

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

-----X
JEFFREY SATTERFIELD, Individually and
On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 12 C 5794 (SLE)
Honorable Sara L. Ellis

-against-

LIME ENERGY CO., JOHN O'ROURKE,
And JEFFREY MISTARZ,

Defendants.

-----X

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION,
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES, AND FINAL APPROVAL HEARING**

**TO: ALL PERSONS AND ENTITIES THAT PURCHASED LIME ENERGY CO. ("LIME")
SECURITIES DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 14, 2008 THROUGH DECEMBER 27, 2012,
BOTH DATES INCLUSIVE (THE "CLASS PERIOD").**

**EXCLUDED FROM THE CLASS ARE DEFENDANTS, ALL CURRENT AND FORMER
DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF LIME DURING THE CLASS PERIOD, MEMBERS OF THEIR
FAMILIES AND THEIR LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES, HEIRS, SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS AND
ANY ENTITY IN WHICH DEFENDANTS HAVE OR HAD A CONTROLLING INTEREST.**

***PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. YOUR RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED BY LEGAL
PROCEEDINGS IN THIS LITIGATION. IF YOU ARE A MEMBER OF THE CLASS DESCRIBED
HEREIN, YOU MAY BE ENTITLED TO RECEIVE A PAYMENT PURSUANT TO THE PROPOSED
SETTLEMENT DESCRIBED BELOW.***

***CAPITALIZED TERMS USED BUT NOT DEFINED HEREIN SHALL HAVE THE SAME MEANING
AS DEFINED IN THE STIPULATION, ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE PARTIES ON JANUARY 21,
2014.***

CLASS RECOVERY: This Notice has been sent to you pursuant to an Order of the United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois (the "Court") in the above-captioned action (the "Action"). One of the purposes of this Notice is to inform you of the proposed Settlement of the Action for \$2.5 million. Plaintiffs estimate there were approximately 8.97 million shares of Lime securities traded during the Class Period that may have been damaged. Pursuant to the Plan of Allocation (see Section III herein), if all affected Lime shares elect to participate in the Settlement, the average recovery per share could be \$0.28, before deduction of any fees, expenses, costs, and awards described herein. The actual amount disbursed to members of the Class who participate in the Settlement may be more or less than this figure.

POTENTIAL OUTCOME OF THE CASE: The parties vigorously disagree on both liability and damages, and do not agree on the average amount of damages per share that would be recoverable if Plaintiffs prevailed on each claim alleged under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Plaintiffs' claims are currently the subject of a motion to dismiss, which remains pending before the Court. The issues on which the parties disagree include, but are not limited to: (a) whether any person who made the allegedly false and misleading statements acted with the requisite state of mind (*scienter*); (b) the materiality of some of the allegedly false and misleading statements; and (c) the effect, if any, of those statements on Lime's Common Stock price.

The Defendants continue to deny that they are liable to the Plaintiffs or the Class and deny that Plaintiffs or the Class have suffered any damages, and the Settlement is not any admission of wrongdoing or liability.

REASONS FOR SETTLEMENT: Plaintiffs believe that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate to, and in the best interests of, the Class. Plaintiffs and their counsel have reached this conclusion after investigating and considering, among other things, the strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants, including the Defendants' contentions that the Class's claims are without merit, the uncertainties of this complex litigation, and the concrete benefits provided by the Settlement to the members of the Class. The Settlement was entered into after mediation proceedings.

Without admitting any wrongdoing or liability on their part whatsoever, Defendants are nevertheless willing to settle provided that all of the claims of the Class are settled and compromised, in order to avoid the continuing burden, expense, inconvenience and distraction to Defendants in this Action.

ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS SOUGHT: Lead Counsel has not received any payment for its services in conducting this litigation on behalf of Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, nor has it been reimbursed for its out-of-pocket expenditures. If the Settlement is approved by the Court, Lead Counsel will apply to the Court for attorneys' fees not to exceed 30% of the Settlement Amount, and reimbursement of expenses not to exceed \$75,000. If the amount requested by counsel is approved by the Court, the average cost would be \$0.09 per share. In addition, a Compensatory Award for the time and expenses incurred by Lead Plaintiffs will be sought, not to exceed \$1,000.

IDENTIFICATION OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL: Requests for further information regarding the Action and this Notice may be directed to Lead Counsel: Leigh Handelman Smollar, Esq., Pomerantz LLP, 10 South La Salle Street, Suite 3505, Chicago, IL 60603, lsmollar@pomlaw.com.

I. THE CLASS INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

The proposed Settlement affects the rights of the members of the Class. The Class consists of:

All persons or entities that purchased Lime Securities during the period from May 14, 2008 through December 27, 2012, both dates inclusive. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, all current and former directors and officers of Lime during the Class Period, members of their families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

The sending of this Notice should not be construed as any indication of the Court's view as to the merits of any claims or defenses asserted by any party to this Action.

II. THE LITIGATION

Summary of the Litigation

The Court handling this Action is the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, and the case is known as *Satterfield v. Lime Energy Co.*, Case No. 1:12-cv-05704. Jamie Fang and Kevin J. Fetzer were appointed by the Court to represent the Class as Lead Plaintiffs. The Defendants in this Action are Lime, John O'Rourke, and Jeffrey Mistarz.

This Action alleges violations of the Federal Securities Laws (specifically Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §78j(b) and 78(t)(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5) against Defendants.

Lime is a publicly traded Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Huntersville, North Carolina. Lime is a provider of clean energy solutions, which include integrated energy engineering, consulting, and implementation of solutions that enable its customers to reduce their facilities' energy consumption, lower their operating and maintenance costs, and reduce their carbon footprint. During the Class Period, Lime Common Stock traded on NASDAQ Stock Exchange ("NASDAQ") under the ticker symbol "LIME."

Lead Plaintiffs allege that, during the Class Period, Lime's stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of untrue or materially misleading statements regarding Lime's financial performance and internal controls. Lead Plaintiffs further contend that Defendants made these statements knowing them to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures, and that investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation.

The Defendants deny all allegations of misconduct alleged by Plaintiffs, and deny having engaged in any wrongdoing whatsoever.

Discovery, Investigation, and Research Conducted by Counsel

Before agreeing to the Settlement, Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted extensive investigation and research into the merits of the Action. This investigation has included consultation with experts concerning the amount of damages suffered by the Class; interviews of confidential witnesses who previously worked at Lime; detailed reviews of Lime's public filings, SEC filings, press releases, and other public statements; review of more than 47,000 documents produced by Defendants as part of the Settlement process; review of analyst reports issued by financial and industry analysts relating to Lime; and research of the applicable law with respect to the claims asserted in the complaints filed in the Action, and the potential defenses thereto.

Proposed Settlement

Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel participated in protracted negotiations with the assistance of mediator Jed Melnick, Esq. During these negotiations, the parties discussed, among other things, the respective claims and defenses, damage analyses, legal analyses, the evidence to be offered by the parties at trial, and other important factual and legal issues.

These negotiations resulted in the agreement to settle all claims of the Class against the Defendants, *i.e.*, the Stipulation, entered into on January 21, 2014. Lead Counsel believe that the claims asserted in the Action have merit and that the evidence developed to date in the action supports the claims asserted therein. Lead Counsel assert, and believe the Class would present supporting evidence at trial establishing, liability against the Defendants under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

However, Lead Counsel recognize and acknowledge the expense and length of continued proceedings, trial, and appeals, and have taken into account the uncertain outcome and the risk of any litigation, especially complex actions such as here. They are also mindful of the inherent problems of proof under, as well as the defenses to, the federal securities laws violations asserted in this Action, including the defenses asserted or that may be asserted by Defendants.

In light of the foregoing, Lead Counsel believe that the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation confers a meaningful benefit upon the Class. Based on their evaluation, Lead Counsel have determined that the Settlement is in the best interests of the Class.

The Release

In return for the payment of the Settlement Fund, Class Members who do not file for exclusion from the Class will release, discharge and dismiss with prejudice all Released Claims as against each and all of the Released Parties, without costs to any party except as provided herein, upon the Effective Date. Lead Plaintiffs and all Class Members, whether or not any such Person submits a Proof of Claim and Release or shares in the Net Settlement Fund, on behalf of themselves and each of their predecessors, successors, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, custodians, agents, assigns, representatives, heirs, executors, trustees and administrators, will be deemed by this Settlement on the Effective Date to release and forever discharge the Released Parties from any and all of the Released Claims.

On the Effective Date, all Class Members, and anyone claiming through or on behalf of any of them, will be forever barred and enjoined from commencing, instituting, prosecuting or continuing to prosecute any action or other proceedings in any court of law or equity, arbitration tribunal, or administrative forum, asserting the Released Claims against any of the Released Parties.

III. PROPOSED PLAN OF ALLOCATION

The \$2,500,000 settlement amount and any interest earned thereon shall be the Settlement Fund. The Settlement Fund less taxes, approved costs, fees and expenses (the “Net Settlement Fund”) shall be distributed to members of the Class who submit valid Proofs of Claim (“Authorized Claimants”).

The Claims Administrator shall determine each Authorized Claimant’s *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Fund based upon each Authorized Claimant’s “Recognized Loss.” The Recognized Loss formula is not intended to be an estimate of the amount of what a Class Member lost or might have been able to recover after a trial; nor is it an estimate of the amount that will be paid to Authorized Claimants pursuant to the Settlement. The Recognized Loss formula is simply the basis upon which the Net Settlement Fund will be proportionately allocated to Authorized Claimants.

The Plan of Allocation has taken into consideration the Limitation on Damages provision of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(e), as well as the principles of economic loss articulated by the Supreme Court in *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336 (2005). For purposes of this Settlement, the Recognized Loss shall be calculated as follows:

1. **For Lime Common Stock purchased during the Class Period and subsequently sold between July 17, 2012 and December 26, 2012**, loss per share is equal to the lesser of: i) the asserted inflation at purchase minus the asserted inflation at sale; and ii) purchase price minus sale price. Between May 14, 2008 and July 16, 2012, the asserted inflation was \$0.95 per share. Between July 17, 2012 and December 26, 2012, the asserted inflation was \$0.04 per share.
2. **For Lime Common Stock purchased during the Class Period and held through the end of the Class Period**, damages per share equal the lesser of: i) asserted inflation at purchase; and ii) purchase price minus the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”) sale price. The PSLRA limits recoverable damages to the purchase price less the average closing price for the 90-day period after the revelation of the alleged misrepresentations/omissions for shares still held after 90 days following the corrective disclosure, or the rolling average through date of sale for shares sold within the 90-day period. The 90-day average price is \$0.70 per share from December 27, 2012 through March 27, 2013.
3. No claim will be recognized for Lime Common Stock sold before July 17, 2012 or purchased on or after December 28, 2012.

General Provisions:

1. There shall be no Recognized Loss attributed to any Lime securities other than Common Stock.
2. The date of a purchase or sale of Lime Common Stock is the “trade” date, and not the “settlement” date.

3. The first-in, first-out basis (“FIFO”) will be applied to both purchases and sales.
4. The date of covering a “short sale” is deemed to be the date of purchase of Lime Common Stock; and the date of a “short sale” is deemed to be the date of sale of Lime Common Stock. Shares originally sold short will have a Recognized Loss of zero.
5. Exercise of option contracts or the conversion of preferred stock into Common Stock will be considered to be purchases or sales of Common Stock as of the date of the exercise or conversion. Option premiums and the conversion price for preferred stock will be incorporated into the purchase/sale price of the Common Stock accordingly.
6. No cash payment will be made on a claim where the potential distribution amount is less than \$10. Please be advised that if you did not incur a Recognized Loss as defined in the Plan of Allocation you will not receive a cash distribution from the Net Settlement Fund, but you will be bound by all determinations and judgments of the Court in connection with the Settlement, including being barred from asserting any of the Released Claims against the Released Parties.
7. The Court has reserved jurisdiction to allow, disallow or adjust the claim of any Class Member on equitable grounds.
8. No person shall have any claim against Plaintiffs’ Counsel, the Claims Administrator or other agent designated by Plaintiffs’ Counsel, or any Defendant or any Defendants’ Counsel based on the distribution made substantially in accordance with the Stipulation and this Plan of Allocation, or further orders of the Court.
9. Class members who do not submit valid Proofs of Claim will not share in the settlement proceeds. Class members who do not either submit a Request for Exclusion or submit a valid Proof of Claim will nevertheless be bound by the settlement and the Order and Final Judgment of the Court dismissing this Action.

IV. REQUESTING EXCLUSION FROM THE CLASS

IF YOU ARE A MEMBER OF THE CLASS, YOU MAY BE ELIGIBLE TO SHARE IN THE BENEFITS OF THIS SETTLEMENT AND WILL BE BOUND BY ITS TERMS UNLESS YOU EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE CLASS.

Each member of the Class shall be bound by all determinations and judgments of the Court in connection with the Settlement, whether favorable or unfavorable, unless such Class Member shall mail, by first class mail, sufficient postage prepaid, a written request for exclusion from the Class, **postmarked no later than April 29, 2014**, addressed to the Claims Administrator at: *Satterfield v. Lime Energy Co.* c/o Rust Consulting, Inc., P.O. Box 8095, Faribault, MN 55021-9495. Such request for exclusion shall be in a form that sufficiently identifies (1) the name and address of the person(s) or entity seeking exclusion, and (2) a list of all transaction(s) involving Lime Common Stock during the period May 14, 2008 through December 27, 2012, including the number of shares, principal amount and trade date of each purchase and sale. A request for exclusion shall not be effective unless submitted within the time and in the form and manner provided for herein. **You cannot exclude yourself by telephone, email or fax.**

If a person or entity who is a member of the Class duly requests to be excluded from the Class, such person or entity will not be bound by any orders or judgments entered in respect of the Settlement and shall not be entitled to receive any benefits provided by the Settlement in the event it is finally approved by the Court.

If a judgment approving the Settlement provided for in the Stipulation is finally entered, all members of the Class who have not requested exclusion shall conclusively be deemed to have released and shall thereafter be barred from asserting any of the Released Claims against the Released Parties.

V. STATEMENT OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS SOUGHT

If the proposed Settlement is approved, Lead Counsel intend to apply to the Court for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses from the Settlement Fund. Lead Counsel will seek no more than 30 percent of the Settlement Fund as fees, plus an additional amount not to exceed \$75,000 as reimbursement for the expenses and costs actually incurred, in prosecuting the action. Lead Counsel believe their intended fee request to be fair and reasonable. Lead Counsel have litigated this case on a wholly contingent basis and have received no compensation during the period the case has been pending. Lead Counsel expended considerable time and expense during the Action. Had the case not been successful, Lead Counsel would have sustained a considerable financial loss.

In addition, Lead Counsel intend to apply to the Court on behalf of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs for reimbursement from the Settlement Fund of their reasonable time, costs and expenses directly relating to their representation of the Class. Lead Counsel will seek no more than \$1,000 for each Lead Plaintiff.

VI. THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

The Final Approval Hearing shall be held before Honorable Sara L. Ellis on May 13, 2014, at 12:30 p.m., in Courtroom 1719 of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Everett McKinley Dirksen Building, United States Courthouse, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60604, to determine: (1) whether a Settlement Class should be certified for purposes of the Settlement and whether Class Plaintiffs and their counsel have adequately represented the Class Members; (2) whether the proposed Settlement of the Class's claims against the Defendants for \$2,500,000.00 should be approved as fair, reasonable and adequate; (3) whether the proposed Plan of Allocation is fair, just, reasonable, and adequate; (4) whether the Court should permanently enjoin the assertion of any claims that arise from or relate to the subject matter of the Action; (5) whether the Action should be dismissed with prejudice against the Defendants as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement filed with the Court; (6) whether the application by Lead Counsel for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses should be approved; and (7) whether the Lead Plaintiffs' application for reimbursement of costs and expenses should be granted.

The Final Approval Hearing may be adjourned or continued from time to time by the Court without further notice to the Class other than an announcement at such Final Approval Hearing or at any adjournment or continuance thereof.

Any Class Member who does not timely and validly request exclusion from the Class and who objects to the Settlement, the adequacy of the representation provided by Lead Plaintiffs and Class Counsel, the proposed Plan of Allocation of the Net Settlement Fund, the Final Order and Judgment contemplated by the Stipulation, the application for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses, and/or the application for the reimbursement of the reasonable costs and expenses of the Lead Plaintiff, or who otherwise wishes to be heard with respect to any of the foregoing, may appear in person or by attorney at the Final Approval Hearing, at his or her own expense, and present any evidence or argument that may be proper and relevant. However, no person shall be heard, and no papers, briefs, pleadings or other documents submitted by any such person shall be considered by the Court unless, no later than April 29, 2014, (1) a notice of the person's intention to appear, (2) a statement of such person's objections to any matter before the Court, and (3) the grounds for such objections or the reason for such person's request to appear and to be heard, as well as the information requested in Section IV herein and all other documents and writings which such person desires the Court to consider, shall be filed by such person with the Clerk of the Court, and, on or before such filing, shall be delivered by hand, overnight mail or by certified mail, return-receipt requested, sufficient postage prepaid, upon each of the following counsel of record:

Leigh Handelman Smollar, Esq.
POMERANTZ LLP
Ten South La Salle Street, Ste. 3505
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Lead Counsel for the Class

Melanie E. Walker, Esq.
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
One South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Defendants' Counsel

Any person or entity who fails to object in the manner prescribed in the paragraph immediately above shall be deemed to have waived any objections that person may have and shall be barred from raising such objections in this or any other action or proceeding. Objections directed solely to the proposed Plan of Allocation, attorneys' fees and expenses, or awards to the Lead Plaintiffs will not affect the finality of either the Settlement or the Judgment to be entered thereto, if the Settlement is approved by the Court.

All members of the Class who do not request exclusion therefrom, in the manner provided herein, will be represented by Lead Counsel in connection with the Settlement, but may, if they so desire, also enter an appearance through counsel of their own choice and at their own expense.

VII. PROOF OF CLAIM AND RELEASE FORM

To be eligible to receive a cash distribution from the Settlement Fund, you must timely complete, sign and file a Proof of Claim and Release Form ("Proof of Claim"). A Proof of Claim is annexed to this Notice. You may receive more than one copy of this Notice and the Proof of Claim, but you should **submit only one Proof of Claim** for each differently named account or ownership, such as an individual account, an IRA account, a joint account, a custodial account, etc.

The Proof of Claim (1) **must** be completed in accordance with the Instructions on the Proof of Claim, (2) **must** enclose all documentation required by the Instructions, and (3) **must** be filed with the Court-appointed Claims Administrator **postmarked on or before June 12, 2014** at the following address:

Satterfield v. Lime Energy Co.
c/o Rust Consulting, Inc.
Claims Administrator
P. O. Box 8095
Faribault, MN 55021- 9495
Telephone: 1-877-872-3809

A Proof of Claim will be deemed filed when mailed via first-class mail, sufficient postage prepaid.

Members of the Class who do not exclude themselves from the Class and who fail to submit a valid and timely Proof of Claim will nevertheless be bound by the Settlement if finally approved, and all orders and judgments entered by the Court in connection therewith.

By Order of the Court, the Proof of Claim provides for and requires a Release of all Released Claims as described in Section II, above, by all members of the Class who file Proofs of Claim. The Release will become effective on the Effective Date of the Settlement.

Each person or entity submitting a Proof of Claim thereby submits to the jurisdiction of the Court for purposes of the Litigation, the Settlement and any proceedings relating to such Proof of Claim, and agrees that such a filed Proof of Claim will be subject to review and further inquiry as to such person's or entity's status as a member of the Class and the allowable amount of the claim.

If you would like acknowledgment of the receipt of your Proof of Claim by the Claims Administrator, please send it by certified mail, return-receipt requested, or its equivalent. **No other formal acknowledgment will be provided, and you will bear all risks of delay or non-delivery of your claim.**

VIII. SPECIAL NOTICE TO BROKERS AND OTHER NOMINEES

Brokerage firms, banks, financial institutions and other nominees (“Nominees”) who, during the Class Period, purchased or sold Lime Common Stock, CUSIP # 53261U205 in the name of the Nominees on behalf of beneficial owners of such securities who may be members of the Class, are requested to provide the Claims Administrator with the name and last known address of each such person or entity for whom the Nominee executed such transactions, **preferably in an MS Excel data table, or, alternatively, in electronic MS Word or WordPerfect files (label size Avery #5162) or on computer generated mailing labels, setting forth: (1) title/registration, (2) street address, (3) city/state/zip.** The Claims Administrator will then cause the Notice and the Proof of Claim to be mailed promptly to said beneficial owners. Alternatively, Nominees may request additional copies of this Notice and the Proof of Claim from the Claims Administrator, in which case the Nominees are required to promptly mail the Notice and the Proof of Claim directly to the persons for whom the transactions were made and provide the Claims Administrator with written confirmation of having done so. For either alternative, contact the Claims Administrator.

After receipt of a timely request for reimbursement and detailed supporting documentation, the Claims Administrator will reimburse the Nominee for all costs reasonably incurred in gathering and forwarding the names and addresses of beneficial owners to the Claims Administrator, or forwarding the Notice and the Proof of Claim to beneficial owners, as the case may be. Requests for reimbursement without details on the actual expenses incurred may not be considered.

IX. FURTHER INFORMATION

This Notice merely provides a brief summary of the Action and the proposed Settlement and is qualified by and subject in all respects to the full terms and conditions in the Stipulation. For a more detailed statement of the matters involved in the Action, you should refer to the pleadings, the Stipulation, and the orders entered by the Court and to the other papers filed in the Action. These papers may be inspected at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for Northern District of Illinois, Everett McKinley Dirksen Building, United States Courthouse, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60604 or online through the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (“PACER”) system, available through the Court’s website, <http://www.ilnd.uscourts.gov/>. If you have any questions regarding the information contained in this Notice, you may contact Plaintiffs’ Counsel **in writing** at the addresses specified in Section VI, above.

You may also visit the Settlement website at www.LimeEnergySettlement.com to find the Stipulation and/or download copies of the Notice and Proof of Claim. In addition, you may request additional copies of the Notice and Proof of Claim by contacting the Claims Administrator at:

Satterfield v. Lime Energy Co.
c/o Rust Consulting, Inc.
Claims Administrator
P. O. Box 8095
Faribault, MN 55021- 9495
Telephone: 1-877-872-3809
Website: www.LimeEnergySettlement.com
Email: info@limeenergysettlement.com

**INQUIRIES SHOULD NOT BE DIRECTED TO THE COURT, THE
CLERK’S OFFICE, DEFENDANTS, OR DEFENDANTS’ COUNSEL.**

Dated: January 28, 2014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Satterfield v. Lime Energy Co.
c/o Rust Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 8095
Faribault, MN 55021-9495

IMPORTANT LEGAL MATERIALS

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Rust Consulting, Inc.