

**EXHIBIT T**

I'm an investor to file the following objection. I think it is equitable to give investors the ability to take control of their sites, and that it increases the harm to the last group of investors, who already have suffered the greatest harm.

We never received a promised site. The investors who did receive sites were those who were into the Ponzi earlier. But those who were in earlier already received more recovery money through the guaranteed payments. They are therefore already closer to being made whole.

If they now have the option to take their sites, only those investors who have sites performing above average are likely to take that action. So they will be taking the cream from the top of the recovery pot, and reducing the average return to everyone else.

That would give greatest potential recovery to those who already have had greatest recovery, and leave a smaller pot behind for those who have thus far received less back.

If anything, I think those who were into the Ponzi last should receive recovery first until they reach parity with earlier investors before those investors receive further recovery. Many early investors have already received 50% or more of their investment back via the Ponzi transfers from late investors. Why then also give them the first pick of the few valuable assets?

██████████