EFiled: Mar 22 2012 1:00PM EDT Transaction ID 43248672 Case No. 5268-VCN

COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JOHN W. NOBLE VICE CHANCELLOR 417 SOUTH STATE STREET DOVER, DELAWARE 19901 TELEPHONE: (302) 739-4397 FACSIMILE: (302) 739-6179

March 22, 2012

John G. Harris, Esquire Berger Harris, LLC One Commerce Center, 3rd Floor 1201 North Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19801 James D. Taylor, Jr., Esquire Saul Ewing LLP 222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1200 P.O. Box 1266 Wilmington, DE 19899-1266

Re: Visbal Salgado v. Mobile Services International, LLC, et al.

C.A. No. 5268-VCN

Date Submitted: February 29, 2012

Dear Counsel:

Plaintiff has moved to modify the Court's order of February 21, 2012, and for partial reargument. The Court imposed discovery sanctions in the amount of \$21,545.04, payable to defray the unnecessary costs incurred by the Defendants as the result of Plaintiff's conduct.

The Plaintiff does not now challenge the amount awarded.

Visbal Salgado v. Mobile Services International, LLC, et al.

C.A. No. 5268-VCN

March 22, 2012

Page 2

The Court's order attempted to accommodate the Plaintiff's ability to pay by

setting a payment schedule. By the motion, the Plaintiff seeks a somewhat more

lenient schedule.

The discovery sanction, in the Court's view, was commensurate with the

conduct. It was not, however, the Court's intent to thwart the Plaintiff's ability to

pursue this action. Plaintiff has now demonstrated that the order, as entered, would

seriously impair, if not defeat, that ability.

The Court will revise the payment schedule in accordance with Plaintiff's

proposal.

This application does not fit conveniently within either Court of Chancery

Rule 59 or Court of Chancery Rule 60. It suffices that reargument is appropriate

because of the Court's misapprehension of material fact. See In re ML/EQ Real

Est. P'ship Litig., 2000 WL 364188, at *1 (Del. Ch. Mar. 22, 2000). The Court,

one supposes, may be viewed as having misapprehended the facts associated with

the Plaintiff's ability to pay. For this reason, the motion for reargument is granted

and the Court will modify the payment schedule.

An order revising the payment schedule will be entered.

Visbal Salgado v. Mobile Services International, LLC, et al.

C.A. No. 5268-VCN

March 22, 2012

Page 3

One final note may be appropriate. Only the payment schedule is modified.

Plaintiff's obligation to pay interest if his scheduled payments are not timely made

is not affected.

Very truly yours,

/s/ John W. Noble

JWN/cap

cc: Register in Chancery-K