

Dear Sir/Madam,

Many different letters could have been sent concerning Opes Prime since March 2008. The abbreviated message for help now would just include issues which are not right and need to be rectified, such as:

1. ANZ were involved in a scheme with Opes Prime where a commercial Stock Lending Arrangement (SLA) was sold to retail customers who asked for a Margin Lending Agreement (MLA). It's not professional. The agreement I signed said the ANZ were custodians, and I was guaranteed nothing could ever go wrong with Opes because they were backed by the ANZ.
2. Sophisticated investors we might be, but professional financial institutions we are not! Why are there not warnings on all SLA spelling out the fact that it is not a MLA.
3. Clients were not given the right to refinance or buy back their own stock. Noting, at the time, we actually thought we owned our stock, but would only have to refinance the loans.
4. The fact that the ANZ became a substantial shareholder in many small companies, was this process always followed up? I'm sure it was NOT!
5. There were some professional and institutional investors who DID know the nature of the agreement, yet they share in the \$254 M payment from the ANZ.
6. Most of the legal proceedings have been taken up by discussions concerning the remuneration of the IMF and Slater & Gordon. What about the clients of Opes? We are insignificant!
7. I work very hard. Over a period of 18 months I purchased 1.2M Pure Energy Options. I made a significant investment in a company which I was sure would have good gas reserves. These Options had to be converted to regular shares, which I had made provisions for. This year British Gas paid \$8.25 for each Pure Energy share. ANZ probably sold my shares to an ANZ associate at a bargain basement price, and I'm not happy losing \$10M! In addition to that there were several other stocks in my company names that I lost through Opes totalling \$4.8M nett.
8. The ANZ are meant to be one of Australia's leading banks-
 1. They receive government guarantee and assistance.
 2. They influence our media.
 3. They influence our legal system.
 4. They influence ASIC.
 5. They are immune from being held accountable for providing products and services to the general public in a practice which should be illegal. Consumers have a right to expect an apple when they ask for an apple.

I'm sorry if I've wasted your time, but the ANZ are not innocent.

Thanking you,