AFRIKAANS HIERBO

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER: NOVEMBER 11.1 2023

THIS NEWSLETTER IS ADDRESSED TO YOU AS A MEMBER OF THE HIGHVELD SYNDICATION ACTION GROUP ("HSAG") ON ACCOUNT OF YOU HAVING MADE AN INVESTMENT IN THE HIGHVELD SYNDICATION COMPANIES 15-22 AND/OR SUPPORT OF THE HSAG.

THE WWW.HSACTION.CO.ZA WEBSITE IS THE PRIMARY PLACE WHERE YOU WILL FIND HSAG INFORMATION, SUBJECT TO THE DISCLAIMER CONTAINED THEREIN (AND ALSO APPLICABLE HERETO), ALTHOUGH EMAILS ARE ALSO SENT OUT FROM TIME TO TIME.

The obligation to keep us up to date with any inaccurate information or of any changes to your personal and/or contact details as well as to make sure that the contents of your monthly statements are correct rests on you as HSAG member.

HSAG OFFICIAL NEWSLETTER – CONTENTS

AMPTELIKE HSAG NUUSBRIEF

1 INTRODUCTION

In a recent judgment, familiar to HSAG members, the "HS21B" investors were removed from the certified class action list, prompting a call from the HSAG for affected investors to submit their share certificates to the HSAG's office by November 30, 2023, to be included in an updated court list. See below for more details.

Progress in the DECA case includes set trial dates for the next year, with potential opposition to combining cases. The DECA case involves complex financial matters and claims against individuals for non-payment and personal liability. In the liquidation matter, Derek Cohen appointed attorneys, and the application seeks to convert business rescue proceedings into liquidation.

The CCAF case sees the legal team working on a supplementary affidavit and compiling updated lists of investors. We also take a look at previous judgments and what they have held.

We clarify what Hans Klopper means in his latest status report, as well as taking a look at a newsletter from HSIF, represented by Helgard Hancke, who again tries to discredit the HSAG.

2 HS21B SHARE CERTIFICATES ISSUED IN HS21/22

Following the judgment by Judge Tolmay on 19 September 2023, the HSAG would like to urgently bring the following important information to the attention of members:

This ruling removed all "HS21B" investors from the HS21-22 list in the certified class action (CCAF) that was used and provided by the late Mr Nic Georgiou, Hans Klopper, Orthotouch and others, to describe those investors that invested in HS21, but were oversubscribed. It has come to the HSAG's attention that there are indeed "HS21B" investors who were issued with share certificates verifying that they indeed own shares in HS22. Such members must contact the attorneys urgently and provide them with a copy of their share certificates, so that they can be included in the updated list of names that the HSAG's legal team is currently preparing. We do not want to submit a

final list to court before those members with certificates are also included. After that, a final court date will be requested.

Therefore, if you know you are an “HS21B” investor, but your share certificate reflects that you are an HS22 or HS21 investor, you must send us a copy of the certificate as proof thereof. The legal team can then, if you fall within the ambit of the court order, present to court the relevant information for you to form part of the certified class action.

The court requires a comprehensive list including all members of the specified group. A final effort will be undertaken to persuade the judge regarding the inclusion of these members listed in “HS21B”, but in fact issued with HS22, or other HS21 share certificates.

It is essential for each member to promptly email all necessary documents to the office before 30 November 2023. Failure to provide the required documentation before the deadline may result in the individual being listed as “HS21B”, and as a consequence thereof, be left out. We also make available details of our PR department’s contact details, namely cell phone number, to communicate with those investors via Whatsapp and telephone. The number is 079 635 4165.

Please mark your email clearly as HS21B and send the copy of your share certificate, as the case may be, to the following email addresses: hsagregister@gmail.com and/or admin@ccaf.co.za

3 PROGRESS IN THE DECA CASE

The status quo has not changed and the trial dates for next year have officially been set. However, one aspect that could have an influence on the hearing, is a successful transfer of the setting aside application from Johannesburg to Pretoria, so that the two cases, which largely overlap, can be merged. This would save substantial costs, as the matter can be argued before one judge. The legal team continuously strive to save costs, as far as possible.

It is now common cause that Hans Klopper, as well as the two Georgiou sons, would not be in favour of the two matters being combined, as they regard themselves to be indemnified by Hans Kloppers' draconic S155 Scheme of Arrangement.

As a reminder, the Rule 30 Application in opposition the Funding application, introduced by the Respondents to impede the Funding Application hearing, solely aimed at frustrating proceedings, was withdrawn by the Respondents before it could be heard in October 2023. The funding application will now also be heard in May of 2024, together with the hearing of the main application.

4 THE NATURE OF THE DECA CASE

This case is a complex financial matter related to the property syndication schemes, known to members as the "Pickvest" or "Highveld" syndications 15-22. There were alleged fraudulent and reckless conduct of individuals, particularly those associated with the Georgiou group of companies, in managing the investments made by over 18 000 public investors totalling more than R4.6 billion.

The central figures in the case are the late Nic Georgiou, who, along with his sons, are alleged to have controlled various entities involved in the schemes, including Orthotouch and Zephan. Other parties include Hans Klopper, the initial Business Rescue Practitioner of the Highveld Syndications, as well as Jacques du Toit, current Business Rescue Practitioner of Orthotouch and Zephan. The HSAG argues that the promised properties were not transferred to the relevant Highveld companies, constituting misrepresentation and unlawful conduct. The Highveld companies voluntarily placed themselves under business rescue in 2011, with a business rescue plan involving the sale of properties to Orthotouch.

The plan outlined that Orthotouch would acquire and manage the property portfolio, under the watchful and "independent" eye of Hans Klopper, which would eventually repay investors after five years. However, the plan faced "challenges" as Orthotouch's cash flow couldn't support monthly payments. Subsequently, a S155 Scheme of Arrangement was proposed by Hans Klopper and adopted, with Orthotouch acting as a "salvage vehicle". The arrangement, however, raised questions about its validity, as

it appeared to involve an agreement between entities controlled by Georgiou and Hans Klopper.

The HSAG brought the derivative action on behalf of the Highveld companies against Hans Klopper and others, for non-payment under the plan. Additionally, the HSAG seeks declaratory orders holding directors and individuals, including Georgiou, his sons and Hans Klopper, personally liable for Orthotouch's debts. The relief sought also includes a "proceeds class action" by investors to collect proceeds from the derivative action, and a "direct class action" against individuals for losses incurred in the failed investment schemes. This action is unfortunately extremely complicated and cumbersome.

The HSAG argues that investors are not bound by the Scheme of Arrangement and can pursue claims based on fraudulent and reckless conduct, seeking damages for losses incurred. The Scheme of Arrangement was to materialize in 2024, but when it became unequivocally clear that it would not materialise, it was decided to proceed with the setting aside.

5 PROGRESS IN THE LIQUIDATION MATTER: DEREK COHEN

Derek Cohen, die 8th Respondent in the matter, has finally appointed his attorneys to represent him in the Liquidation matter. He was added as a party to the Liquidation application, seeing as he operated in the capacity of an independent "receiver" in connection with Orthotouch within the context of the Scheme of Arrangement. Apart from his role as a Receiver, Derek Cohen is a consultant and director of companies.

In the course of his responsibilities as the appointed receiver under the S155 Scheme of Arrangement, Derek Cohen was tasked with the crucial role of preparing a Liquidation and Distribution Account, akin to the duties of a liquidator under a winding-up order. The purpose of this account was to provide transparency regarding Orthotouch's financial affairs and assets.

However, the outcome of Cohen’s task did not meet the promises and expectations set out. Instead of offering a comprehensive portrayal of Orthotouch's financial

situation and assets, the Liquidation and Distribution Account seemed to comprise little more than a basic list. This list, described as a pre-existing spreadsheet or database, contained the names of various investors, along with the value of their investments in different Highveld companies, as well as the current value of these investments. There was also substantial delay in obtaining the list from Cohen, so much so, that the Honourable Judge Spilg made critical observation about it in a May 2016 judgment in the Johannesburg High Court. Judge Spilg expressed his dissatisfaction, finding *"it is evident from the papers as a whole that the applicants will not get ice in winter from any of the respondents who have opposed the application for substituted service unless ordered to do so by the court*". Later in the same judgment Judge Splig describes Klopper and Cohen's actions in the matter, as "*recalcitrant*".

Furthermore, Derek Cohen's involvement, along with other individuals such as Georgiou, Klopper, Myburgh, and Kleovoulou, has been associated with actions that are allegedly fraudulent or, at the least, grossly negligence. These actions, including a failure to exercise the proper degree of care and skill in their duties, resulted in great losses and damages suffered by the applicants

The HSAG alleges that Cohen's actions aligned with the interests of Georgiou, and that he was never independent, as he should have been, in his capacity as receiver. He has over the years also sought postponements and made applications to intervene in legal proceedings, contributing to the complexity of the Highveld Syndication matters.

6 NATURE OF THE LIQUIDATION MATTER

The application is seeking the conversion of business rescue proceedings into liquidation proceedings for two entities, Orthotouch and Zephan, in accordance with section 132(2)(a)(ii) of the Companies Act 71 of 2008. The HSAG is requesting that the court place both entities (which were consolidated by Jacques du Toit) under final liquidation, or alternatively, provisional liquidation, with a rule nisi issued to call on interested parties to show cause why a final order of liquidation should not be granted.

The main contention is that the business rescue proceedings for Orthotouch and Zephan should be converted to liquidation proceedings, due to their alleged insolvency and the belief that it is just and equitable to do so. The HSAG argues that the business rescue proceedings have not effectively addressed the financial issues facing the companies, and have, in fact, served to protect individuals (including Georgiou, Klopper and others) rather than the interests of the investors, with billions of rands of investments.

The HSAG argues that the conversion to liquidation is necessary for a proper investigation into the affairs of the investment schemes and to provide transparency in addressing the interests of investors. With liquidation, the necessary accountability for the actions perpetrated by the Business Rescue Practitioner, Jacques du Toit, will also come about.

Provisional liquidation is an alternative procedure that involves the court appointing an insolvency practitioner to take control of a company. However, the effect is the same as “normal” liquidation in that the liquidator's role is to protect the company's assets, books and records, as well as the public interest. The liquidator is appointed after a winding-up petition has been submitted to the court. The court may appoint a provisional liquidator if there is concern that the company's assets will be taken before the business is wound up.

A preliminary liquidation order, as well as a final liquidation order, have the following effects:

There is suspension of all legal action. No creditor can take legal action against the company. A provisional liquidator is appointed. They take control of the company's assets, business, and other affairs. The directors, including the Business Rescue Practitioner, lose all authority. All civil proceedings are also suspended until a liquidator is appointed.

The liquidator can recommend to the court that the liquidation order be lifted. They can also recommend that control of the company be returned to management, or that in the event of provisional liquidation, a final order be granted. The investigations carried

out by the liquidator can result in serious issues for directors. These include personal liability for business debts, being disqualified as a director, as well as a possible criminal investigation into them if fraudulent activity is discovered. In this event, all possible infringements by a business rescue practitioner will also be investigated.

7 PROGRESS IN THE CCAF CASE

The legal team is diligently working on the supplementary affidavit, as ordered by Judge Tolmay in her recent judgment. This is a critical step in ensuring that all relevant information is presented to support our case in court. We implore all HS21B members to cooperate, by providing the information asked elsewhere, as they have a final opportunity to possibly be included.

In support of the supplementary affidavit, we are actively engaged in compiling new and updated lists of investors. These lists aim to more precisely reflect the identities of investors, as opposed to the last accurate list we had in 2020, which included HS21B. It is essential for us to have the most up-to-date information to strengthen our case and to ensure that every possible investor is reflected on the list.

If you are an investor in CCAF and are unsure of your current status, we kindly request you to reach out to our attorneys' offices, as set out herein. Your cooperation in providing accurate and current information is invaluable in this process.

We have again came to the conclusion that the interest of the majority of action group members must always prevail and that we cannot wait for smaller groups to join before we proceed Our commitment to achieving justice for all affected investors remains unwavering, but unfortunately, we are bound to look after the interests of all faithful members and the larger group.

8 WHAT OTHERS SAY

Whatever false information may be maliciously spread by the Georgious, Hans Klopper, Jacques du Toit or other affiliates about the HSAG and its representatives, we would like to reiterate that our standard has always been and will be to be in line with what the courts said, in all the different judgments we have received so far.

- In a September 2016 judgment, made by Judge Spilg in the Johannesburg High Court, after Klopper brought an application to appeal a previous Splig judgment, the Honourable Judge further comments on a Rule 30 procedural application by the Respondents. He writes *"the respondents [Georgiou and others] cannot have it both ways. This is a classic case of a party performing cart wheels with no purpose other than to frustrate the merits of the case being dealt with expeditiously".* He likens the case they are making to "*Stalingrad defence; where issues taken on appeal simply delay the matter and build up costs for lay litigants against those who have deep pockets. The risk of being financially out-litigated cannot be in the interests of justice particularly where the interests of justice are served ultimately by ensuring that the most effective and practical means is adopted to bring the rescission application to the notice of the thousands of affected investors".*

- In a March 2017 judgment, made by Judge Ismail in the Johannesburg High Court, he maintains that "*this court cannot idly sit by and observe or countenance such conduct (referring to the withdrawal of the nominal applicants after they settled with Georgiou) designed to deprive the investors of their rights to proceed with [the matter]"*.

- In an April 2017 judgment, made by Judge Murphy in the Pretoria High Court, he confirms that *"[the late Nic] Georgiou colluded with [the Applicants] in a manner that can only be described as an abuse of the court process"* and that *"they have left other members… high and dry". "Their conduct improperly prejudiced the [paying members].* The Honourable Judge ends of with *"improper and irregular steps have been taken in order to defeat the claims of numerous mostly elderly and impecunious claimants"*.

- In 2019, the retired Judge Bertelsmann in another matter, similar to the HSAG matters, strongly criticized Klopper for not adequately fulfilling his responsibilities in managing a company's business rescue proceedings. The judge emphasized that Klopper was aware of the company's insolvency early

on and should have terminated the business rescue proceedings accordingly. Furthermore, the judge highlighted Klopper's failure to adhere to statutory duties and failure to report to the Commission after three months had passed without concluding the business rescue proceedings . The judge's report asserted that Klopper's inaction made him liable for the losses suffered by the company and its creditors. Additionally, the judge observed that Klopper's hands-off approach, particularly after the launch of the liquidation application, indicated a primary motivation for commercial gain (this should also apply to Du Toit).

Below excerpts from Judge Bertelsmann (as set out in an earlier newsletter):

"It is unfortunately necessary to record that Mr Klopper has been gravely remiss in the exercise of his functions as a business rescue practitioner."

"In the first instance he must have been aware that the company was trading in insolvent circumstances from a very early stage of his appointment."

"His comments during the evidence he gave at the enquiry are unmistakable in this regard."

"He was in duty bound to alert the Court to the incontrovertible fact of the Company's insolvency and to terminate the business rescue proceedings."

"It is difficult to accept that he entertained a bona fide belief that the elusive funding would be found, especially after the … litigation."

In the HSAG matters and in 12 years, Klopper failed to comply with his statutory duties of ensuring the adoption of a business rescue plan and of reporting to the Commission after three months had passed without the business rescue proceedings having been terminated. Instead, he vigorously opposed the HSAG matters with investors' own funds, and drove a smear campaign against their representatives and legal team.

- On another occasion, the senior advocate of Nic Georgiou and his entities (including Zephan) , withdrew their case at the Supreme Court of Appeal and tendered a punitive cost order. Unfortunately, Georgiou died before those costs could be recovered, leaving the HSAG without those necessary funds. Punitive costs orders are usually given when a court wants to show its displeasure with a defendant's conduct during a trial. It is exceptionally rare that a legal representative would, before judgment is made, tender such costs themselves, obviously unless they knew beforehand that their client had abused the court process, been in contempt of court or had conducted the litigation in a poor way.

9 HANS KLOPPER: OCTOBER STATUS REPORT

Hans Klopper has sent out a status report, which fits hand in glove with Helgard Hancke's "newsletter" (see below). In this "report", he states that HS21B investors will not be allowed to form part of an already certified class action due to the HSAG's conduct. This is false. A Rule 30 application was brought by our opponents, to exclude certain investors, which Hans Klopper included under HS21 and HS22.

This application was brought to exclude such members from a list which the late Nic Georgiou, Hans Klopper and Orthotouch provided, and which was brought before court. This group of the so-called HS21B forms a very small portion of the certified class action and the Rule 30 application by the Respondents delayed the proceedings for a very long period of time.

It was not an easy decision for the judge to make and it took more than four months for her to deliberate. Hans Klopper and others were the sole cause for this confusion, because they supplied the lists with the information contained therein. Since the Tolmay judgment, members came forward, stating that they indeed have HS22 (and possible other) share certificates, even though they were listed as HS21B. Those members are now called upon to contact the HSAG attorneys and present their certificates.

The High Court did not make a finding against the certified HS21 and HS22 class action group and simply ordered that HS21B investors identified as such on Klopper's list, do not fall under the certified HS21 and 22 class. No cost order was made against the certified class (CCAF), but rather forms costs in the main application, which is seen as a victory in our pursuit for justice.

Klopper conveniently omits to mention that the list that he supplied, containing the names of HS21B investors, was in fact presented to court, and it was against his HS21B column on the list that our opponents now objected to, and filed an application. It was no “new” list but the same list that Klopper and other Respondents used all the time and presented to all parties, including the court.

Klopper is, as many times before, simply economical with the truth. Any other allegations made by Klopper as to the reason for the silence in the media is moot, as this was only an interlocutory application, and relates to just more that 3% of the total claim value of the certified class action. In practical terms it is nominal and as such, of no great consequence.

Klopper, like Hancke further hammers on the same point: that the HSAG has not been “successful in nearly 10 years”, without being honest that the lack of progress falls squarely on his shoulders, as well as Georgiou and their lackeys.

- Firstly, Klopper crippled the companies by putting them in business rescue;
- Klopper then secretively brought a S155 Scheme of Arrangement to be endorsed in Johannesburg court, another court than Pretoria which his own scheme prescribed;
- Georgiou, Klopper, du Toit and others fought the investors with their own life savings and money;
- Georgiou secretly and without scruples, bought off two steering committee members, Elna Visagie and Helgard Hancke; and
- thereafter the erstwhile HSAG class action applicants; and
- who then unlawfully then tried to withdraw the class action;
- further unforeseen delays were Covid-19;

- Nic Georgiou died (overseas), and
- thereafter Georgiou's executor (who was apparently 10 year older than him) also died etc.

None of the reasons for our so-called non-success is due to the investors, other than being impoverished in the process, or not willing or able to invest in their own case. It is Klopper, through his fellow business rescue practitioner, Jacques du Toit, who managed to delay the matters.

Hans Klopper also points the finger at the HSAG for delaying the hearing of the DECA case. This is factually incorrect and for good reason, no basis is laid for this. The matter was supposed to be enrolled in January 2024 but Klopper's own legal counsel was only available in May 2024. Klopper is the first and main Respondent in the DECA case, and must take the necessary steps to account to court why he didn't pursue the billions of rands that disappeared under his and Georgiou's watch, care and control.

Klopper then goes on about the application to transfer the setting aside of the Scheme of Arrangements application. Klopper again plays judge in his own case and accuses the HSAG of not paying the necessary costs for the "unsuccessful" Pretoria application, allegedly brought in the "wrong court". This is utter nonsense and untrue. Klopper is clearly not playing open cards, because it is expressly stipulated in his own plan, Scheme, that Pretoria has jurisdiction.

Klopper does not have a lot to say about the liquidation application, but this is probably because Jacques du Toit , his nominated BRP, cannot spend the company money as he wishes and everyone is waiting for Du Toit to come forward with long awaited financials of the insolvent Zephan and Orthotouch, from which Helgard Hancke received a staggering R600 000.

We have until date hereof also not received Jacques du Toit's answering affidavit in the Liquidation Application. This is because he has a serious predicament because he must now, as an officer of court, testify under oath. In four months, he was unable to file opposing papers, clearly because he must do so under oath. One of Du Toit's other

excuses is that his senior counsel is not "available" in respect of documents that were already "95%" completed weeks ago. Furthermore, he tries to raise all kinds of technical defences from others.

Klopper indicated that he would “abide” by the Court’s ruling in relation to the transfer matter and a notice to this effect was given to the applicants’ attorneys. He elected, on a calculated basis not to testify under oath that Pretoria is the court with jurisdiction, as should actually be the case.

The Georgiou sons oppose the transfer and have filed their answering affidavits, but have shot down the application, alleging there are “irremediable” technical defects. This is because they know that an insolvency interrogation would have serious consequences for them and are therefore trying to keep the case from proceeding, and possibly losing such indemnity.

All in all, there is again nothing new from Klopper and he, once again, shamelessly assumes his role as Georgiou mouthpiece. Say no more…

10 HSIF: HELGARD HANCKE

The HSAG already decided years ago not to waste time and money unnecessarily on Helgard Hancke, but in light of his timing, we state the following:

Recently Helgard Hancke has again published a “newsletter”, under the guise of the HSIF: Highveld Syndication Investor’s Forum (we all know who pay him). It is literally years since “Hancke” has put his name to a newsletter, and it would appear that the hundreds of thousands of rands that he recently received illegally in an attempt to thwart the class action have now run out.

In his latest “newsletter”, Hancke feverously attempts again to cast doubt on the integrity and efforts of the Highveld Syndication Action Group (HSAG). It is clear that this information is part of the continued smear campaign (driven by Klopper and Du Toit) aimed at discrediting the HSAG and their attorneys, and creating unnecessary concern among our valued members.

Hancke is considered by the HSAG as a *persona non grata* and non-entity. He has no responsibilities, desperately trying to derail the HSAG and spreading false news and information with regards to the class action at an enormous remuneration from the investments of HS 15-22 investors. We have little doubt that he has run out of the initial R600 000, unlawfully given to him by Jacques du Toit, and that he is surely hoping for a Christmas bonus. He has been joined at the hip with those responsible for the failed investment scheme, and this latest newsletter coincides with the determination of court dates early next year. These matters could bring to the fore his role in the failed scheme and is it apparent that he is reiterating the same baseless information in anticipation of what is to come. Our opponents' strategy now appears to be, to sow fear and confusion.

Members are reminded that Helgard Hancke was sacked as an HSAG steering committee member and is now a glorified mouthpiece for both Hans Klopper, Jacques du Toit and the Georgious. This was proven by the figures that were made available, where Du Toit siphoned R600 000 to Hancke for doing their dirty work in frustrating the class action. On the face of it, Hancke is not accountable to any party, so the only explanation that remains is that he is doing the bidding of the Georgious, and also Klopper and Du Toit, seeing as any communication from them would hurt the latters' façade of impartiality they have been trying to nurture – as Business Rescue Practitioners and officers of the court.

The HSAG continues to work tirelessly to pursue justice and see all cases through to the end but cannot do so without the continued support of its members. Our legal team is continuously working relentlessly on your behalf, despite many members not bringing their side, and we are certain of the legitimacy of our actions. Contrary to the misleading claims made by Hancke, the HSAG works with the greatest care and the best possible transparency to protect its members' interests and conduct the case. Our members' concerns and financial well-being are carefully considered.

We believe that the truth will ultimately prevail in the upcoming court proceedings, and any false information spread by Hancke will be exposed. The last time Hancke tried to enter the legal arena, the court slapped him with a punitive costs order. When the

sheriff arrived at his residence, he had no money to pay those costs, and our opponents had to come to his financial rescue.

11 IMPORTANT: USE OF CORRECT ACCOUNT NUMBERS AND REFERENCES

HSAG members who are in both HSAG and CCAF, please report any change to both HSAG and CCAF's e-mail addresses, be it death of a member, change of e-mail address, mobile phone number or residential address.

Members are reminded to note the reference numbers as contained on their statements. Requisitions must be paid by members into the correct accounts with the correct reference number attached. The time, effort and administration it costs the HSAG's legal team to correct any erroneous payment leads to the HSAG case becoming unnecessarily expensive.

Account numbers and references are affixed to each statement and we request that members please review their statements carefully when making payments.

If you have paid your amount into an incorrect account, send an e-mail with a request to transfer the amount to the correct account, and remember to attach your proof of payment to the email.

If you paid the amount into e.g. CCAF Trust Account 3, but the amount was intended for your HSAG Trust Account 2, or vice versa.

Payments made incorrectly in CCAF, send email to admin@ccaf.co.za.
Payments incorrectly paid in HSAG, send email to hsactiongroup@gmail.com

12 GENERAL ENQUIRIES

A query we often get is regarding the transfer of shares, after the death of a loved one. We would like to remind everyone that this is done by Orthotouch. It is the company that handles the transfer of the shares and it is only after we have received a document, issued by them, indicating that the shares have been transferred in a new

name, that we can change it on our system. We are also aware of the fact that it is in Business Rescue - however, this should have no impact on their work performance and we ask that everyone contact them on this email: **admin@orthotouch.co.za.**

Over the years, some people's claims have increased to an amount greater than the initial investments invested in the Highveld Syndication, due to the fact that, among other things, they inherited investments from their parents. Members must make sure that they provide documents and certificates that prove the transfer, as they will eventually be needed to prove the increased claim amount. At this stage we accept people's value of their investment based on their written evidence.

Finally, please note that if no payments have been made by you over a long period of time, it is possible that previous trust requisitions and payments may not be reflected on the statement.

13 IMPORTANT: USE OF THE CORRECT EMAIL ADDRESSES!

The correct use of e-mail addresses (as stipulated on our website and e-mails) as well as HSAG members' initials and surnames, syndication numbers and reference numbers (e.g. identity number, etc.) for all communications are essential and obligatory. Failure to comply herewith may lead to unnecessary delays or any reply at all.

The official and existing e-mail addresses for the HSAG are as follows:

- **hsactiongroup@gmail.com** for all General Enquiries; (For Example - to change contact details, Proof of Payments, Death of a Member, payments erroneously paid into HSAG Trust Account 2, incorrect references etc.);
- **hsagenquiries@gmail.com** for Specific Enquiries; (For Example requesting information/statements regarding a specific member, exemption queries for a specific member);
- **hsagregister@gmail.com** for the registration and deregistration of HSAG members, as well as notice of members who have died;

- **hsagwhistle@gmail.com** for all Confidential Information that you would like to send to us anonymously;
- **hsagestates@gmail.com** for all estate related questions.

The official and existing e-mail addresses for CCAF (HS 21 & 22 certified class action) are as follows:

- accounts@ccaf.co.za for proof of payments, incorrect references on proof of payments
- admin@ccaf.co.za for the official request to pay registration fees over 6 months form, payments erroneously made to CCAF Trust Account 3, as well as deregistering from CCAF;
- enquiries@ccaf.co.za for statements not received and all other CCAF questions and enquires

If an investor or any person sends an email to the wrong address, it will result in the email not receiving the speedy or necessary attention, if any. If you do not wish to receive any further emails, please inform us thereof in writing.

14 IMPORTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The general and repetitive terms, conditions and other general information that was previously contained in the Newsletter, is now available on the HSAG website at www.hsaction.co.za **and can directly be accessed via the following link:** http://hsaction.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/HSAGTsCs.pdf

The HSAG Steering Committee wishes prosperity and success to each and every member for the foreseeable future.

Kind regards

HSAG Steering Committee
Contact the HSAG's attorneys at:
Tel: (021) 887 7877
hsactiongroup@gmail.com