


IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

CAUSE NO. ⁴¹⁸ OF 2004

BETWEEN:

- (1) GLOBALVEST MANAGEMENT COMPANY L.P.
(A Limited Partnership organised under the laws of the Territory of the US Virgin Islands)
- (2) UTILITIVEST II LP
- (3) UTILITIVEST III LP
- (4) LATINVEST FUND LTD.
- (5) BRAZVEST FUND LTD.
- (6) GLOBALVEST VALUE FUND, LP
- (7) LATINVEST PARTNERS, LP
- (8) LATINVEST HOLDINGS LDC
- (9) GLOBALVEST HEDGE FUND, LP
(Each of the Second to ninth Plaintiffs being entities organised under the laws of the Cayman Islands)
- (10) UTILITIVEST II DELAWARE LLC
- (11) UTILITIVEST III DELAWARE LLC
- (12) BRAZVEST FUND DELAWARE LLC
- (13) GLOBALVEST HEDGE DELAWARE LLC
- (14) GLOBALVEST VALUE HOLDINGS DELAWARE LLC
- (15) LATINVEST FUND DELAWARE LLC
- (16) LATINVEST HOLDINGS DELAWARE LLC
- (17) LATINVEST PARTNERS DELAWARE LLC
(Each of the Tenth to Seventeenth Plaintiffs being entities organised under the laws of the State of Delaware)



Plaintiffs

and

- (1) DANIEL VALENTE DANTAS
- (2) OPPORTUNITY MEM S.A.
(An entity organised under the laws of Brazil)
- (3) CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, LTD.
- (4) CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, L.P.

Defendants

WRIT OF SUMMONS

WRIT OF SUMMONS

TO: DANIEL VALENTE DANTAS
Rua Vieira Souta, 85 – 5 andar/
Corbertura, Ipanema,
City of Rio de Janeiro
State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

AND TO: OPPORTUNITY MEM S.A.
Av. Presidente Wilson
No. 231, 28° andar (parte)
City of Rio de Janeiro
State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

AND TO: CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, L. P.
c/o Maples and Calder
Ugland House
George Town, Grand Cayman

AND TO: CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, LTD.
c/o Maples and Calder
Ugland House
George Town, Grand Cayman

THIS WRIT OF SUMMONS has been issued against you by the above-named Plaintiffs in respect of the claim set out on the next page.

Within 14 days after the service of this Writ on you, counting the day of service, you must either satisfy the claim or return to the Court Office, P.O. Box 495G, George Town, Grand Cayman, the accompanying Acknowledgement of Service stating therein whether you intend to contest these proceedings.

If you fail to satisfy the claim or to return the Acknowledgement within the time stated, or if you return the Acknowledgement without stating therein an intention to contest the proceedings, the Plaintiff may proceed with the action and judgment may be entered against you forthwith without further notice.

Issued this 15 day of October 2004

NOTE – This Writ may not be served later than 4 calendar months (*or, if leave is required to effect service out of the jurisdiction, 6 months*) beginning with the date of issue unless renewed by order of the Court.

IMPORTANT

Directions for Acknowledgement of Service are given with the accompanying form.

IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

CAUSE NO. OF 2004

BETWEEN:

- (1) GLOBALVEST MANAGEMENT COMPANY L.P.
(A Limited Partnership organised under the laws of the Territory of the US Virgin Islands)
- (2) UTILITIVEST II LP
- (3) UTILITIVEST III LP
- (4) LATINVEST FUND LTD.
- (5) BRAZVEST FUND LTD.
- (6) GLOBALVEST VALUE FUND, LP
- (7) LATINVEST PARTNERS, LP
- (8) LATINVEST HOLDINGS LDC
- (9) GLOBALVEST HEDGE FUND, LP
(Each of the Second to ninth Plaintiffs being entities organised under the laws of the Cayman Islands)
- (10) UTILITIVEST II DELAWARE LLC
- (11) UTILITIVEST III DELAWARE LLC
- (12) BRAZVEST FUND DELAWARE LLC
- (13) GLOBALVEST HEDGE DELAWARE LLC
- (14) GLOBALVEST VALUE HOLDINGS DELAWARE LLC
- (15) LATINVEST FUND DELAWARE LLC
- (16) LATINVEST HOLDINGS DELAWARE LLC
- (17) LATINVEST PARTNERS DELAWARE LLC
(Each of the Tenth to Seventeenth Plaintiffs being entities organised under the laws of the State of Delaware)

Plaintiffs

and

- (1) DANIEL VALENTE DANTAS
- (2) OPPORTUNITY MEM S.A.
(An entity organised under the laws of Brazil)
- (3) CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, LTD.
- (4) CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, L.P.

Defendants

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Parties

1. The First Plaintiff (“Globalvest”) is an SEC registered investment adviser in the form of a US Virgin Islands limited partnership. Globalvest provides investment management services to the Second to Ninth Plaintiffs (“the Cayman Funds”), each of which is an investment fund organised under the laws of the Cayman Islands.
2. Each of the Cayman Funds other than the Second and Third Plaintiffs is an open-ended investment fund. The Second and Third Plaintiffs are closed-ended investment funds.
3. The Tenth to Seventeenth Plaintiffs (“the Delaware LLCs”) are each single member limited liability companies which hold the investments made by the Cayman Funds in the assets which are the subject matter of this claim. In the case of each of the Cayman Funds the said assets form a large proportion of the total assets of the fund.
4. The Second to Seventeenth Plaintiffs inclusive are hereinafter referred to as “the Funds”.
5. The Third Defendant (“CVC Ltd”) is a Cayman Islands exempted limited company. It is the general partner and investment manager of the Fourth Defendant (“CVC LP”), a Cayman Islands exempted limited partnership. As such CVC Ltd exercises all relevant management and operational control over CVC LP.
6. CVC LP is a private equity fund with total assets of approximately US\$600 million. CVC LP invests largely in Brazilian infrastructure.

7. The First Defendant (“Dantas”) is the founder and senior partner of the Opportunity Group of companies, which includes CVC Ltd. The Second Defendant (“Opportunity MEM”) is a holding company owned by CVC LP through its general partner and agent CVC Ltd.

Telemig and Tele Norte

8. CVC LP has invested, *inter alia*, in the majority of the voting shares of each of Telemig Celular Participações S.A. (“Telemig”) and Tele Norte Celular Participações S.A. (“Tele Norte”).
9. Telemig and Tele Norte are companies organised under the laws of Brazil. They were created as part of the privatisation of the former state owned telephone company of Brazil, Telecomunicações Brasileiras S.A. (“Telebrás”). This was in turn a part of the Brazilian privatisation programme which commenced in 1990. The privatisation of Telebrás took the form of an auction on 29 July 1998. The Bid Announcement MC BNDES 01/98 (the “Bidding Rules”) provided that 64,405,151,125 shares in each of the 13 new companies would be sold, amounting to a “unique and non-divisible block” of 51.79% of the total number of voting shares (“the Control Block”) in each new company.
10. The minimum price specified in the Bidding Rules for the purchase of the control block in Telemig was R\$230,000,000 and in Tele Norte was R\$90,000,000. At the time of the auction the Brazilian Real was more or less at parity with the US dollar.
11. The winning bids for the respective Control Blocks in Telemig and Tele Norte were made by a consortium comprising CVC LP, Telesystem International Wireless Inc. (a Canadian wireless telecommunication company) and several Brazilian investors, principally pension funds.

Non-Consolidation Rule

12. As part of the privatization process, a “non-consolidation” rule was implemented whereby the spun-off telecommunications companies were prohibited from reuniting for a period of five years. The Plaintiffs and other investors invested in the minority voting shares of Telemig and Tele Norte because, *inter alia*, they expected to experience significant gains when the five-year non-consolidation period expired. The non-consolidation period expired in August 2003.

Purchase of Telemig and Tele Norte Shares

13. After the auction of the Control Blocks for Telemig and Tele Norte the remainder of the voting shares were listed for public sale as common shares on the *Bolsa de Valores de São Paulo* (“BOVESPA”). The non-voting shares are traded in the form of American Depository Receipts (“ADRs”) on the New York stock exchange and on the BOVESPA as preferred shares.
14. From November 1998 the Cayman Funds began to acquire voting shares of Telemig and Tele Norte on BOVESPA. Prior to that the Cayman Funds had already purchased significant numbers of Telebrás shares which were subsequently converted into shares in Telemig and Tele Norte. In total the Cayman Funds now hold 22% of the voting shares of Telemig and 15% of the voting shares of Tele Norte. The said shares are held indirectly through the Delaware LLCs.
15. The vast majority of the said shares were acquired prior to August 2001.
16. In addition the Cayman Funds have acquired, and hold through the Delaware LLCs, 6% of the non-voting shares of Telemig and 31% of the non-voting shares of Tele Norte. Some of these non-voting shares were purchased in the form of ADRs on the New York Stock Exchange and others as preferred shares on the BOVESPA and later converted into ADRs.

Chain of Control

17. By virtue of a corporate chain the Control Blocks in Telemig and Tele Norte are owned and controlled by CVC Ltd on behalf of CVC LP.
18. Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, the Plaintiffs will allege that the control chain is as follows:
 - 18.1. CVC LP is the owner and controller of Futuretel S.A. (“Futuretel”);
 - 18.2. Futuretel owns and controls Opportunity MEM;
 - 18.3. Opportunity MEM owns over 50% of the voting shares in Newtel Participações S.A. (“Newtel”);
 - 18.4. Newtel owns over 50% of the voting shares in Telpart Participações S.A. (“Telpart”);
 - 18.5. Telpart directly owns the Control Blocks in each of Telemig and Tele Norte.

The Funds’ Minority Shareholder Rights

19. Under Brazilian law the minority shareholders in each of Telemig and Tele Norte are entitled, *inter alia*, to “tag along” rights in the event of a sale of a controlling interest in either company. These rights provide that each minority shareholder is entitled to receive, upon a sale of a controlling interest, a sum equivalent to 80% of the price per share realised by the sale of controlling shares.

Conspiracy to Injure

20. On or before April 14 2004 the Defendants (or any two or more together) conspired and combined together, and with other persons, wrongfully and with the sole or predominant intention of injuring the Plaintiffs and/or of causing loss to the Plaintiffs by damaging or destroying the business of the Plaintiffs.

21. The motivation of the Defendants was and continues to be:
 - 21.1 to create illiquidity in the investments of the Funds in Telemig and Tele Norte;
 - 21.2 to force the Funds to sell the investments in Telemig and Tele Norte at an undervalue to Dantas and/or CVC LP; and thereby
 - 21.3 to deprive the Funds of the benefit of their lawful tag along rights.

22. Pursuant to and in furtherance of the conspiracy pleaded at Paragraph 21 above the Defendants (or one or more of them) have done the following by which the Plaintiffs have been injured:
 - 22.1 On 14 April 2004 the Defendants caused and/or procured the commencement of proceedings in the federal civil courts for the state of Brasilia by Telemig, Tele Norte, the operating subsidiaries of Telemig and Tele Norte, Telpart, Opportunity Mem and two other companies in the Opportunity Group against the Delaware LLCs ("the Brasilia Claim"). The said proceedings allege that the operating subsidiaries of Telemig and Tele Norte have suffered losses of US\$97 million;

 - 22.2 On or before 11 June 2004 Dantas instructed his servant or agent Roberta Fisher ("Fisher") to approach Globalvest to ascertain whether Globalvest was prepared to resolve the Brasilia Claim on the following basis:

- 22.2.1 There would be an out-of-court settlement of the Brasilia Claim;
 - 22.2.2 The settlement would compensate Dantas personally for his allegedly hurt feelings and for the alleged diminution of his reputation as an investment manager caused by Globalvest's actions;
 - 22.2.3 The settlement would not be possible within the confines of the Brazilian regime for minority shareholder rights, as this regime would not compensate Mr Dantas personally for his injured feelings. The Plaintiffs understood this to mean that the settlement would entail the Funds giving up their minority shareholder rights by selling their shares in Telemig and Tele Norte to Dantas and/or CVC LP prior to a sale of the respective Control Blocks.
- 22.3 Acting on the instructions of Dantas, Fisher telephoned Globalvest on 16 June 2004 and asked to speak to Peter Gruber, the President of Globalvest. Fisher stated that she had several years' experience working on transactions on behalf of Dantas, and that the purpose of her attempt to contact Mr Gruber was to discuss the resolution of issues between Opportunity and Mr Gruber;
- 22.4 Later in the afternoon of 16 June 2004, and again on 17 June 2004, Fisher telephoned Mr Gruber;
- 22.5 On 9 July 2004 a meeting took place between Fisher, Globalvest's Director of Research Dave Wheeler, and Mr Gruber;
- 22.6 On August 4 2004, Fisher telephoned again and a telephone conversation took place between Dave Wheeler and Mr Gruber;

- 22.7 On August 6 2004 a telephone call took place between Fisher and Dave Wheeler;
- 22.8 During the aforesaid telephone calls and meeting Fisher:
- 22.8.1 put forward the basis of settlement set out in paragraph 22.2 above;
- 22.8.2 stated that the timing of her approach, two months after the commencement of the Brasilia Claim, was not a coincidence; and
- 22.8.3 emphasised that the Brasilia Claim would probably last for several years, during which time the Funds would suffer the burden of its continuation.
23. The Plaintiffs will defend the Brasilia Claim in the Brasilia courts on the footing, *inter alia*, that:
- 23.1 it is frivolous and without foundation;
- 23.2 it is a transparent attempt by the Opportunity Group to consolidate control of Telemig and Tele Norte;
- 23.3 the Defendants' real motive for commencing the lawsuit was to create illiquidity in the Funds' investments in Telemig and Tele Norte, thereby damaging the Plaintiffs' business and investor relationships with the intention of compelling the Funds to sell their shares in Telemig and Tele Norte at well below market value.
24. Accordingly the Delaware LLCs will seek an order from the Brasilia Courts that the claimants in that action be fined for litigating in bad faith.

25. For the avoidance of doubt the Plaintiffs do not seek the determination of any of the issues in the Brasilia litigation in their claim herein. The Plaintiff's case herein is that the commencement of the Brasilia Claim, regardless of its merits or eventual outcome, is part and parcel of the conspiracy and unlawful interference perpetrated by the Defendants against the Plaintiffs.

Unlawful Means

26. Pursuant to and in furtherance of the conspiracy pleaded at paragraph 21 above the Defendants have unlawfully conspired and combined to cause injury to Telemig and Tele Norte, in that they have conspired unlawfully to secure a benefit for themselves at the expense of Telemig and Tele Norte respectively by procuring the withdrawal of the Brasilia Claim.

27. In the premises:

27.1 the Defendants have conspired and combined together as pleaded at paragraph 21 above by unlawful means, wrongfully and with intent to injure and/or to cause loss to the Plaintiffs; and

27.2 The Defendants have used unlawful means with the object and effect of interfering with the legitimate business of the Plaintiffs.

Loss and Damage

28. As a result of the matters pleaded above the Plaintiffs have suffered, and are continuing to suffer, a catastrophic decline in business and loss of profits.

29. After receipt of the Brasilia Claim each of the Fourth to Ninth was forced to exercise its respective power to suspend investments to realise investments.

30. By reason of the said suspensions, and by reason of the fact of the outstanding Brasilia proceedings (notwithstanding that they are without foundation and will be so defended in Brasilia), the Plaintiffs' business has been drastically affected in the following ways:
 - 30.1 Each of the Fourth to Ninth Plaintiffs has been and remains closed to further subscription monies;
 - 30.2 Globalvest has been severely impaired in forming new funds;
 - 30.3 Globalvest has been unable to market the Cayman Funds to new investors, to market existing funds under its management or to persuade third party funds to use Globalvest as an investment manager.
31. The decline in business caused by the Defendants' actions is continuing.
32. The Plaintiffs' loss of business is substantial:
 - 32.1 Globalvest is a leading investment fund management business specializing in global and emerging markets with more than two decades of experience of investing in developing markets. Globalvest is widely recognised as the market leader in Latin American investments over the past fifteen years;
 - 32.2 Prior to the commencement of the Brasilia Claim Globalvest's Latin American Composite, measured in compliance with Performance Presentation Standards of the Association for Investment Management and Research ("AIMR-PPS"), had outperformed the S&P 500, IFC Latin America, IFC Asia, MSCI-EAFE and others for over 10 years;

32.3 Prior to the commencement of the Brasilia Claim Globalvest was the recipient of numerous awards for high achievement in the field of fund management, and in particular:

32.3.1 *The #1 World's Best Performing Money Manager across all International Equity & Emerging Markets Mandates as at fourth quarter 2003, awarded by Nelson Thomson Financial;*

32.3.2 *The Top Performing Regional Equity Fund for the one-year period ended 2003, The Top Performing Brazil Equity Fund for the one-year period ended 2003 and The #1 International Equity for Global Emerging Markets for the five-year period ended 2003 awarded by Standard & Poor's;*

32.3.3 *The #1 World's Best Performing Money Manager across all International Equity & Emerging Markets Mandates as at December 2002, awarded by Nelson Thomson Financial;*

32.3.4 *The #1 World's Best Performing Money Manager across all international equity mandates as at March, 2000 awarded by Nelson Thomson Financial;*

32.3.5 *The #1 World's Best Money Manger across all international equity mandates as at December, 1999 for the last decade awarded by Nelson Thomson Financial;*

32.3.6 *The Best Performing Latin American Equity Fund for the seven-year period ended 1998 and The Best Performing Latin American Equity Fund for the five-year periods ended 1996 and 1997 awarded by Latin Finance/Standard & Poor's Micropal;*

32.3.7 *The best performing Latin American equity fund for the five-year periods ended 1996 and 1997* awarded by Latin Finance/Standard & Poor's Micropal;

32.3.8 *The #1 World's Best Money Manager across all international equity mandates and Emerging Markets Mandates for the five years ended 1997* awarded by Nelson;

32.3.9 *The best performing fund in Latin America for the five-year period ended 1997* awarded by the Financial Times.

32.4 Globalvest manages assets in excess of US\$335,000,000. Prior to the commencement of the Brasilia Claim Globalvest anticipated that this figure would have approximately doubled over the subsequent five years. Annual fees charged by range from 1-2% per annum of the assets under management, in addition to a "carried percentage" amounting to 20% per annum of net investment gains.

32.5 The Plaintiffs stand to lose all of the future profit of their business by reason of the matters complained of herein.

33. The Plaintiffs will allege that the loss of business suffered by them is such as would in any event follow, in the ordinary course of business, from the Defendants' conspiracy and unlawful interference.

34. The Plaintiffs will aver that the damages are at large, and that an award of US\$300,000,000 is appropriate upon the facts set out herein.

35. Further the Plaintiffs will claim exemplary damages inasmuch Defendants' conduct has been calculated by them to make a themselves which may exceed the compensation payable to the

36. In addition the Plaintiffs claim for expenses incurred by them as a result of the matters complained of herein. In particular and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing the Plaintiffs claim for:


36.1 All management time devoted to the Brasilia Claim; and

36.2 All legal expenses incurred in defending the Brasilia Claim.

37. Further the Plaintiffs claim and are entitled to interest pursuant to statute on all sums found to be due to them at such rates as the Court shall deem just.

AND the Plaintiffs claim:

- (1) Damages for conspiracy and/or unlawful interference, including exemplary damages;
- (2) Pre-judgement and post-judgement Interest pursuant to the Judicature Law;
- (3) Attorney Costs and court *ad valorem* and filing fees;
- (4) Such further relief and/or other relief as may be just.



STUARTS

Attorneys-at-Law for the Plaintiffs

This Writ of Summons was filed by Stuarts, Attorneys-at-Law for the Plaintiff whose address for service is Cayman Financial Centre, 36A, Dr. Roy's Drive, P.O. Box 2510 GT, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands, IB/ 0729.

IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

CAUSE NO. OF 2004

BETWEEN:

- (1) GLOBALVEST MANAGEMENT COMPANY L.P.
(A Limited Partnership organised under the laws of the Territory of the US Virgin Islands)
- (2) UTILITIVEST II LP
- (3) UTILITIVEST III LP
- (4) LATINVEST FUND LTD.
- (5) BRAZVEST FUND LTD.
- (6) GLOBALVEST VALUE FUND, LP
- (7) LATINVEST PARTNERS, LP
- (8) LATINVEST HOLDINGS LDC
- (9) GLOBALVEST HEDGE FUND, LP
(Each of the Second to ninth Plaintiffs being entities organised under the laws of the Cayman Islands)
- (10) UTILITIVEST II DELAWARE LLC
- (11) UTILITIVEST III DELAWARE LLC
- (12) BRAZVEST FUND DELAWARE LLC
- (13) GLOBALVEST HEDGE DELAWARE LLC
- (14) GLOBALVEST VALUE HOLDINGS DELAWARE LLC
- (15) LATINVEST FUND DELAWARE LLC
- (16) LATINVEST HOLDINGS DELAWARE LLC
- (17) LATINVEST PARTNERS DELAWARE LLC
(Each of the Tenth to Seventeenth Plaintiffs being entities organised under the laws of the State of Delaware)

Plaintiffs

and

- (1) DANIEL VALENTE DANTAS
- (2) OPPORTUNITY MEM S.A.
(An entity organised under the laws of Brazil)
- (3) CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, LTD.
- (4) CVC/OPPORTUNITY EQUITY PARTNERS, L.P.

Defendants

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICE
OF WRIT OF SUMMONS**

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICE
OF WRIT OF SUMMONS**

If you intend to instruct an Attorney to act for you, give him this form IMMEDIATELY.

Important. Read the accompanying directions and notes for guidance carefully before completing this form. If any information required is omitted or given wrongly, THIS FORM MAY HAVE TO BE RETURNED. Delay may result in judgment being entered against a Defendant whereby he may have to pay the costs of applying to set it aside.

-
1. State the full name of the Defendants by whom or on whose behalf the service of the Writ of Summons is being acknowledged.

2. State whether the Defendant intends to contest the proceedings (*tick where appropriate*)

Yes No

-
3. If the claim against the Defendant is for a debt or liquidated demand, AND he does not intend to contest the proceeding, state if the Defendant intends to apply for a stay of execution against any judgment entered by the Plaintiff (*tick box*)

Yes

Service of the Writ is acknowledged accordingly

(Signed) _____

[Attorney] for

[Defendant in person]

Address for service:

Please complete overleaf

Notes on address for Service

Attorney: where the Defendant is represented by an attorney, state the attorney's place of business in the Cayman Islands. A Defendant may not act by a foreign attorney.

Defendant in person: where the Defendant is acting in person, he must give his post box number and the physical address of his residence or, if he does not reside in the Cayman Islands, he must give an address in Grand Cayman where communications for him should be sent. In the case of a limited company, "residence" means its registered principal office.

Endorsement by plaintiff's Attorney (or by plaintiff if suing in person) of his name, address and reference, if any, in the box below.

| |
|---|
| STUARTS 4th Floor Cayman Financial Centre Dr Roy's Drive Grand Cayman Reference: |
|---|

Endorsement by defendant's Attorney (or by defendant if suing in person) of his name, address and reference, if any, in the box below.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

**DIRECTIONS FOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICE OF
WRIT OF SUMMONS**

1. The accompanying form of *Acknowledgment of Service* should be completed by an Attorney acting on behalf of the Defendant or by the Defendant if acting in person.

After completion it must be delivered or sent by post to the Law Courts, P.O. Box 495G, George Town, Grand Cayman.

2. A Defendant who states in his Acknowledgment of Service that he intends to contest the proceedings *must also serve a Defence* on the Attorney for the Plaintiff (or on the Plaintiff if acting in person).

If a Statement of Claim is indorsed on the Writ (i.e. the words "Statement of Claim" appear on the top of page 2), the Defence must be served within 14 days after the time for acknowledging service of the Writ, unless in the meantime a summons for judgment is served on the Defendant.

If the Statement of Claim is not indorsed on the Writ, the Defence need not be served until 14 days after a Statement of Claim has been served on the Defendant.

If the Defendant fails to serve his Defence within the appropriate time, the Plaintiff may enter judgment against him without further notice.

3. A *Stay of Execution* against the Defendant's goods may be applied for where the Defendant is unable to pay the money for which any judgment is entered. If a Defendant to an action for a debt or liquidated demand (i.e. a fixed sum) who does not intend to contest the proceedings states, in answer to Question 3 in the Acknowledgment of Service, that he intends to apply for a stay, execution will be stayed for 14 days after his Acknowledgment, but he must, within that time, *issue a Summons* for a stay of execution, supported by an affidavit of his means. The affidavit should state any offer which the Defendant desires to make for payment of the money by instalments or otherwise.

See over for notes for guidance

Please complete overleaf

Notes for Guidance

1. Each Defendant (if there are more than one) is required to complete an Acknowledgment of Service and return it to the Court's office.
2. For the purpose of calculating the period of 14 days for acknowledging service, a writ served on the Defendant personally is treated as having been served on the day it was delivered to him.
3. Where the Defendant is sued in a name different from his own, the form must be completed by him with the addition in paragraph 1 of the words "sued as (*the name stated on the Writ of Summons*)".
4. Where the Defendant is a FIRM and an attorney is not instructed, the form must be completed by a PARTNER by name, with the addition in paragraph 1 of the description "Partner in the firm of (.....)" after his name.
5. Where the Defendant is sued as an individual TRADING IN A NAME OTHER THAN HIS OWN, the form must be completed by him with the addition in paragraph 1 of the description "trading as (.....)" after his name.
6. Where the Defendant is a LIMITED COMPANY the form must be completed by an Attorney or by someone authorised to act on behalf of the Company, but the Company can take no further step in the proceedings without an Attorney acting on its behalf.
7. Where the Defendant is a MINOR or a MENTAL PATIENT, the form must be completed by an Attorney acting for a guardian ad item.
8. A Defendant acting in person may obtain help in completing the form at the Court's office.