

EXHIBIT D1

Reinstatement of Carpenter

How many times had this application been DQ'd?

During the past two years, how did this deficient application improve or change the circumstances causing the original DQ?

I understand a couple of points were sent back to a lower court but the primary holding was the Courts were not the place for an appeal of an administrative decision, so how frequently does an Arkansas AG propose a settlement to a case that has been won at the Supreme Court?

At any time during the settlement discussions was the AG or any other party communication with members of the MMC?

Would the 6th place applicant, prior to this action by the MMC, have a cause of action against the state for this?

Did we settle one case only to invite another one?

Can we be confident this settlement proposal did not violate any FOIA?

Lack of Expanded Licenses Granted

Did the MMC receive an affidavit of bias regarding one Commissioner?

If so, why was this not acted upon prior to options to grant licenses?

The MMC created an unjust, unfair and discriminatory circumstance by awarded the original 5 they way they did. In other words, these 5 cultivators could have open communication with any commission one on one at any time, in fact they could have breakfast or coffee yet the other reserve applicants have been remained silent during this application phase to maintain integrity to their process. Where was the integrity from the other competition? Do you see how this can create unfairness?

Asking dispensary owners about supply in an open meeting is not an accurate way to determine supply issues. It is a way to create retribution on

an owner from a supplier. Did any Commissioner pick up the phone and call a dispensary owner to find out what the supply is really like?

The MMC asking current growers about expansion of their facilities, seems to me they are worried about the future market in Arkansas not being properly supplied without expansion. The ability of 5 cultivators to expand suggests the supply might could be met in the future but it does nothing to suggest the supply will become more affordable because it does not create more competition, it just creates more business and profit for the ones currently growing.

Why is medical marijuana so much cheaper in Oklahoma than it is here?

Why did Oklahoma get their dispensaries and cultivators open before us when we had a two-year head start? We passed MMC in 2016. Okla. passed it in 2018. How do you explain this?

Free-market conservatism is the backbone of this country. Why do these principles not apply in this case?

How are patients best served by restricting the supply?

Do you consider the MMC commission to be an advocate for the patients or the MMC industry?

What input was sought and received from patient advocacy organizations before making this decision?