

Lucille Atillo

From: Lucille [lucille@beverlyhillsscreeningclub.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2003 11:25 AM
To: 'info@vegasbbb.org'
Subject: reply to The Interchange Group Complaint number 133521

Complaint No. 133521

I am not satisfied with company's (The Interchange Group) response because:

1. As stated in page 2 of the agreement they executed, (www.beverlyhillsscreeningclub.com/funding/TIG.doc) TIG has not expeditiously met our financial needs. The project we presented was the Beverly Hills Screening Club at the Howard Hughes Promenade. All they did was introduce us to other institutions that required more upfront fees.

Eg. Bancorp of Asia that required \$20,000 USD.

(http://www.geocities.com/ferrari_line/Bancor/Bancor.htm)

TIG assigned us to a consultant that spent most of her and our time modifying the business plan to Travel Silk which yielded no funding nor business. Because all recommendations required more asset based/ credit/ traditional banking funding which Mr. Prince informed Mr. Luczak upfront that was not feasible at our situation. Mr. Prince and myself had challenges in our credit reporting because of a funding institution that we paid \$35,000 USD for another funding transaction who was not able to perform and we had to take care of the bridge financing. I lost my home as a result of it and Mr. Prince lucrative business in the Las Vegas Fashion Show Mall as a result. We had all hope and trust in TIG but apparently, they were not deliverers themselves.

They also referred us to Liberty Ventures who we paid also \$1,000 in upfront non refundable fee processing plus 10 business plans. They referred us to a consultancy firm whom we paid \$997. Liberty Ventures to date has not funded us either. Liberty Ventures last referral, Jack Turner has not performed either despite our constant update and communication.

They referred us to National Loan who was also a broker whom we referred to someone who had real estate as collateral and good credit. TIG wants to claim money from us for someone whom we passed on which was not applicable to us.

2. I requested the return of the \$6k I paid because of their non deliverance.
3. We tried to communicate through email but they changed (from tingrp@aol.com, tingrp@yahoo.com). Mr. Luczak has not returned call of Mr. Prince regarding our inquiry about why in writing the 6k we put in was applied to the Gemini Capital Fund. Apparently, they figured out, we were not going to get scammed once again of their request for \$35k of upfront fee for a \$1M funding from Gemini Capital Fund whom Mr. Luczak could not provide proof of a successful funded entity, it being new.
4. This is a story to share to the public.