

---

**From:** Barry J. Cohen <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 29, 2017 3:11 PM  
**To:** jeffrey E.  
**Subject:** Re: Alternative IRS Response Letter--PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIALits

Agree. Joslin said 2012 is before he became involved, and that we can tie t=e numbers now.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 29, 2017, at 9:45 AM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>> wrote:

It's separate from why we can't tie to our own return On Sat, Apr 29, 2017 at 9:42 AM jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com<mailto:je=vacation@gmail.com>> wrote:  
Let's get to that answer

On Sat, Apr 29, 2017 at 9:29 AM Barry J. Cohen <[REDACTED]><mailto:[REDACTED]>> wrote:  
But why would lots of other Apollo people be getting something similar if t=is is just about a Tom Turin mistake?

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 29, 2017, at 8:46 AM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>> wrote:

Irs says 880 understatement. TOM says 880 loss not gain . Soo. Sloppy it's =ifficult to decode On Sat, Apr 29, 2017 at 8:31 AM Barry J. Cohen <[REDACTED]><mailto:[REDACTED]>> wrote:  
I agree the alternative letter is not great. Note that the IRS's first let=er suggests that the BRH numbers are fine, but they can't figure out how w= applied them to the return. The IRS's secon