

EXHIBIT G

Ms. Damian,

I am writing to object to the amendment to one eligibility requirement in the "Proposed Noticing And Claims Administration Process" as outlined in today's email and on your website.

I do not believe any person employed by or contracted to TGC or Mr. Courtright during the relevant period should be entitled to a claim. In particular, [REDACTED] was my first contact at TGC/Income Store who marketed the program, made assertions about imminent changes in their business model that never came to fruition to, in my view, entice me to make the decision to invest, and shared website links that he purportedly owned via email correspondence.

In addition, my interactions with my "project manager" [REDACTED] were unusual and suspect. I went long period of time without updates on my "project" and had to contact her. When she returned my email, usually two weeks later, we eventually scheduled a phone conference. When I asked her about errors and incompletions on the website they were supposedly developing to monetize, she assured me they were going to fix and expand the content, create an attractive title banner etc., and the progress was either very limited or never happened. When I asked her why they had not purchased the two revenue generating sites first to support the development of the "authority site" they were creating from scratch as outlined in my consulting performance agreement, she told me there weren't many revenue generating sites available for purchase at that time, (last fall), and the sites they did purchase were assigned based on sign-on date. I believed then, and still believe now, she was not being truthful with me. I felt as though I was being "put off."

Thus, I do not believe that anyone, from the leadership to the operational staff, was not aware of what was going on, and in some way complicit with this situation. And so, I do not believe any of them should have a claim as outlined in your amendment.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]