VIA DHL
June 3, 2008

Mr. Donald S. Clark
Secretary of the Commission
Room H-172

600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580

lRJGINAL

RE: Second Civil Investigative Demand Issued May 16, 2008 0 i a 3130

Dear Mr. Clark:

This letter serves as the petition of Nutraceuticals International LLC (the "Company") to quash, or in the alternative, to limit the above referenced civil investigative demand (the "CID").

The first civil investigative demand served upon the Company was fully answered and submitted in the time agreed. The interrogatories requested the number of employees and the identification of employees involved in the marketing of hoodia gordonii material. The instant CID seeks the names, addresses, email addresses and job descripton of all employees, whether or not they have been involved in the marketing of hoodia gordonii material or not. The CID also demands bank account information and the identities of signatory authorities for any such accounts. The information sought byTd (information)Tr gordonii

AFFIDAVIT

State of New Jersey)

) ss.:

County of Bergen)

I, Cassandra O'Connor, am over 18 years of age and hereby depose and say:

1. I am employed as a receptionist for Nutraceuticals International LLC since January, 2008.

2. At about 4:00 PM on May 13th, 2008, I was asked by another employee to take a phone call from a woman who told me her name was Deb and that she needed to talk to someone about some paperwork. When I told her that all of the business managers had left for an off-site meeting, she requested their cell phone numbers. When I replied that I was not authorized to give those out and that I could take her number down and have someone get back to her, she demanded a cell phone number and questioned my understanding of how important it was that she speaks with someone. She never mentioned a specific name or what this was about other than they had sent some paperwork to our office under the direction of our attorney (also she did not specify any name) and that the issue needed to be resolved today.

3. I tried to reach a business manager and only reached one person who instructed me to call the person Deb back and find out what she was asking about, so at approximately 4:25 PM I called the woman, named Deb, back at the number she left 202-326-2610. When I explained to her that all of the managers had left for the day, and that the one that I had reached had no knowledge of any paperwork she had referred to, she repeated that it was "an urgent matter for the Federal Trade Commission" and that she "needed to speak with them right away". She also stated that she could verify that the paperwork was signed for and by whom.

4. I asked which date she had sent the;aperwork. She told me that it was sent on Apr. 21 st and we should have received it on Apr. 22n or 23rd• I asked if she knew who it was addressed to
and she didn't give me an answer. I admitted that if it had been signed for, it would probably be
my signature on the paperwork, but that I didn't recall receiving anything from the Federal Trade Commission and that I usually pass the mail along to whomever it is addressed to, so without
that information, I wouldn't be able to follow up on it.

5. I was then put on speaker phone, and a woman, whose name I couldn't hear but could hear
that she was a lawtr4..0076 Tc 2.09.0135 Tc 3c 1.895 Tj -0.035 T3S84 152.89t 0.639 0 Td (didn't 0 .626 0 Td (Tj j 0.0084w023 Tc 1.243.327 0 02 Td (th'ythinged'19 Tc 1.725 0 T4 (Federal)0 Tc 1.816 0 Td (I)Tj

information out to strangers.

6. The unidentified lawyer then asked to speak to Deb Vickery. rsatd that she wasn't in the office. The woman repeated what I said in a questioning tone, and I replied that Deb does come to this office, but that she was not here this week. She then asked for Zoltan. I told her that he was in Europe. She asked if I knew when he would be back, and I said that I didn't. She then asked if! knew what "obstruction to I said I

thenoat S w w

be was