

EXHIBIT S

Dear Ms. Damian:

██████████ respectfully objects to the Receiver's distribution proposal. As explained in the attached letter from ██████████ counsel, ██████████, ██████████ entered into a Consulting Performance Agreement with Today's Growth Consultant ("Income Store") on August 12, 2019 and wire-transferred \$110,000 on August 16, 2019. Contrary to the agreement, Income Store failed to purchase a website for ██████████, and ██████████ rescinded the agreement on December 5, 2019. Income Store failed to refund ██████████ \$110,000, and never paid ██████████ anything.

The Receiver's distribution proposal fails to account for the fact that investors like ██████████, who have no website and who never received any payments of any kind, are differently situated than investors who have websites and or at least received payments. Despite multiple requests to Income Store and the request for assurances in ██████████ letter, ██████████ has never received any explanation as to what happened to its money. Whether Income Store used the funds to pay other investors or whether the Receivership has used the funds to pay receivership expenses, neither should have done so.

██████████ recognizes that Income Store's financial position is terrible. Nonetheless, ██████████ submits that any distribution proposal must take into account of the fact that different classes of investors are situated differently. To be equitable, investors like ██████████, which have received nothing, should have a different and higher priority than investors who have been able to recover at least some of their investment or who received a website. Perhaps this is ultimately what you have in mind; but if so, ██████████ submits that the distribution proposal should state this more explicitly.

No one invested in Income Store to become a victim; but given the Ponzi scheme, some have fared worse than others. If you have questions or would like to discuss, please let me know.

Sincerely,

██████████ – Member