


SEC v Complete Business Solutions Group Inc. et al; Case No. 9:20-cv-81205-RAR



To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you without Legal representation to respond to two items. The notion of a Ponzi scheme and the disagreement of what the Receiver has calculated for my Claim Determination.

With regards to the notion that this was a Ponzi Scheme, that is not true! With a Ponzi Scheme typically the investors have to 'Call' for their investment back. These dividend investments were delivered like clockwork every month so at not point in my 3 year involvement did I ever have the idea that this was anything remotely like a Ponzi.

With regards to my claim determination I believe We are being punished because we had a previously matured and closed agreement and decided to open another subsequent agreement. This is simply not fair. And So my question, if the Court thinks this is fair, would be are they going back to all investors that had matured and closed agreements that decided NOT to do a subsequent investment after a closed investment and asking them for money back because they were reimbursed too much money? Because by the Receiver's calculation you are only entitled to what you put in no matter when you invested and regardless of whether or not your investment is closed or not. The details of my claim are below and they were also previously given in great detail with all the appropriate accompanying documents to the Receiver as asked.

I am writing today with regards to my objection that I have been assigned for the final dollar amount of \$128,833 that will be given to Mark Mehok. My belief is that you were counting interest payments from a previously closed transaction prior to my current open subscription agreement of \$230,000. But that roughly \$38,000 was part of interest payments to a subscription agreement that was previously closed with a complete return of principal Prior to me opening my current investment/subscription agreement. Here are some further details: My situation is a bit different. I made an initial investment of \$100,000 back on 9/13 /2016 for which I have an initial subscription agreement for (attached); I was given interest payments for that. Now Subsequent to that I made an additional \$50,000 investment on the initial investment on 3/15/2017, and was given interest payments regularly along the way. HOWEVER, on 3/23/2018 CGBSG returned 100% of all of my principal (Bank statement illustrating \$150K deposit). Given this information for which I have attached the proof, there should be no decrease of any of those interest payments towards my end number of principal because this agreement and transaction closed this investment.

On 3/26/2018 I entered into a **brand new agreement** with a completely new subscription agreement (attached) with different terms and a brand new wiring of new funds (attached). This

initial investment was \$150,000 which paid me a monthly interest payment of \$2250 a month for the next 12 months (\$27,000)

Then on 3/6/ 2019 I added \$50,000 to my principal for a total of \$200,000 which paid me \$3000 a month For the next 12 months (\$36,000)


Then lastly, on 3/12/2020 (just days before SEC shutdown) I put an additional \$30,000 into my principal for a total of \$230,000 and subsequent to that additional increase in my Principal investment I only received two \$958.33 (total of \$1,916.66) payments after which time I received no additional interest payments Because of Par Funding being shut down by the SEC... therefore the Total Interest payments that I received from my last active investment was \$64,917

So given the fact that I received 100% of my principal back from my first investment, those interest payments that were received, should not count towards decreasing my total principal payment back from the receivership.

Also, I had \$230,000 invested in par funding but that investment was staggered over three years and thus my interest payments only had a grand total of \$64,917

This investment of mine was earmarked for my son's education to college and has created quite the burden of not having access to it. So my request is that the \$64,917 which has been returned from my current agreement could make my return of Principal be \$165,083 and that be the correct number.

I look forward to your response

 (mmehok@comcast.net)
MARK MEHOK

REC'D BY _____
MAY - 8 2024
ANGELA E. NOBLE
CLERK U.S. DIST. CT.
S. D. OF FLA. - MIAMI

33128 33128 33128

Clerk's Office
Southern District of Florida
Willie D. Ferguson Jr US Courthouse
400 North Miami Ave
Miami, FL 33128

