BUSINESS APPRAISAL REVIEW REPORT

Dated November 30, 2009

Opining on the Credibility of the

Valuation Report Dated February 4, 2003

Prepared by John Paul, CPA

of Pablo & Associates, P.A., Certified Public Accountants,

With Respect to the Appraisal of the

Fair Market Value of 1,170 Shares of Common Stock

on a Not-Freely Marketable, Minority Interest Basis of

WASHINGTON PRINT ENTERPRISES, INC.

As of August 29, 2002

Strictly Confidential

PREPARED BY THOMAS KALAJIAN, CRTP, AVA, ABAR

PROVIDENT VALUATION PROFESSIONALS, INC.

Secure Correspondence: U.S. Post Office Box 1120 | Lake Forest, CA 92609-1120

www.ProvidentValuationProfessionals.com

Info@ProvidentValuationProfessionals.com

(949) 716-4875 ▪ (800) 404-6920 | Fax (949) 583-0161

BUSINESS APPRAISAL REVIEW REPORT

Opining on the Credibility of the Appraisal of the
Fair Market Value of 1,170 Shares of Common Stock,
on a Not-Freely Marketable, Minority Interest Basis of

WASHINGTON PRINT ENTERPRISES, INC.

As of August 29, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BUSINESS APPRAISAL REVIEW REPORT

Opining on the Credibility of the Appraisal of the
Fair Market Value of 1,170 Shares of Common Stock,
on a Not-Freely Marketable, Minority Interest Basis of

WASHINGTON PRINT ENTERPRISES, INC.

As of August 29, 2002

---

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Definitions of Specific Terms Used in this Business Appraisal Review Report

The terms used in this Business Appraisal Review Report listed below have the following specific meanings:

"Review Report"	This Business Appraisal Review Report
"Reviewer"	The preparer of this Review Report, namely, Thomas Kalajian, CRTP, AVA, ABAR
"Client"	The person or entity which engaged the Reviewer, namely, Mr. Samuel Simon, Attorney at Law of Stanford, Simon and Smith, Attorneys at Law
"Appraisal Report"	The Valuation Report undergoing review in this Review Report
"Appraiser"	The preparer of the Appraisal Report undergoing review, namely, John Paul, CPA
"Company," "Subject"	Name of the entity of which the equity interest was the subject of the Appraisal Report, namely Washington Print Enterprises, Inc.

1.2 Introduction of the Appraisal Review Engagement

Mr. John Paul, CPA, of Pablo & Associates, P.A., Certified Public Accountants, was retained by Mrs. Margarita Gonzalez, Executrix of the Estate of Julio Agosto Gonzalez, to appraise Fair Market Value of 1,170 Shares of Common Stock, on a Not-Freely Marketable, Minority Interest Basis of Washington Print Enterprises, Inc. as of August 29, 2002 for the purpose of "estate tax reporting."

The Appraisal Report comprises 37 pages in the body of the report, which is followed by three exhibits. The Appraisal Report is included in its entirety in the Exhibits section of this Review Report.

Subsequent to the issuance of the Appraisal Report, and pursuant to the terms of an engagement letter dated September 1, 2009, Mr. Samuel Simon, Attorney at Law, of Stanford, Simon and Smith, Attorneys at Law, retained Thomas Kalajian, CRTP, AVA, ABAR, of Provident Valuation Professionals, Inc. to prepare a Review Report with respect to the above-referenced Appraisal Report.

1.3 Introduction to the Subject of the Appraisal Report

The Subject is a commercial printer and lithographer, conducts its operations from Cape Verde, New York, and has been operating since 1960, originally founded by Julio Agusto Gonzalez and carried on through successive generations of Gonzalez family members. It has 12 employees and operates small sales units in both Washington, D.C. and New Jersey. A majority of sales are conducted in Washington state with a large concentration of customers in Washington, D.C.

The Company experienced a sudden decline in revenue of almost 50 percent two years prior to the valuation date, and had not recovered its revenue to those levels as of the valuation date. Management expected revenue growth to be approximately 2-3 percent over the next ten years, which is about the expected rate of inflation, so in real terms, the Company is not expected to increase revenue. Rather, management seeks to maintain earnings levels by cost containment measures alone.

The purpose of the appraisal was represented to be for estate tax purposes, arising because of the demise of the shareholder whose minority interest holdings in the stock of the Subject Company were subject interest under appraisal.

2. OPINION

I was retained by Mr. Samuel Simon, Attorney at Law, of Stanford, Simon and Smith, Attorneys at Law to review the accompanying Appraisal Report prepared by John Paul, CPA, dated February 4, 2003.

This Business Appraisal Review was conducted for the purpose of determining that the approaches and methodologies utilized by John Paul, CPA were relevant to the objectives and purpose, as stated in the Appraisal Report prepared by John Paul, CPA, and applied on a reliable basis consistent with generally accepted appraisal practices in the United States of America as of November 30, 2009. A Business Appraisal Review does not entail the performance of an appraisal of a subject interest. Therefore, this Business Appraisal Review should not be construed to be an opinion of value.

In my opinion, subject to the assumptions and limiting conditions discussed in this Business Appraisal Review Report, the opinion presented by John Paul, CPA is not credible and is not in conformity with generally accepted appraisal practices normally relied upon by business appraisers in the United States of America, as promulgated by the Business Appraisal Standards of the Institute of Business Appraisers and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP).

____
Thomas Kalajian, CRTP, AVA, ABAR

November 30, 2009

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE APPRAISAL REVIEW

3.1 Process of Detection and Disclosure of Observations Considered in the Review Report

I have read and analyzed the Appraisal Report prepared by John Paul, CPA. I detected and listed 36 instances of impairments, such as ambiguities, insufficient information, mysteries, questions, contradictions, errors, miscalculations, flaws, defects or other irregularities, after which I discontinued my counting of these instances inasmuch as I believe I had sufficient probative data to support my position on the diminished professionalism of the written report. Not included in that listing were an additional 51 instances of grammatical, typographical, punctuation errors or other writing irregularities which I detected in the first 10 pages of the Appraisal Report, after which I discontinued my counting of these instances.

I considered instances of commission and omission by the Appraiser, including, but not limited to, those factors and procedures, categorized in the list below, usually considered in the development and writing of a professional business appraisal report.

- The factors to be considered in Rev. Rul. 59-60,
- Definition and clarity of the appraisal assignment,
- Appropriate selection of the valuation date, as applicable,
- Description and history of the subject company, its products and markets,
- Appraiser’s consideration of the economic factors in the appraisal report,
- Appraiser’s consideration of the industry factors in the appraisal report,
- Credibility of the quantitative analysis of the subject company,
- Credibility of the qualitative analysis of the subject company,
- Selection, development and support for financial statement adjustments,
- Matters affecting the asset approach,
- Matters affecting the income approach,
- Matters affecting the market approach,
- Acceptance and rejection of valuation approaches and methods,
- Matters affecting discounts and premiums,
- Reconciliation of indicated values,
- Sources of information,
- Quality and professional characteristics of the written report.

I did not disclose all of the aforementioned instances I detected. Further, once my analysis reached a point where I detected several serious or fatal impairments, I discontinued my analysis as having sufficient probative information to support my opinion.

I selected 16 instances for disclosure based on the severity of the impairment as it affected the credibility of the Appraisal Report, and if that impairment was one among multiple impairments within the same procedure or section. Where a procedure or section of the Appraisal Report was replete with multiple impairments, I broadened my description of that impairment to encompass the broader nature of the multiple impairments.

3.2 Adequacy of Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the appraisal is variously described as:

- "for the closing of the estate of..." [transmittal letter, second page (no page number)];
- "estate tax reporting" [Section 1.1 Assignment Information (no page number)].

The disclosure of the purpose is somewhat inconsistent and imprecise, but this does not constitute a fatal impairment.

3.3 Appropriateness of the Definition of Value

The Appraiser uses an appropriate definition of value for estate tax compliance purposes as *fair market value*. However, for estate tax purposes, the use of *The International Glossary of Business Valuation Terms* is not authoritative for purposes of compliance with tax law. The impairment arises because the most authoritative source for determining the definition of value for estate tax purposes, Rev. Rul. 59-60, was not cited [Section 1.6 (no page number)].

3.4 Acceptability of the Appraisal Methodologies Used

The Appraiser uses two appraisal methods, one not acceptable and the other conditionally acceptable. [Section 6.5 (no page number)]

- The Adjusted Net Assets method is not an acceptable method to estimate an indication of value of a minority interest because the minority interest equity holders cannot liquidate the Subject Company, the basic premise attendant to the Adjusted Net Assets Method, and, therefore, cannot consummate the hypothetical transaction posited in the Appraisal.

- The Multiple Period Discounted Cash Flow method is an acceptable method to arrive at an indication of value for this Subject because the earnings of both of the two most recent historical years indicate a nearly a 50% earnings decrease from the two years prior to that, *absent* the Appraiser's supporting analysis which would have otherwise perhaps justified the use of those two most recent historical years as a basis for use as an appropriate proxy for the Company's future earning capacity to use the Single Period Capitalization method. However, absent that supporting justification, the remaining choice would appropriately be to use the Multiple Period Discounted Cash Flow method.

3.5 Reliability of the Selected Methodologies

The reliability of the selected methodologies are impaired as follows:

- The Adjusted Net Assets method is not reliably applied because the adjustments to arrive at fair market value considers only the fixed assets, and those adjustments are not supported by a qualified independent appraisal.

- The amount of the rounded indicated value of $3,409,000 is incorrectly transferred to the Reconciliation section as $1,991,000, an understatement transfer error of $1,418,000.

- The Multiple Period Discounted Cash Flow method is not reliably applied in accordance with generally accepted appraisal practices because of multiple impairments.

3.6 Comprehensiveness of the Financial Analysis

The financial analysis is impaired because of the following:

- The financial analysis is limited in breadth and shallow in its depth,
- The financial analysis narrative and conclusions contradict the narrative in the preceding sections of the Appraisal Report,
- The financial analysis contradicts the Appraiser's application of Company's growth rate in forecasting net income and cash flow, and in developing the discount rate. [Section 3.0 et. seq. (no page number)]

3.7 Assessment of the Company Performance Presented Versus Industry Peers

The Company performance presented versus industry peers is impaired, rendering it inadequate, not replicable, unreliable and its already weak conclusions invalid because of the following:

- The Appraiser does not cite in the footnote the annual issue date of the RMA comparative analysis, so the reader cannot confirm the appropriate *Annual Statement Studies* have been used as an industry cohort [Section 3.2.2, no page number].
- The Appraiser used unadjusted, internally-prepared, interim financial statements for use in comparison to RMA industry standards, which are based on annual financial reporting, many entries of which have undergone some annual accounting adjustments before being submitted to RMA for inclusion in their data base. This permits unquantifiable distortions in the interim Company data, diminishing the credibility of the common-size analysis and its conclusions [Section 3.2.2, no page number].
- Likewise, the common size analysis, again relying upon RMA data and using misleading interim financial data, was unreliable and misleading because it was based on both unreliable Company data and impugned industry data.