02/23/2021

To Judge Peter J. Messitte,

My partner, Timothy Foote, and I, Jacqueline Woody purchased Lot SR197 in what we were told was called The Reserve. We put approximately \$70,000 down on what was to be our dream home on the water, well canal really. About a month later while we were in the process of discussing a dock design and erosion control with ABM contractors, we were completely blindsided by the raid and seizure of "The Reserve." Since it was obviously being investigated for some time, we felt like how could they let us purchase with this developer knowing what they know? Now two and half years later we feel like the opt in or opt out is a lose-lose, we opt in and are still paying on a contract that is discounted disproportionately to the risk we assume holding on to a lot with no knowledge of if and when a developer will take over and what the amenities and HOA fees will be, on the other hand we opt out will no real figure as to what we will get reimbursed from the approximately \$70,000 we paid. We feel like the development is worse off than before it was raided, an illiquid tract of land. Some lots have been surveyed with roads and infrastructure, and some haven't, and some are somewhere in between. At a discounted rate off of around 25-35% off our original contract price of \$325,000 seems out of line as to what the comps are or what as to what a cold buyer would be willing to pay for raw land in a defunct development that is sparsely build out. We, therefore, do not agree with the current redress plan and feel that the only way to fairly settle with all the consumers, which was the purpose of this seizure, is to work out contract prices based on real comps and not a lot calculator algorithm made up by lawyers. Thank you for your time.

Timothy Foote

Himafcote @ Smail. com

707 217-7171

FEB 2 6 2021

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

PETER J. MESSITTE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

6500 CHERRYWOOD LANE GREENBELT, MARYLAND 20770 301-344-0632

MEMORANDUM

To: Counsel of Record & Pro Se Parties

From: Judge Peter J. Messitte

Re: In re Sanctuary Belize Litigation

Civil No. PJM 18-3309

Date: February 23, 2021

There is still apparent confusion as to the procedure for objecting to the FTC's proposed redress plan. Chambers has received a number of individual emails that have not been docketed with the Office of the Clerk of Court.

To reiterate, no filings should be sent directly to the Judge's chambers. Rather, materials must be sent directly to the Clerk's Office to permit access by all parties. Submissions should be received by February 26, 2021, and should be filed in person or via mail to the Clerk of Court, 6500 Cherrywood Lane, Greenbelt, Maryland 20770.

However, for now, in order to facilitate the process, the Court will Order that the Clerk file those e-mail documents already received in chambers.

At least one set of objectors has asked for "confidential" discussions with the Court. The Court cannot agree to this request. Accordingly, the Court will not docket that objection, but the objectors may file their submission in accordance with this Order.

Despite the informal nature of this ruling, it shall constitute an Order of the Court and the Clerk is directed to docket it accordingly.

Peter J. Messitte

United States District Judge

CC: Court File

