

BY MESSENGER

Victor Cohen. Esa

6th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20580

Bear Victor:

As we discussed on Thursday Tune 6. 1001 a four

of which is attached to this letter as Exhibit A). None of the facts described in my earlier letter have changed, except that on December 15, 1991 the additional \$3.5 million will be provided by Company X in the form of credit enhancement and the original \$3 million note will convert to a cash flow mortgage having an indefinite term. However, as we discussed on June 6, 1991, given the financial condition of Company V (the horrower) convertible of the future financial performance of Company Y. Accordingly, the Loan Agreement provides certain additional veto powers

Riserto, on work, of the transference of

for Company X as well as certain affirmative and negative

Company Y's management will operate the daily business

approval. In the event that Company X does not approve of a input in Y's prices a possible antifuction whaten when to France +FTC hote may occar, four all forces a barried.

Victor Cohen, Esq. June 10, 1991 Page Two

requested change in the budget, then the parties agree to submit the issue to an independent third party for resolution.

Second, the Loan Agreement provides that in subsequent years Company Y will prepare an annual budget and submit the budget to Company X for approval. Once again, if

party for resolution.

Third, if Company X provides the additional million scodit onbargament or Dogarher 15 1001 that majority shareholders of Company Y agree to subordinate their loans to Company Y to the Company X loan and/or forgive some of the loans they made to Company Y in order to provide Company X with additional lender protection.

percentage or the net profits of company Y.

Fifth, in the event that any key executive position becomes vacant, Company X would have veto power over any replacements selected by the Company Y management.

Finally, Company Y affirmatively covenants to maintain at a prescribed level the sales volumes, price lists and sales staff commissions of Company Y, subject to change as provided in the budgets.

As we discussed, Company X would not have the right to appoint management or make daily operating decisions. The veto powers over Company Y's management decisions granted to Company X are directed toward assuring the continued

that although this hybrid loan had some of the aspects of "ownership", so long as Company Y's veto rights over

the honoficial experation of the steak-e-----

Victor Cohen, Esq. June 10, 1991 Page Three

Please contact me immediately if I have in any way misunderstood your analysis of this matter. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Hy.