not furnished bail, then the person must be brought before the court for a contradictory hearing within 72 hours after arrest.

Present law provides that bail may be set above the scheduled amount if the court deems it appropriate or if the district attorney moves for good cause to have the bail set above the scheduled amount and the court finds it appropriate.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that the court having trial jurisdiction over the offense charged, on its own motion or on motion of the state or defendant, for good cause at a contradictory hearing, may either increase or reduce the amount of bail, modify the conditions of a bail order, or require new or additional security.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that a person held may invoke the supervisory jurisdiction of the court of appeal on a claim that the trial court has improperly refused bail or a reduction of bail in a bailable case.

Proposed law retains present law.

Proposed law deletes present law relative to notice and provides that notice to a defendant of a court appearance date may be provided on the bond or in open court, or may be made as follows to the address provided pursuant to proposed law:

- (1) Delivered by an officer designated by the court at least two days prior to the appearance date.
- (2) Mailed by United States first class mail at least three days prior to the appearance date.

Proposed law provides that a surety for a defendant is not entitled to notice of the defendant's court appearance dates, and is to remain diligently informed of the public records relating to the defendant's case.

Present law provides that a surety may surrender the defendant or the defendant may surrender himself, in open court or to the officer charged with his detention, at any time prior to forfeiture or within the time allowed by law for setting aside a judgment of forfeiture of the bail bond.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that a surety may surrender the defendant within the surrender period, which must be at any time before 60 days after the mailing of notice of the signing of judgment of forfeiture or, after a timely deposit with the prosecuting attorney as required by proposed law, at any time before 180 days after the mailing of notice of the signing of judgment.

Present law provides that for the purpose of surrendering the defendant, the surety may arrest him.

Proposed law retains present law.

Proposed law provides that the surrender of the defendant may be made in any of the following ways:

- (1) By delivering the defendant to the custody of the officer originally charged with his detention during the surrender period.
- (2) By obtaining a certificate of surrender from the officer originally charged with the defendant's detention while the defendant is currently in the custody of the officer and during the surrender period.
- (3) By constructively surrendering a defendant incarcerated in another parish or county within the continental United States by filing a motion in summary proceeding within the surrender period.

Present law provides that during the period provided for surrendering the defendant, the surety may request that the officer originally charged with the detention of a felony defendant place the name of the felony defendant into the National Crime Information Center registry for a \$25 processing fee.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that if after payment of the \$25 the name of the defendant is removed from the National Crime Information Center registry without cause during the period provided for surrendering the defendant, the surety is relieved of all obligations under the bond.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that the court in which the defendant is held to answer may issue a warrant for the arrest and commitment of the defendant who is at large on bail when any of the following are true:

- (1) There has been a breach of the bail undertaking.
- (2) It appears that a surety has become insufficient, is dead, cannot be found, or has ceased to meet the qualifications of law or does not own adequate immovable property within the state.
- (3) The court is satisfied that the bail should be increased or new or additional security required.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that a defendant who has surrendered himself under the provisions of

present law or has been rearrested under the provisions of present law is entitled to bail.

Proposed law deletes present law.

Present law provides that the court is to immediately issue a warrant for the arrest of the person failing to appear and order a judgment decreeing the forfeiture of the bond against the defendant and his sureties in solido for the full amount of the bond.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that if at the time fixed for appearance the defendant fails to appear as required by the court, the judge may, or must on motion of the prosecuting attorney, issue a warrant for the arrest of the defendant.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that upon motion of the prosecuting attorney, notice to the defendant, and the defendant's failure to appear, a bond will be forfeited and a judgment signed.

Proposed law retains present law and adds that the judgment of bond forfeiture is to be issued against the defendant and his sureties, in solido, in the amount of the bond.

Present law provides that after entering the fact of the signing of the judgment of bond forfeiture in the court minutes, the clerk of court is to promptly mail notice of the signing of the judgment.

Proposed law changes the time to mail notice of the judgment of bond forfeiture from "promptly" to "within 60 days" and adds that the notice is to be mailed to the judgment debtors. Proposed law otherwise retains present law.

Present law provides that after mailing the notice of the signing of the judgment, the clerk of court is to execute an affidavit of the mailing and place the affidavit and the return receipts in the record.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that failure to mail notice of the signing of the judgment within 60 days after the defendant fails to appear releases the sureties of all obligations under the bond.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that failure to mail notice of the signing of the judgment within 60 days of the signing of the judgment is a defense that may be raised against the judgment in the summary proceeding provided for in proposed law but does not extinguish the obligation of the bond.

Present law provides that after mailing notice of the signing of the judgment of bond forfeiture, the district attorney must cause the judgment to be recorded in every parish in which the

recordation may be proper without cost.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides that after the mailing of notice of the signing of the judgment, the district attorney may cause the judgment to be recorded in any parish without cost.

Present law provides that the defendant and his sureties are entitled to assert defenses and actions in nullity by use of summary proceedings in the criminal matter within 60 days after the date of mailing the notice of the signing of the judgment of bond forfeiture.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides that any summary proceeding brought by the defendant or his sureties within the 60-day period is to be determined by the court within 180 days of the date of mailing the notice of the signing of the judgment of bond forfeiture.

Proposed law retains present law and adds that the institution or pendency of such summary proceedings does not affect the enforceability of the judgment nor the requirement of a timely deposit with the prosecuting attorney under proposed law.

Present law provides that the defendant and his sureties have the right to suspensive and devolutive appeals from the judgment of bond forfeiture.

Proposed law retains present law.

Present law provides relative to the enforcement of a judgment of bond forfeiture and satisfaction of judgment.

Proposed law deletes present law and provides the following procedure for the enforcement of a judgment of bond forfeiture:

- (1) The sureties are to deposit with the prosecuting attorney the full principal amount of the judgment of bond forfeiture within 60 days after the mailing of notice of the signing of judgment.
- (2) The judgment of bond forfeiture will be deemed satisfied if either the defendant appears in court or is surrendered under proposed law within 60 days after the mailing of notice of the signing of judgment, or the defendant appears in court or is surrendered under proposed law within 180 days of the mailing of notice of the signing of judgment, if the deposit with the prosecuting attorney has been timely made as required under proposed law.
- (3) If the sureties fail to make a timely deposit as required under proposed law, then the judgment of bond forfeiture will be executed by the prosecuting attorney in the same manner as any other money judgment, and the prosecuting attorney will be entitled to

reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of 25% of the judgment.

- (4) If after a deposit is made the defendant does not appear in court and is not surrendered within 180 days after the mailing of notice of the signing of judgment, then the deposit will immediately be applied in satisfaction of the judgment.

Present law provides that a judgment decreeing the forfeiture of an appearance bond cannot be rendered if it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the defendant is prevented from attending because of any of the following:

- (1) He has a physical disability, illness, or injury.
- (2) He is being detained in the jail or penitentiary of another jurisdiction.
- (3) He is serving in the armed forces of the United States.
- (4) He is a member of the Louisiana National Guard called to duty pursuant to present law.

Proposed law provides that the defendant being unable to attend is a defense against the judgment of bond forfeiture rather than a bar to rendering of judgment, and deletes from present law the cause of being detained in a jail or penitentiary of another jurisdiction.

Proposed law otherwise retains present law.

Present law provides procedures relative to failure to satisfy a judgment of bond forfeiture. Proposed law deletes certain date-specific provisions of present law.

Proposed law provides that if a judgment forfeiting a commercial surety bond becomes subject to execution under proposed law, then the prosecuting attorney may additionally file a rule to show cause why the commercial surety company should not be prohibited from executing criminal bail bonds before the court issuing the judgment of bond forfeiture.

Proposed law provides that at the rule to show cause the court must issue an order enjoining the commercial surety company from posting criminal bail bonds if the court finds all of the following:

- (1) A judgment of bond forfeiture has been rendered against the commercial surety.
- (2) Proper notice has been mailed.
- (3) No suspensive appeal has been perfected.
- (4) The defendant has neither been surrendered nor appeared within 60 days (rather than 180 days in present law) of the date of mailing the notice of the signing of the judgment.

- (5) 60 days (rather than 200 days in present law) have passed since the date of mailing the notice of the signing of the judgment and the surety has failed to make a timely deposit as required under proposed law.
- (6) The judgment of bond forfeiture has not been satisfied by payment.

Present law provides that the surety company may use evidence not contained in the record to show that it did not receive post-forfeiture notice or the post-forfeiture notice was not properly mailed.

Proposed law deletes present law reference to evidence not contained in the record to show that the surety company did not receive post-forfeiture notice, and otherwise retains present law.

Effective upon signature of the governor or lapse of time for gubernatorial action.

(Amends C.Cr.P. Arts. 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, and 336 and R.S. 15:85; repeals C.Cr.P. Arts. 327.1, 330.1, 330.2, 334.1, 334.2, 334.3, 334.4, 334.5, 335.1, 335.2, 336.1, 336.2, 337, 338, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 349.1, 349.2, 349.3, 349.4, 349.5, 349.6, 349.7, 349.8 and 349.9)