



10.2.2022

Dear naturist friends,

By his letter of February 8, 2022, Mr. Loréface, CEO of the company Euronat, continues to attack the two spokespersons of the GCR2: Mr. Gilles de Bohan and Mr. Jean Alzieu, thus trying to reduce to 2 people the vast movement of protest against the proposed agreement and for the appeal of the judgment of December 3, 2020.

For your information, you should know that the majority of the IFE Board of Directors has decided to reject this rider and to appeal.

Euronat strongly urges you to sign the draft amendment on the grounds that it is based on two accounting expertises. These two expertises, paid by Euronat and distorted by the figures that have been provided, will be contested in appeal.

Moreover, we have other expert reports that contradict those cited by Euronat.

You can see for yourself on the tables of the rider the significant increase in your fee.

You can understand that Euronat is very interested in this increase.

As promised, we have had the legal aspects of the text of the amendment

to the contract sent to you by Euronat and Barbara Ropers.

Our lawyers strongly advise against signing this document in its current wording because it profoundly modifies your contract and contains anomalies with serious consequences.

The most important point is that some of your contractual rights are cancelled by this rider.

Your contracts provide that the fee must be assessed according to the charges defined in the regulations of use.

This rider negates that fundamental right and you agree to pay a fee that is not supported by actual charges.

Although it is written in the accompanying letter that it was drawn up over a long period of time so that it is legally unassailable, it is not!

There are three major discrepancies. And even if you wish to accept the proposed financial conditions which greatly increase your expenses, you must request a correction of the drafting on the following three points:

1) At the top of page 4 it states that the fee covers the right of use and the right of residence.

This is legally in contradiction with your contract which states that you have purchased this right of use and this right of stay.

You cannot agree to pay a royalty share on the right to stay and use that you already own.

The royalty must cover, for our share of common parts, only expenses of management, exploitation and animation of the naturist center.

2) The article 5 which foresees the negotiations to be made in 2044 does not refer any more to the real operating expenses.

One does not know any more what will be the basis of these negotiations.

It is written that "The modalities of the calculation of the royalty will be the subject of an agreement between EURONAT SAS and the TDJ".

If the terms of the calculation are to be discussed, it is a denial of your current rights to pay according to the sole management, operation and animation costs of the center.

Indeed, the calculation will no longer have a legal basis.

This calculation is quite simple today, we do not know where the renegotiation of its terms could lead. You must reject this article.

3) Article 6 of this amendment is legally incorrect.

It is not correct to state that the number of parties is the reason why this settlement cannot be approved by the judge.

The reality is different: the judge of first instance having already judged, he no longer has any power to homologate a transaction.

Finally, the land publicity of this document does not give it any legal scope contrary to what is written.

You must request the deletion of article 6 in its entirety.

In order for this rider to be unassailable, you must ask for a rectification of this text if you are decided to accept the increases because it is in contradiction with your current rights and could become a source of future litigation.

For DGC2: Gilles de Bohan and Jean Alzieu

Translated with
www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)