

**From:** Robert Wilkinson <[rwilkinson@wwbslaw.com](mailto:rwilkinson@wwbslaw.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, March 24, 2023 12:03 PM

**To:** Jonathan Miller <[jm@securixsystems.com](mailto:jm@securixsystems.com)>

**Cc:** Josh Gregory <[josh@frontier.ms](mailto:josh@frontier.ms)>; Mike McGrey <[mike@securixsystems.com](mailto:mike@securixsystems.com)>; Steve Taschler <[steve@securixsystems.com](mailto:steve@securixsystems.com)>; Marissa Paradowski <[marissa@securixsystems.com](mailto:marissa@securixsystems.com)>; Alex Wilkinson <[aw@securixsystems.com](mailto:aw@securixsystems.com)>; Tracy Branch <[tracyb@securixsystems.com](mailto:tracyb@securixsystems.com)>; david tucker <[tcllc@yahoo.com](mailto:tcllc@yahoo.com)>; Quinton Dickerson <[quinton@frontier.ms](mailto:quinton@frontier.ms)>

**Subject:** Re: Collections Letters

I want it to be absolutely clear Chief Dunston approves. That is crucial that he approves this letter.

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 24, 2023, at 10:32 AM, Jonathan Miller <[jm@securixsystems.com](mailto:jm@securixsystems.com)> wrote:

It has taken us six months to get support and actual approval from the city to send these notices. Long ago the city officially told us that it would not support a collections company...theirs or others but NO collections agency. When we raised the subject of us doing it and adding 30% as in the contract, they unofficially said that would not be supported but it seemed to be the catalyst for finally getting approval on us handling this. ***It has been a long road and not a pleasant one to get where we are. I don't want to lose this momentum.***

This has nothing to do with the SX-FRONTIER relationship and so does not involve Steve. It is an operational matter which we have invested far too much time and resources in already and we have an operational office and staff all busy finally handling this, (and little else).

There is no margin for us in this business of course and if we are to further pay a share, as originally proposed, for an outside collections agency, that can't work unless those are files we have at least worked and had no response from. If this relationship was a JV in which we shared costs and profits with you guys that would be one thing but this is quite another and I have continued to keep staff onboard and have them now to handle these needs. While I totally agree with the notion of an outside party rather than us handling this, what I am looking at is yet another element where we have continued to bleed cash in preparation for things that then ....might change.

We have never had a letter to use like these two. We are very desperate to use the staff we have to first see if we can get some money in the house and then turn things over but we have a very great many citations now a year old with no follow-up. That hurts us, hurts you and hurts the city.

More to the point perhaps is that we get accused of not doing as instructed and agreed by the city and while we have some disconnects, that is almost always untrue and here.... we have a clearly-agreed path and have been told what to do. Why not do as instructed first and then turn over those that do not respond to a collections agency if the city agrees? We've had more than a year to get such a company involved and I agree that we ***should*** be doing things that way but can we not at least first try to do what the city has agreed and instructed us to do?

I have terminated Traci Johnson and Grace Kelly. Kelly, Milton and Blake are all half-time but even so, I still have staff sitting around doing nothing at all who have been instructed to handle collections and if the summons ever go out... be at court to provide a final chance and collect there also. BTW, the Court Clerk does not know that and told Grace that if a summons goes out it is over

for us and we would NOT be allowed to collect at court or in any other manner. I assume that means a collections agency would also not be allowed to do so but do not really know.

In summary, the two letters you see are the result of months of "going back and forth" and what the city wants to see us do. I do not want to yet again have Securix seen as "trying to change things" when in reality we have just accommodated what we were told countless times as various individuals and offices changed their minds without letting others know. There's been massive confusion and while I agree with everything you fellows said yesterday, we first need to have the chance to do exactly what the city said to do and try to reach out to those who long ago assumed they were never hear from this again. We need to at least try.

In the interim, let me also say that we are not looking for any comments on the two letters. I am absolutely NOT going to ask anyone at the city to make additional changes after all these months of discussion. These will either work or fail but they will not change as I am sure you understand. We can't be in a situation yet again where, because there is a lack of internal discussion and agreement at the city, we might be unfairly accused of not following the agreed and documented path forward.

All that said and assuming there is a future ... we get a Hot List to use elsewhere... let's please decide and document what we do with a collections agency in Senatobia and hopefully elsewhere.

Comments most welcome as always.