



ORIGINAL

cc: OS
OOC
RSCS
Rly

**BEFORE THE
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION**

RECEIVED

2013 MAY 31 PM 3: 20

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
FEDERAL MARITIME COMM

Docket No. 09 -01

MITSUI O.S.K. LINES LTD.

COMPLAINANT

v.

**GLOBAL LINK LOGISTICS, INC., OLYMPUS PARTNERS, OLYMPUS GROWTH
FUND III, L.P., OLYMPUS EXECUTIVE FUND, L.P., LOUIS J. MISCHIANTI, DAVID
CARDENAS, KEITH HEFFERNAN, CJR WORLD ENTERPRISES, INC. AND CHAD J.
ROSENBERG**

RESPONDENTS

**RESPONDENT GLOBAL LINK LOGISTICS, INC OPPOSITION TO OLYMPUS
RESPONDENTS'
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT**

Global Link Logistics Inc. ("Global Link") hereby files responses to the Proposed Findings of Fact of Respondents Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P. ("OGF"), Olympus Executive Fund, L.P. ("OEF"), Louis J. Mischianti, L. David Cardenas and Keith Heffernan (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Olympus Respondents").

The Olympus Respondents:

1. Respondent OGF is a private equity investment fund organized as a Delaware limited partnership. (Affidavit of L. David Cardenas ("Cardenas Aff.") at ¶ 3, attached hereto as Exhibit 2 (O.R. App. 8); Verified Answer of Olympus Respondents. filed July 9, 2010 ("Verified Answer of Olympus Respondents") at p. 2 (MOL App. 1503)).

Response: Admit.

2. OGF's general partner is OGP III, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 3 (O.R. App. 8)).

Response: Admit.

3. OGF operates out of its office in Stamford, Connecticut. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 3 (O.R. App. 8)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed

Finding of Fact No. 3.

4. In May 2003, OGF purchased 74.51 percent of the shares in GLL Holdings, Inc., the parent company of and holding company for Global Link ("Holdings"). (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 4 (O.R. App. 8)).

Response: Admit.

5. OGF also held ownership interests in several entities other than Holdings. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 4 (O.R. App. 8)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed

Finding of Fact No. 5.

6. On June 7, 2006, OGF sold its interest in Holdings to Global Link's current owners pursuant to a stock purchase agreement dated May 20, 2006 (hereinafter "SPA"). (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 5 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Admit.

7. Respondent OEF also is a private equity investment fund organized as a Delaware limited partnership. (Affidavit of Louis J. Mischianti ("Mischianti Aff.") at ¶ 3, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 (O.R. App. 12); Verified Answer of Olympus Respondents at p. 2 (MOL App. 1503)).

Response: Admit.

8. OEF operates out of its office in Stamford, Connecticut. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 3 (O.R. App. 12)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed

Finding of Fact No. 8.

9. In May 2003, OEF purchased 0.49 percent of the shares in Holdings. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 4 (O.R. App. 12)).

Response: Admit.

10. Holdings was one of several entities in which OEF held ownership interests. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 4 (O.R. App. 12)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed Finding of Fact No. 10.

11. On June 7, 2006, OEF sold its minority interest in Holdings to GLL Sub Acquisition, Inc. under the May 20, 2006 SPA. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 5 (O.R. App. 12)).

Response: Admit.

12. OEF and OGF are “private equity funds that are not subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction, are not entities regulated by the Commission, and are not in a position to take action that places them in peril insofar as the Commission is concerned.” (Order in 08-07, at p. 10 (O.R. App. 24)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

13. Respondent Cardenas is a member of OPG III, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company that serves as the general partner of Respondent OGF. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 2 (O.R. App. 8)).

Response: Admit.

14. Mr. Cardenas served as a board director and officer of Holdings and Global Link from May 2003 to June 2006. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 6 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Admit.

15. Respondent Mischianti is president of LJM Corporation, a Delaware corporation that serves as a general partner of Respondent OEF. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 2 (O.R. App. 12)).

Response: Admit.

16. Mr. Mischianti served as a board director of Holdings and Global Link from May 2003 to June 2006. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 6 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Admit.

17. Mr. Mischianti did not serve as an officer of either Holdings or Global Link. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 6 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed

Finding of Fact No. 17.

18. Respondent Heffernan served as a board director and officer of Holdings and Global Link from May 2003 to June 2006. (Affidavit of Keith Heffernan (“Heffernan Aff.”) at ¶ 2, attached hereto as Exhibit 5 (O.R. App. 33)).

Response: Admit.

19. None of the Olympus Respondents are or ever have been shippers, NVOCCs, freight forwarders or ocean transportation intermediaries, marine terminal operators, ocean common carriers, or any other person subject to the requirements of the Shipping Act. (Verified Answer of Olympus Respondents at p. 2 (MOL App. 1503)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 35-9, 96-104.

20. The Olympus Respondents did not negotiate, execute or otherwise participate in any way in any contract with MOL for ocean transportation of property on behalf of themselves or any third party, including Global Link. (Complainant’s Responses to Respondent Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P.’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6, attached hereto as Exhibit 6 (O.R. App. 37-38); Complainant’s Responses to Respondent Olympus Executive Fund, L.P.’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6, attached hereto as Exhibit 7 (O.R. App. 64-65); Complainant’s Responses to Respondent David Cardenas’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6, attached hereto as Exhibit 8 (O.R. App. 91-92); Complainant’s Responses to Respondent Keith Heffernan’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6, attached hereto as Exhibit 9 (O.R. App. 118-119); Complainant’s Responses to Respondent Louis J. Mischianti’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6, attached hereto as Exhibit 10 (O.R. App. 145-146)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

21. The Olympus Respondents did not communicate with MOL or participate in communications with MOL in connection with Global Link’s business or the ocean transportation of property in general. (Complainant’s Responses to Respondent Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P.’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 37-38); Complainant’s Responses to Respondent Olympus Executive Fund, L.P.’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for

Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 64-65); Complainant's Responses to Respondent David Cardenas's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 91-92); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Keith Heffernan's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 118-119); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Louis J. Mischianti's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 145-146)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

22. The Olympus Respondents did not pay MOL for the ocean transportation of property. (Complainant's Responses to Respondent Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P.'s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Request for Admission 5 (O.R. App. 38); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Olympus Executive Fund, L.P.'s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Request for Admission 5 (O.R. App. 65); Complainant's Responses to Respondent David Cardenas's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Request for Admission 5 (O.R. App. 92); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Keith Heffernan's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Request for Admission 5 (O.R. App. 119); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Louis J. Mischianti's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Request for Admission 5 (O.R. App. 146)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

23. The Olympus Respondents did not book ocean transportation with MOL. (Complainant's Responses to Respondent Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P.'s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 37-38); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Olympus Executive Fund, L.P.'s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 64-65); Complainant's Responses to Respondent David Cardenas's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 91-92); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Keith Heffernan's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 118-119); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Louis J. Mischianti's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 145-146)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

24. The Olympus Respondents never obtained or attempted to obtain ocean transportation for any property, at any price. (Complainant's Responses to Respondent Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P.'s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 37-38); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Olympus Executive Fund, L.P.'s First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 64-65); Complainant's Responses to Respondent David Cardenas's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 91-92); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Keith Heffernan's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 118-119); Complainant's Responses to Respondent Louis J. Mischianti's First Set of Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents at Requests for Admission 1 through 6 (O.R. App. 145-146)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

Olympus Respondents Did Not Participate In The Transactions Underlying MOL's Claims Of Shipping Act Violations:

25. The practice of split routing existed before OGF and OEF ever invested in Global Link and it continued well after OGF and OEF sold its shares in Holdings in 2006. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 12 (O.R. App. 10); Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 13); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 34); American Arbitration Association, Commercial Arbitration Tribunal Partial Final Award (Case No. 14 125 Y 01447 07, Feb. 2, 2009) (the "Partial Final Award") at pp. 15, 33 (MOL App. 15, 33)).

Response: Global Link admits that the practice existed long before OGF and OEF invested in Global Link. It denies that it continued well after they sold their shares. See CFoF 105-1029.

26. The Olympus Respondents did not know of Global Link's formulation of the practice of split routing. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 12 (O.R. App. 10); Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 13); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Global Link admits that the Olympus Respondents did not know of the practice when Chad Rosenberg first implemented it. Global Link denies that the Olympus Respondents did not learn of split routing in 2003.

27. The Olympus Respondents did not participate in Global Link's formulation of the practice of split routing. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 12 (O.R. App. 10); Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 13); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Admit.

28. The Olympus Respondents did not know of Global Link's implementation of the practice of split routing. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 12 (O.R. App. 10); Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 13); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Admit.

29. The Olympus Respondents did not participate in Global Link's implementation of the practice of split routing. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 12 (O.R. App. 10); Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 13); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

30. The Olympus Respondents did not take any action or participate in any action to implement Global Link's practice of split routing. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶¶ 7, 9, 11 (O.R. App. 9-10); Mischianti Aff. at ¶¶ 7-8 (O.R. App. 13); Heffernan Dep. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

31. As is customary for OGF and OEF when investing in an enterprise, OGF and OEF appointed several of its members as directors and/or officers of Holdings and/or Global Link, but left the operational decisions to Global Link's management. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶¶ 6-7 (O.R. App. 9); Mischianti Aff. at ¶¶ 6-7 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Global Link does not know what OGF and OEF's customary practice was but denies that the directors and officers left the operations decisions to Global Link's management. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

32. As directors and officers, OGF and OEF members served the limited role of representing the shareholders in protecting the value of their investment by helping the company to improve its infrastructure and challenging management to grow the company. (Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 3 (O.R. App. 33)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

33. Mr. Mischianti had no involvement in the day-to-day operations of Global Link. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Admit.

34. Mr. Mischianti only participated in board meetings. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 6 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Admit.

35. Split-routing was never addressed during the Global Link board meetings in which Mr. Mischianti participated. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶¶ 6, 8 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Denied. See Global Link App. 150, MOL App. 1973, 1975.

36. Mr. Mischianti had no knowledge of Global Link's business relationship with MOL and never communicated with MOL personally. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed Finding of Fact No. 36.

37. Mr. Mischianti never arranged for the transportation of property on behalf of Global Link and was not involved in setting or negotiating routes of transportation or any other transportation practices. (Mischianti Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 13)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed Finding of Fact No. 37.

38. Like Mr. Mischianti, Mr. Cardenas had no involvement in the day-to-day operations of Global Link. Global Link's management continued to make the day-to-day operational decisions. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

39. The primary reason Mr. Cardenas served as an officer of Global Link was to sign documents on behalf of the company. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

40. Although Mr. Cardenas was aware that Global Link used MOL as a carrier, he never personally communicated with MOL regarding Global Link. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

41. While Mr. Cardenas held calls/meetings with Global Link management during his tenure as a board member and officer, Mr. Cardenas did not discuss specific routing practices,

including with respect to MOL, with Global Link management. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 8 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

42. Mr. Cardenas never arranged for the transportation of property on behalf of Global Link and was not involved in setting or negotiating routes of transportation or any other transportation practices. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

43. Like Mr. Cardenas and Mr. Mischianti, Mr. Heffernan also had no involvement in the day-to-day operations of Global Link. (Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 2 (O.R. App. 33)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

44. Although Mr. Heffernan was aware that Global Link used MOL as a carrier, he also never personally communicated with MOL regarding Global Link. (Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 5 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

45. While Mr. Heffernan also participated in calls/meetings with Global Link management, Mr. Heffernan did not discuss specific routing practices regarding MOL with Global Link management. (Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 5 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

46. Mr. Heffernan never arranged for the transportation of property on behalf of Global Link and was not involved in setting or negotiating routes of transportation or any other transportation practices. (Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 4 (O.R. App. 33-34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

47. Global Link regularly engaged in split-routing well before OGF and OEF acquired ownership interests in Holdings. (Partial Final Award at p. 33 (MOL App. 33))

Response: Admit.

48. Mr. Rosenberg brought the practice of split-routing with him from the freight forwarders at which he had previously been employed. (Partial Final Award at pp. 9-10 (MOL App. 9-10)).

Response: Admit.

49. Messrs. Cardenas and Heffernan did not learn about Global Link's split-routing practice until after OGF and OEF acquired their interests in Holdings. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 9 (O.R. App. 9); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 6 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Global Link admits that Cardenas and Heffernan learned of split routing in 2003 and never sought to discontinue the practice.

50. The extent of their knowledge of the practice consisted of a general explanation from Mr. Rosenberg, Global Link's founder and then-president. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶¶ 9-11 (O.R. App. 9-10); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

51. Mr. Mischianti was not involved in this discussion. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 9 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Admit.

52. Mr. Cardenas was first advised about Global Link's split-routing practice in a brief telephone conversation with Global Link management in the summer of 2003. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 9 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Admit.

53. Mr. Heffernan generally recalls that Global Link management raised split-routing after OGF acquired its interest in Holdings. (Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 6 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Admit.

54. Mr. Rosenberg generally explained to Mr. Cardenas that sometimes a shipment is delivered to a location other than where it has been booked with the steamship line. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 10 (O.R. App. 9-10)).

Response: Admit.

55. Mr. Rosenberg advised that he had received legal advice on the practice and that he thought it was legal. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 10 (O.R. App. 9-10)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to what Mr. Rosenberg told him but submits that based on the evidence in the record, Mr. Rosenberg should not have believed the practice was legal.

56. Global Link management never gave Messrs. Cardenas or Heffernan any details about the communications Global Link had with the ocean carriers or with the trucking firms used to complete the split moves.¹ (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 11 (O.R. App. 10); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Global Link objects to the Olympus Respondents use of footnotes as it is contrary to the Administrative Law Judge's Order of June 22, 2010 ("ALJ's Order"). That Order was incorporated in the Presiding Judge's Order of December 11, 2012. Global Link denies Proposed Finding of Fact No. 56. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

57. Messrs. Cardenas and Heffernan were not informed by Global Link management and did not know that different destinations were written on master bills of lading and house bills of lading. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 11 (O.R. App. 10); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 7 (O.R. App. 34)).

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

58. On June 7, 2006, Respondents OGF, OEF, and CJR World Enterprises, Inc. ("CJR") sold Holdings, and its subsidiary Global Link, to Golden Gate Logistics, Inc. ("GGL").² (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 5 (O.R. App. 9)).

Response: Global Link objects to the Olympus Respondents use of footnotes as it is contrary to the Administrative Law Judge's Order of June 22, 2010 ("ALJ's Order"). Global Link admits Proposed Finding of Fact 58.

59. The Olympus Respondents have not held any interest in any NVOCC since that sale. (Cardenas Aff. at ¶ 14 (O.R. App. 10); Heffernan Aff. at ¶ 9 (O.R. App. 35)).

Response: Global Link has no independent knowledge in regard to Proposed Finding of Fact No. 59.

¹ The Arbitration Panel also found that split-routing may have been discussed during a board meeting held in November 2005 in which Mr. Cardenas attended. (Partial Final Award at p. 35 (MOL App. 35)). However, no attendee, including Mr. Cardenas, recalls any such discussion concerning split-routing. (Partial Final Award at p. 35 (MOL App. 35)).

² GGL, nor any of its shareholders or officers, are respondents in this proceeding. (Amended Complaint (MOL App. 999-1008)).

60. Global Link's utilization of the split-routing practice did not end when OEF and OGF sold their interests in Holdings. (Partial Final Award at p. 15 (MOL App. 15)).

Response: Global Link admits that its current owner ceased the practice as soon as it was feasible. See CFoF 5, 104.

61. Global Link continued the practice until at least June 2007, when its current owners initiated an arbitration, styled *Global Link Logistics, Inc., et al. v. Olympus Growth Fund III, L.P., et al.*, Case No. 14 125 Y 01447 07, against the Olympus Respondents and other former owners of Global Link in an effort to recoup a portion of the sale proceeds (the "Global Link Arbitration"). (Partial Final Award at p. 14 (MOL App. 14)).

Response: Deny. Global Link's current owner sought to discontinue the practice in early 2007, but MOL refused to allow it do so. See CFoF 105-129.

62. The evidence demonstrates that the Olympus Respondents did not participate in the transactions underlying MOL's claims of alleged Shipping Act violations, the routing practices in place at Global Link that resulted in shipments being delivered to destinations other than those listed in the master bills of lading, or any other conduct at issue in these proceedings.

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

63. The evidence also demonstrates that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the Olympus Respondents because the Olympus Respondents did not participate in the transactions underlying MOL's claims of alleged Shipping Act violations.

Response: Deny. See Global Link CFoF 45-91, 96-104.

Respectfully Submitted,



David P. Street
Brendan Collins
GKG LAW, PC
1054 Thirty-First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: 202/342-5200
Facsimile: 202/342-5219
Email: dstreet@gkglaw.com
bcollins@gkglaw.com

Attorneys for Respondent
GLOBAL LINK LOGISTICS, INC.

DATE: May 31, 2013

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that I have delivered a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to the following addressees at the addresses stated by depositing same in the United States mail, first class postage prepaid, and/or via email transmission, this 1st day of March, 2013:

Marc J. Fink
David Y. Loh
COZEN O'CONNOR
1627 I Street, NW – Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
Email: mfink@cozen.com
dloh@cozen.com

Attorneys for Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd.

Ronald N. Cobert
Andrew M. Danas
GROVE, JASKIEWICZ AND COBERT, LLP
1101 17th Street, N.W., Suite 609
Washington, DC 20036
Email: rcobert@gjacobert.com
adanas@gjacobert.com

Benjamin I. Fink
Neal F. Weinrich
BERMAN FINK VAN HORN, PC
3423 Piedmont Road, NE – Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30305
Email: bfink@bfvlaw.com
nweinrich@bfvlaw.com

Attorneys for CJR World Enterprises, Inc. and Chad Rosenberg

Warren L. Dean
C. Jonathan Benner
Harvey Levin
Kathleen E. Kraft
THOMPSON COBURN, LLP
1909 K Street, NW – Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
Email: wdean@thompsoncoburn.com
jbenner@thompsoncoburn.com
hlevin@thompsoncoburn.com
kkraft@thompsoncoburn.com

Andrew G. Gordon
PAUL WEISS RIFKIND WHARTON & GARFISON LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
Email: agordon@paulweiss.com

*Attorneys for Olympus Growth Fund III, LP; Olympus Executive Fund, LP;
Louis J. Mischianti; David Cardenas; and Keith Heffernan*


