



June 14, 2006

522418-70585

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a proud American citizen, I must convey to you my concern regarding the proposal of Business Opportunity Rule R511993. In the event that it might be adopted, I would like to make it known that it would negatively affect my livelihood as a Limu Company distributor, which is my major source of income as sole support for my household.

This country was founded on free enterprise, which is the backbone of our economy. My desire is to remain an independent citizen and viable member of society, which hinges on my ability to be self employed, and to assist others in enhancing their lives through lawful monetary gain. I believe that the FTC must be made aware that the productive citizens of this country are not best served by over-regulation of any industry with causes no harm. The Direct Sales Industry more than adequately polices itself whenever a remedy is needed or a complaint is lodged by the public.

The Limu Company complies with all applicable buy back requirements and always makes it very easy for individuals to terminate their membership with the company, no matter what the reason. As a matter of fact, any individual who desires to terminate their membership in the Limu Company is not required to give any reason for their request.

I understand and appreciate the need for the FTC to protect the public where and when it is necessary, however, the proposed rule is not properly guided and is very broad in spectrum. The seven day waiting period is not necessary and gives the impression to the new distributor that there is something at risk to be weary of. This will interfere with my ability to enter into lawful business transactions and enroll new members. As a former auto salesperson, I know firsthand that purchasers of new cars or real estate are given a 3day window to terminate their contract for such a costly item; so why then would a person have to wait 7 days to be allowed to go into business for themselves and receive shipment of a product that they wish to consume, which is far less costly than either of the two aforementioned products?

Regarding exposing litigation rulings, the proposal does not allow for distinction between lawsuits that have been won, versus those lawsuits that might have been lost. In addition, requiring references from other distributors would cause unnecessary delay for the person who wishes to become engaged as a distributor and would raise privacy issues for those distributors supplying the reference material. In an age of identity theft, this is not at all practical and puts those distributors at unwarranted personal risk.

I have been selling products via direct marketing for a little over 2 years, and it has been one of the most rewarding endeavors I've ever been engaged in, both professionally and personally. I have been self employed for most of my adult life, and this has been the most fruitful and rewarding experience I've had. I love what I do and am rewarded not only monetarily, but in every other way possible for leading a productive life. My life has grown immeasurably through my direct marketing business and my circle of friends and colleagues has broadened, whereas with my traditional businesses, I was only able to provide services to very wealthy individuals. While that was all fine and well, my new business allows me to help others attain what it is they might never be able to attain through a traditional business model.

I am of the opinion that this proposed rule will bear unwanted consequences that could be avoided. As well, I believe that free enterprise must remain a viable option for any American citizen who wishes to better themselves, their family and their community in a legal manner.

Thank you for your consideration of my views, and I trust you will do the right thing by the public and by those of us who support our families and this country by being self employed.

Sincerely,

Suzan Gray

RE: BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY RULE, R-511 993