Ida Rose 1128.73 (per shr. 13279)

Tracy

Tracy Jr. 1389.78 C 10466+
+ Kids (917.07) they pay 5400)

Charlotte 5700 share

Nancy - 633.41
Child they pay 43.413
$776.823

764.87
+ Kids 215.12
979.99

David 2162.09
Karen 597.56
Kids 1195.11 They pay
$3944.57

Total for Tr. Jr., David, I. Rose, Nancy, Char.
7818.43

460,000

JONES, WALDO, HOLBROOK & McDONOUGH

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

DONALD B. HOLBROOK
CALVIN L. RAMPTON
W. ROBERT WRIGHT
RANDON W. WILSON
RONALD J. OCKEY
K. S. CORNABY†
JAMES S. LOWRIE
RONNY L. CUTSHALL
CHRISTOPHER L. BURTON
LARRY C. HOLMAN
WILLIAM B. BOHLING
D. MILES HOLMAN
ROBERT S. McCONNELL
JOHN W. PALMER
THOMAS E. K. CERRUTI
CRAIG R. MARIGER
RICHARD B. JOHNS
DAVID B. LEE*
BARRY D. WOOD*
GRETTA C. SPENDLOVE
TIMOTHY B. ANDERSON
SUZANNE WEST
ELIZABETH M. HASLAM
G. RAND BEACHAM
RANDALL N. SKANCHY
JANET C. GRAHAM
BRUCE E. BABCOCK
DAVID R. MONEY
GEORGE W. PRATT
JAMES W. STEWART
MERILYN M. STRAILMAN*§
LESLIE A. LEWIS
PAUL M. HARMAN
SUE VOGEL
EVAN A. SCHMUTZ
TIMOTHY C. HOUPT
DALE R. CHAMBERLAIN
WILLIAM C. GIBBS
RONALD D. MAINES*
VIRGINIA S. SMITH
EDWARD R. MUNSON
DAVID L. JONES
ROBERT A. GOODMAN
JAMES W. BURCH
KEVEN M. ROWE
MICHAEL PATRICK O'BRIEN
DAVID N. SONNENREICH
WM. KELLY NASH
SHARON E. SONNENREICH
JAMES W. PETERS
SUSAN S. BOSTWICK
CURTIS R. WARD
JEROME ROMERO
MICHAEL R. SHAW
MITZI R. COLLINS
GREGORY CROPPER
DAVID R. PURNELL‡
BARRY G. LAWRENCE
GLENN M. GOFFIN
MICHAEL J. KELLEY

OF COUNSEL
SIDNEY G. BAUCOM
ROGER J. McDONOUGH
ALDEN B. TUELLER

*ADMITTED AND RESIDENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
†REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY
‡ADMITTED IN TEXAS AND IDAHO ONLY
§ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA

SHEEKS & RAWLINS 1875
RAWLINS & CRITCHLOW 1891
RAWLINS, THURMAN, WEDGEWOOD & HURD 1897
RAWLINS, RAY & RAWLINS 1907
INGEBRETSEN, RAY & RAWLINS 1929
INGEBRETSEN, RAY, RAWLINS & CHRISTENSEN 1941
INGEBRETSEN, RAY, RAWLINS & JONES 1948
RAY, RAWLINS, JONES & HENDERSON 1949

SALT LAKE CITY OFFICE
1500 FIRST INTERSTATE PLAZA
170 SOUTH MAIN STREET
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84101
TELEPHONE (801) 521-3200
TELECOPIER (801) 328-0537
TELEX 324898

WASHINGTON, D.C. OFFICE
SUITE 900
2300 M STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037
TELEPHONE (202) 296-5950
TELECOPIER (202) 293-2509

ST. GEORGE OFFICE
THE TABERNACLE TOWER BLDG.
249 EAST TABERNACLE
ST. GEORGE, UTAH 84770
TELEPHONE (801) 628-1627
TELECOPIER (801) 628-5225

IN REPLY REFER TO:
Salt Lake City

June 5, 1989

Ida Rose Hall
1711 North Lambert Lane
Provo, UT 84601

Re: Joint Representation of Former Megadiamond Industries, Inc. Shareholders

Dear Ida:

This letter addresses aspects of this firm's joint representation of you and all other participating former Megadiamond Industries, Inc, ("Megadiamond") shareholders in your prosecution of an action against Smith International, Inc., ("Smiths") for claims arising out of the sale of Megadiamond to Smith.

While all of the participating former Megadiamond shareholders have asked this law firm to represent them in this matter, we have informed each of you that we cannot undertake this joint representation unless such representation is in accordance with the Utah Rules of Professional Conduct. Specifically, is our compliance with Rule 1.7 of the Utah Rules of Professional Conduct which, in pertinent part, states:

> (a) A lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation of that client will be directly adverse to another client, unless:
>
> (1) The lawyer reasonably believes the representation will not adversely

affect the relationship with the other client; and

(2) Each client consents after consultation.

(b) A lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation of that client may be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client or to a third person or by the lawyer's own interests, unless:

(1) The lawyer reasonably believes the representation will not be adversely affected; and

(2) Each client consents after a consultation. When representation of multiple clients in a single matter is undertaken, the consultation shall include explanation to each client of the implications of the common representations and the advantages and risks involved.

Pursuant to Rule 1.7, we wish to explain to you the advantages and disadvantages involved in the joint representation of all former Megadiamond shareholders in the above-referenced matter. We believe that the advantages of joint representation will center on the ability to present a "united front" in this litigation, to have the lawyers of your choice, and to greatly reduce your legal fees and expenses.

The disadvantages of being jointly represented include the possibility of conflicts arising between any of the participating former shareholders. Yet, because each of the former shareholders' legal claims and factual objectives are virtually identical, we believe that no actual conflict of interest exists among you. It is conceivable, however, that at some point in the future, your interests may diverge. This might occur if, for example, you have conflicting desires as to how this lawsuit should be handled. If such a conflict should arise and a resolution of it cannot be reached, we may have to withdraw from representing all conflicting parties unless the conflicting parties can reach an agreement as to who we would continue to represent (and if proper under the Utah Rules of Professional Conduct). If we did withdraw from representing

you or any of the participating former Megadiamond shareholders, you and/or they would have to bear the financial burden of hiring new counsel and familiarizing the new counsel with this matter.

Another aspect of joint representation relates to confidences. Under the Utah Rules of Professional Conduct, attorneys must hold in strict confidence all information relating to the representation of a client. (Rule 1.6) When one lawyer or law firm represents multiple parties in the same lawsuit, the sharing of information with the other clients is often necessary. This necessity will likely apply to the sharing of information we will obtain from and between participating Megadiamond shareholders in our efforts to provide efficient and thorough representation. Our representation of you will require an agreement to such an exchange.

Finally, as we have discussed earlier, an Oversight Committee has been created to function as the decision-making body throughout this matter. This committee is comprised of three or four participating shareholders with Duane Horton as chairperson. This committee will need to be authorized to act on your behalf for all matters arising from this matter.

Please understand that any concerns or interest you may have at any time may be communicated to this committee or either to Bill Bohling or Jeffrey Walker.

We recommend you discuss this letter with independent counsel. If you consent to our representation, please so indicate below and return this letter to our office in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. If you have any further questions or concerns regarding the content of this letter, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

JONES, WALDO, HOLBROOK & McDONOUGH

By:_____
William B. Bohling

By:_____
Jeffrey N. Walker

CONSENT

I have read and I understand the foregoing discussion with respect to Jones, Waldo, Holbrook & McDonough's joint representation of all the former Megadiamond shareholders in the above-referenced matter.

I hereby consent to Jones, Waldo, Holbrook & McDonough's joint representation of all the former Megadiamond shareholders in the above-entitled lawsuit and to the sharing of confidences as well as the formation and function of the Oversight Committee as described above.

_____

jnw 20/sa