

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

<p>SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,</p> <p style="text-align:center">Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MOBILE BILLBOARDS OF AMERICA, INC., INTERNATIONAL PAYPHONE COMPANY, TIGER MEDIA, INC., RESERVE GUARANTY TRUST, MICHAEL A. LOMAS and MICHAEL L. YOUNG,</p> <p style="text-align:center">Defendants.</p>	<p style="text-align:center">CIVIL ACTION NO.  1:04-CV-2763-WBH</p>
--	---

**RECEIVER’S FOURTH INTERIM REPORT**

S. Gregory Hays, Receiver for Defendants Mobile Billboards of America, Inc. (“Mobile Billboards”), International Payphone Corporation d/b/a Outdoor Media Industries (“IPC”); Tiger Media, Inc. (“Tiger”); Reserve Guaranty Trust (“RGT”); California Mobile Billboards, Inc. (“CMBI”); and, Western Reserve Guaranty Trust (“WGRT”) (collectively referred to as the “Receiver Entities” or the “Receiver Estate”) files this Fourth Interim Report showing the Court as follows:

## Introduction

1. The Receiver was appointed by this Court in Orders entered in this action on September 21, 2004, October 18, 2004 and February 7, 2005 (“the Receivership Orders”).

2. The Receiver has previously filed three interim reports in this case as follows:

First Interim Report      December 1, 2004

Second Interim Report    March 3, 2005

Third Interim Report     June 13, 2005

In general, the facts and circumstances described those in reports are accurate as of today. In sum, the Receiver has determined that the billboard investment offerings that are the subject of this action operated as a Ponzi scheme. The Reserve Guaranty Trust, which was purportedly established to secure MBA’s repurchase obligation, was not funded in the way described to investors and was not achieving the returns necessary to meet the financial obligations to investors. The principal assets in the trust were payphones that were operating at a loss at the time of the Receiver’s appointment. In addition, the offering materials and presentations made to prospective investors contained numerous misrepresentations regarding the investment and failed to disclose other facts that were material to the investment decision.

3. Since his appointment, the Receiver and the professionals working with him have taken control of the Receiver Estate and its assets; engaged in accounting and tracing efforts; investigated the facts and circumstances surrounding the subject offerings; and pursued various actions against third-parties. This Fourth Interim Report is intended to provide the Court with an update regarding these activities, as well as the status of the Receiver Estate. It is important to understand that while this receivership is active, the Receiver may learn additional facts that could differ from the information provided below. This report contains an assessment of this receivership based upon facts currently known to the Receiver, his counsel, accountants and consultants.

### **Overview**

4. The Receiver and the professionals working with him continue to investigate the location and use of specific money and assets and the role of various IRA custodians. Other than these issues, the investigative phase of the receivership was, in large part, completed during the last quarter of 2005. The vast majority of time and effort are now being devoted to pursuing claims on behalf of the Receiver Estate, managing the payphone portfolio described in the Second Interim Report and recovering and liquidating assets, as appropriate. As indicated in the Receiver's Third Interim Report, investors paid \$55,889,438 for billboard investments and \$17,448,350 for payphone investments (most of which were

converted to billboards). The disbursement and use of these monies has been traced and accounted for and is set forth in detail in Exhibits “A” and “B” to the Third Interim Report. For convenience, Exhibit “A” to the Third Interim Report, which is a summary of the Sources and Uses of Cash, is also attached to this Report as Exhibit “A.” As demonstrated in the summary and explained in the Third Interim Report, the unfortunate reality of this case is that the proceeds of the offering were used up or wasted in the course of the offering. While the Receiver has traced \$12,111,101 in “payments to or on behalf of insiders” (i.e., those responsible for conducting the offering), it is clear that the vast majority of those monies were spent for living expenses and other “lifestyle” purchases, with very little invested in assets of value.

5. At this juncture, it appears that the value of the remaining assets and monies that represent the proceeds of the subject offerings are small compared to the \$73 million obtained from investors. Accordingly, the Receiver cannot be certain that there will be a significant distribution to investors and other creditors. The Receiver’s current assessment continues to be that if there is to be a meaningful distribution, the source of funding will be recoveries from third-parties. It is evident that the payphone portfolio has value in that it is funding the activities of the receivership (see below). However, it is unlikely that the cash generated

from operations or the ultimate sale of the payphones would result in a significant distribution to investors and other creditors.

### **Administration and Operation of the Receivership Assets**

6. The operating payphone portfolio continues to be the most significant tangible asset in the Receiver Estate. (See, Receiver's Second Interim Report). As more fully described below, the Receiver continues to operate the payphones. In addition, the Receiver has agreed to sell the billboard frame inventory. Since the filing of the Third Interim Report, the Receiver, his accountants, consultants and attorneys have also engaged in other significant administrative activities, which are described below.

7. Payphone Operations. As indicated in the Receiver's Second and Third Interim Reports, the portfolio of payphones that are a part of the Receiver Estate constitute an active, ongoing business operation. The Receiver's staff, along with the independent service contractor, continue to manage this business, and they have been successful in turning these assets from losing money to making a positive financial contribution to the Receiver Estate. Unfortunately, however, the payphone market continues to be in a general state of decline. Moreover, the subject payphone portfolio included a substantial number of payphones in Louisiana, which were damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Katrina.

The financial performance of the payphone portfolio for 2005 and the first quarter of 2006 was as follows: :

	<u><i>Year Ended Dec 31, 2005</i></u>	<u><i>1<sup>st</sup> QTR 2006</i></u>
<i>Revenues</i>	\$ 2,494,000	\$ 456,000
<i>Cost of sales</i>	<u>1,977,000</u>	<u>405,000</u>
<i>Gross profit</i>	517,000	51,000
<i>SGA/overhead expenses</i>	59,000	14,000
<i>Net revenue from operations</i>	<u>\$ 458,000</u>	<u>\$ 37,000</u>

To date, the Receiver's operation of the payphones has resulted in a net revenue improvement per phone of \$23 and generated pre-tax net income of over \$650,000. However, as the most recent revenue numbers reported in the table above suggest, the payphone portfolio is experiencing a decline in revenues consistent with the industry, generally. The revenues for the first quarter of 2006 also reflect the seasonality of the industry.

The Receiver's staff is continuing to look for ways to reduce costs and improve revenues and operational profit per phone. Most importantly, the contracts for two significant customers are up for renewal (or termination) this year. The resolution of these contracts will have a significant impact on the payphone operations.

Initially, the Receiver determined that the payphone operations needed to be turned around and properly managed instead of being quickly

liquidated. After the business became profitable, the Receiver determined the continued operation of the payphones was in the best interest of the Receiver Estate until the issues regarding the major contracts were renegotiated. Assuming that the customer contracts are renewed, the Receiver expects that the payphone operations will continue for the foreseeable future.

Given the overall circumstance of the payphone market and the unusual aspects of trying to operate a business in the context of a receivership, it is difficult to determine whether the Receiver Estate, the investors and other creditors will be best served by a sale of these assets or their continued operation long-term, with the proceeds being distributed to investors over time. With the declining industry, the Receiver expects that the cash flow from the payphones will likely exceed the amount that would be realized from a sale in 2006. However, he and his staff are assessing the long-term value of the payphone operations.

8. Billboard Frame Inventory. From the beginning of this proceeding, unfinished billboard parts have been stored in a commercial warehouse in North Carolina. This inventory included several hundred thousand linear feet of extruded aluminum. The market for these materials is limited. The Receiver has recently entered into an agreement for the sale of this inventory on an installment basis. The purchase price, to be paid over 12 months, totals \$126,300. Impart Media, the purchaser, made an initial payment of \$24,000. The balance of the purchase price

will be paid within twelve months in accordance with an agreed upon formula. In addition, the purchaser assumed the rental obligation to the warehouse which is \$600 per month. This sale was accomplished as the result of significant effort by the Receiver's staff, and the purchase price obtained is substantially higher than the amount that would have resulted from a sale of the materials to a scrap dealer.

9. Tax Issues. The Receiver determined that tax returns for the Receiver Entities had not been prepared for 2003 and 2004. These returns were prepared with great difficulty because of the very poor state of the companies' accounting records. For example, there were four different QuickBooks files for International Payphone Corporation, none of which reconciled with the prior years' tax returns. In addition to filing returns for 2003 and 2004, amended federal and state returns were filed for Mobile Billboards of America, Inc. for 2001 and 2002 to correct errors discovered in those returns. The Receiver also determined that Mobile Billboards had been filing state returns unnecessarily in many states in which it was not legally doing business. Final returns were prepared for those states. Final returns were also prepared for International Payphone Corporation in those states in which payphones were no longer maintained. State registrations and qualifications to do business are being maintained through CT Corporation System as registered agent. Required state annual reports and other filings were prepared. 2005 tax returns for all Receiver Entities are presently on extension and will be

prepared before their due date of September 15, 2005. The Subchapter S elections of all receiver entities were terminated as of January 1, 2006. To date, tax refunds totaling \$44,696. have been received.

Communications, property, sales, and other taxes connected with the payphone operations are managed by the payphones operations staff. Ongoing oversight, assistance, and sales tax registration is performed by the Receiver's tax professionals.

10. As of the filing of this Fourth Interim Report, 810 (out of a total of 1159) investors have filed claims with the Receiver. The Receiver is attempting to contact the remaining investors to help them file their claims as well.

### **Recoveries and Causes of Action**

11. Lomas Condominium. As reported in the Receiver's Third Interim Report, the Receiver asserted a claim to a condominium in Long Beach, California, which, at the time, was the residence of Michael Lomas. Since the filing of that report, the Receiver determined that there was a second judgment creditor, whose claim was superior to the creditor that had forced the filing of the litigation to "clear title." The result was that the purchase contract described in the original report did not close. Michael Lomas moved out of the condominium and did not contest the Receiver's claim to the equity.

After extensive negotiations with the judgment creditors, prospective purchasers and realtors, the litigation was resolved and the condominium was sold. Like many of the individual matters in this receivership, the issues were complex and required significant effort by Receiver's counsel (in Georgia and California) to accomplish this result. The net recovery by the Receiver, *before* legal fees and other related expenses incurred, was \$216,000.

12. Lomas Consent Judgment. On December 2, 2005, the SEC and Michael Lomas entered into a Consent Judgment the provided for an Order of Disgorgement against Michael Lomas in the amount of \$5,747,218, plus prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of \$414,679, for a total of \$6,161,897. The judgment also provides for a continuation of the freeze of the assets of Michael Lomas as set forth in the Order Granting Permanent Injunctions, Freezing Assets and Ordering Other Ancillary Relief as to Defendant Michael A. Lomas that was entered on September 21, 2004. By its terms, the Receiver has the right to enforce the judgment. In addition to the condominium described above, the Receiver has recovered two older model Jaguars that are in poor condition and are expected to have very little liquidation value. The Receiver continues efforts to recover on the judgment, but it currently appears that Lomas has few remaining assets.

13. Settlement with Auditors. Heiser and Jesko, Inc., a small accounting firm located in Ohio, (“H&J”) performed audits for Mobile Billboards and CMBI. The Receiver and the professionals working with him reviewed these audits as a part of their investigation and determined that the Receiver had viable claims against H&J.

Through his counsel, the Receiver made a demand to H&J outlining the Receiver’s claims. Without having to commence formal litigation, the Receiver and H&J were able to agree to a settlement amount, which was the subject of a settlement agreement approved by this Court after notice to all investors. In sum, the settlement provided that the Receiver would forego litigation against H&J in return for payment of all available insurance coverage under H&J’s professional liability insurance policy.

While the Receiver and his counsel believe that the value of this claim, if successful, would be significantly higher than the settlement amount, it was evident that H&J did not have assets sufficient to satisfy a substantially larger damages award. Accordingly, the Receiver and his counsel determined that the cost of pursuing the litigation would not result in a significantly larger recovery and would have increased the legal fees and other administrative expenses incurred by the Receiver Estate.

14. Litigation Against Sales Agents. As more fully described in the First Interim Report, the subject billboard investments were sold through a network of sales agents. The cumulative amount paid to these sales agents in commissions and bonuses exceeds \$19,000,000. The Receiver and his counsel previously made efforts to recover these commissions by sending letters to 150 different sales agents demanding a return of commissions. Only a few of the agents returned their commissions upon in response to these demand letters.

On or about October 18, 2005 (i.e., since the filing of the Third Interim Report), the Receiver filed a lawsuit in this Court against 143 sales agents for the return of all commissions and/or bonuses received as a result of their sales activities. *See, S. Gregory Hays, Receiver for Mobile Billboards of America, Inc., et al. v. David E. Adam, et al.*, Civil Action File No. 1:05-CV-2705, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

Given the number of defendants, the management of the case is, in some ways, cumbersome. As of the date of filing this Report, 105 of the defendant sales agents have been served with the Complaint. Efforts are continuing to be made to locate the remaining defendants and have them served with process. Approximately eight defendants have filed bankruptcy proceedings, which means that the Receiver's action is stayed as to those individuals. Approximately 42 defendants are in default. The Receiver has moved for the entry of a default and

will ultimately seek the entry of a default judgment against these individuals. Approximately 46 are actively defending against the Receiver's claims either through counsel or representing themselves pro-se.

The Receiver and his counsel believe that the merits of his claims are strong. However, it is becoming increasingly apparent that many of the agents have very limited resources with which to make a settlement payment or respond to a judgment if one is entered against them in this action. Accordingly, it is very difficult to predict how much money will actually be recovered as a result of this litigation.

15. Litigation Against Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, LLP. On March 31, 2006, the Receiver and six individual investors filed a complaint against the law firm of Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, LLP ("PHJW"). *Hays, et. al. v. Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP*, Civil Action File No. 1:06-CV-0754-CAP, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. The Receiver's attorneys are representing all of the plaintiffs in this case. The Complaint asserts claims on behalf of the Receiver and on behalf of the investors, both individually and as representatives of all investors. The investors will file a motion in late June asking the Court to certify the investor claims as a class action. Until that motion is decided, the applicable rules and an order entered in this case limit the Receiver's ability to communicate with investors about the case.

16. Claims Against Third-Parties. The Receiver and his counsel continue to analyze claims that might be asserted against a limited number of other third-parties based upon their involvement in or connection with the Receiver Entities and the underlying facts and circumstances of this case. However, it is inappropriate for the Receiver to identify the specific matters that are under review.

### **Financial Affairs of the Receiver Estate**

17. Attached hereto as Exhibit “B” is a summary of all funds received and disbursed by the Receiver since the date of his appointment. While the report indicates that the Receiver Estate has approximately \$700,000 in cash on hand, there are unpaid professional fees, as well as ongoing litigation expenses, for which this money will be used.

18. The vast majority of the expenses are the professional fees related to the administration of the Receiver Estate, which includes operations, investigation, accounting, tracing and asset recovery efforts. The Receiver and those working with him are mindful of the circumstances present here and that their fees are paid from the Receiver Estate. Accordingly, all of those involved in these activities endeavor to work efficiently and in a cost effective way. Even so, this is a complicated case requiring the professionals involved to devote significant time and effort to these administrative activities. In this regard, the Receiver’s overriding objectives are to perform the tasks ordered by the Court in the

Receivership Orders and to manage the payphones and pursue recoveries that will ultimately inure to the benefit of the investors and other creditors of the Receiver Entities.

This 19<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2006.

By: /s/ J. David Dantzler, Jr.  
J. David Dantzler, Jr.  
Georgia Bar No. 205125  
Attorney for S. Gregory Hays,  
Receiver For Defendants Mobile Billboards  
of America, Inc., et. al.

Troutman Sanders LLP  
Bank of America Plaza, Suite 5200  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

<p>SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,</p> <p style="text-align:center">Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MOBILE BILLBOARDS OF AMERICA, INC., INTERNATIONAL PAYPHONE COMPANY, TIGER MEDIA, INC., RESERVE GUARANTY TRUST, CALIFORNIA MOBILE BILLBOARDS, INC., WESTERN RESERVE GUARANTY TRUST, MICHAEL A. LOMAS and MICHAEL L. YOUNG,</p> <p style="text-align:center">Defendants.</p>	<p style="text-align:center">CIVIL ACTION NO.  1:04-CV-2763-WBH</p>
--	---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This shall certify that on June 19, 2006, I electronically filed the RECEIVER'S FOURTH INTERIM REPORT with the Clerk of Court using the CM/EFC system, which will automatically send an e-mail notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

James Alexander Rue  
William P. Hicks  
Julie O'Daniel  
Nina Marino

This 19<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2006.

By: /s/ J. David Dantzler, Jr.  
J. David Dantzler, Jr.  
Georgia Bar No. 205125  
Attorney for S. Gregory Hays,  
Receiver  
For Defendants Mobile  
Billboards of America, Inc.,  
International Payphone  
Corporation, Reserve Guaranty  
Trust and Tiger Media, Inc.

Troutman Sanders LLP  
Bank of America Plaza  
Suite 5200  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216

# **EXHIBIT A**

**SCHEDULE OF SOURCES AND USES OF CASH  
FOR THE PERIOD  
MARCH 22, 1999 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 21, 2004**

**Sources of Cash**

Billboard Investment Offering	\$	55,889,438	
Revenue from Billboard Advertising		555,737	
Phone Investment Offering		17,448,350	
Revenue from Payphone Operations		6,137,525	
Other Income		95,020	
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>\$</b>		<b>80,126,070 100%</b>

**Uses of Cash**

Commissions Paid to Sales Agents	\$		<b>19,448,938</b>	24%
Lease Payments Paid to Investors			<b>17,536,172</b>	22%
Payphone and Billboard Contract Cancellations			<b>4,665,096</b>	6%
<b>Payphone Expenditures</b>				
Payphone Purchases		8,069,532		
Expenses associated with Payphone Operations		4,445,580		
Payphone Site Commissions		787,726		
<b>Total Payphone Expenditures</b>			<b>13,302,838</b>	17%
<b>Billboard Expenditures</b>				
Purchases of Billboard Frames and GPS Units		877,653		
Advertising and Billboard Operating Expenses		2,090,219		
<b>Total Billboard Expenditures</b>			<b>2,967,872</b>	4%
Payroll - Receiver Entities (not disclosed below)			<b>3,632,735</b>	5%

**Insider Payments**

Payments to or on behalf of Michael A. Lomas				
Salary and Bonuses	\$	385,250		
Direct Payments from Receiver Entities		1,197,432		
Investment in House in France		200,000		
Purchase and Improvements of Long Beach Condo		674,684		
Purchase of Memorabilia, Art and Books		670,798		
Purchase and Expenditures for Automobiles		131,426		
Additional Credit Card Expenditures		115,310		
Expenditures for New York Condo		159,463		
Expenditures for Medical Services		39,254		
Expenditures for Jewelry and Clothing		128,535		
All Other Indirect Payments from receiver Entities		817,632		
Direct and Indirect Payments by - California Ground		428,000		
Direct and Indirect Payments by - KP Iron		100,000		
Direct and Indirect Payments by - 10-84 Trust		22,500		
Direct and Indirect Payments by - First Century Trust		97,584		
Direct and Indirect Payments by - Direct Marketing Insituite		995,687		
Expenditures to ventures - Walker's Retail		80,000		
Expenditures to ventures - Spa W		214,000		
Expenditures to ventures - Walker's Experience		150,000		
Expenditures to ventures - Walker's By The Cup		63,000	<b>6,670,556</b>	

**SCHEDULE OF SOURCES AND USES OF CASH  
FOR THE PERIOD  
MARCH 22, 1999 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 21, 2004**

Payments to or on behalf of Laurinda Holohan			
Salary and Bonuses	\$	462,541	
Direct Payments - Rent/Office		74,794	
Direct Payments - All Other		176,268	
Indirect Payments - Auto		38,913	
Indirect Payments - All Other		26,264	
Credit Card Expenditures		56,290	835,070
Payments to or on behalf of Michael L. Young			
Salary and Bonuses	\$	184,421	
Direct Payments		421,266	
Indirect Payments		135,669	741,356
All Other Insider's - Direct Payments	\$		2,483,588
Credit Card Expenditures - American Express			1,380,531
<b>Total Insider Payments</b>			<b>12,111,101</b> 15%
<b>Professional Fees</b>			
Maloney & Knox	\$	1,548,401	
Dittrick & Associates		267,594	
Gregory L. Thorpe		87,000	
Heiser & Jesko		47,984	
Pachulski, Stang		300,000	
Paul, Hastings		498,336	
Thomas Halbert		78,781	
Byron D. Van Iden		53,196	
Polen & Battles		46,818	
All Other Professional Fees		162,848	
<b>Total Professional Fees</b>			<b>3,090,958</b> 4%
Overhead Expenses			743,190    1%
All Other Expenditures			1,743,689    2%
Cash Available at Receiver Appointment			883,481    1%
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>\$</b>		<b>80,126,070</b> <b>100%</b>

# **EXHIBIT B**

**SEC v. Mobile Billboards of America**  
**Receiver's Source & Use of Funds Report**  
For the twenty months from 9/21/04 to 5/31/06

**Sources of Funds:**

Recovery from Professional Firms	225,176.82
Recovery of Tiger Media Receivables	56,890.25
Recovery from Frozen Bank Accounts	434,197.90
Recovery for "The Trust" - TCA Trust	542,207.69
Profits form Payphone Operations	810,000.00
Sale of Real Property	266,869.86
Sale of Other Assets	28,860.00
Litigation Against Sale Agents	22,850.50
Litigation Against Accountants	325,000.00
Recovery from Taxing Authorities	53,625.92
Recovery of Miscellaneous Items	70,970.83

**Total Receipts:** **2,836,649.77**

**Uses of Funds:**

Warehouse Rental	10,800.00
Professional Services:	
McKenna Long & Aldridge	170,089.82
HFC - Forensic Accounting	903,965.18
HFC - Payphone Operations	82,228.00
S Gregory Hays, Receiver	182,575.60
Troutman Sanders	460,277.91
Westrup Klick LLP	26,371.71
Jack Seward & Assoc	20,092.74
Document Production	1,423.79
Taxes Payable	21,532.92
Corporate Representation for legal notices	10,979.03
Payphone payroll	39,688.83
Payphone insurance	50,678.96
Misc. Disbursements	8,350.06
Payoff secured liens	
3/13/2006 Mary Doty	25,000.00
3/13/2006 Joe Fedele	25,000.00

**Total Disbursements:** **2,039,054.55**

**Balance at 5/31/06**

**797,595.22**

**Other Documents**

1:04-cv-02763-WBH Securities and Exchange Commission v. Mobile Billboards of America, Inc. et al

**U.S. District Court****Northern District of Georgia**

## Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was received from Dantzler, James entered on 6/19/2006 at 4:24 PM EDT and filed on 6/19/2006

**Case Name:** Securities and Exchange Commission v. Mobile Billboards of America, Inc. et al  
**Case Number:** 1:04-cv-2763  
**Filer:** S. Gregory Hays  
**Document Number:** 110

**Docket Text:**

STATUS REPORT *Receiver's Fourth Interim Report* by S. Gregory Hays. (Attachments: # (1) Exhibit A# (2) Exhibit B)(Dantzler, James)

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

**Document description:**Main Document

**Original filename:**n/a

**Electronic document Stamp:**

[STAMP dcecfStamp\_ID=1060868753 [Date=6/19/2006] [FileNumber=1324200-0] [29cd25a24f7db86e2fa1343e1dad35eb84259ae91fd524c6158e586ca0cad9897729c060fe77207919d8743135fc27f73bcb2fa593154584d06320a45b3b166c]]

**Document description:**Exhibit A

**Original filename:**n/a

**Electronic document Stamp:**

[STAMP dcecfStamp\_ID=1060868753 [Date=6/19/2006] [FileNumber=1324200-1] [44b4e618457f1ac1fdd7945e86c1cd003f1b4682f9c292914b6cc85394ac5b7cce4642d3a4e54deb10b5bc69cdbaffa54745c6f2c1d42c4bd4aa61ac9fe33dbe]]

**Document description:**Exhibit B

**Original filename:**n/a

**Electronic document Stamp:**

[STAMP dcecfStamp\_ID=1060868753 [Date=6/19/2006] [FileNumber=1324200-2] [6716eb99b134e1132d72c917551cc0811f0b5f3ca8d4055250664d19f8deef3c9f68bde6cf249d8b576e4e0849441f51c4e0f5371c2df093f5483d95acc4c3e1]]

**1:04-cv-2763 Notice will be electronically mailed to:**

Gregory Bartko gbartko@mindspring.com

Matthew R. Clark matthew.clark@troutmansanders.com

James David Dantzler , Jr david.dantzler@troutmansanders.com, ganell.meek@troutmansanders.com

Marc N. Garber mngarber@garberlaw.net

William P. Hicks Hicksw@SEC.Gov, Kuceram@SEC.Gov

John Ludlow Latham jlatham@alston.com

Nina Marino marino@kaplanmarino.com, eiland@kaplanmarino.com

Julie M. O'Daniel jodaniel@alston.com

James Alexander Rue rueba@sec.gov, kuceram@sec.gov

**1:04-cv-2763 Notice will be delivered by other means to:**

J. Wesley Covington  
Bryant, Patterson, Covington, Idol & Lewis, P.A.  
P.O. Box 341  
Durham, NC 27702

Malhar S. Pagay  
Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl, Young, Jones & Weintraub P.C.  
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard  
11th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067