

EXHIBIT A

HARDER & COMPANY*

*operating through a law corporation

April 1, 2011

File No. 7016

Aztec Copper Inc.
Edmonton, Alberta
hoist13@telus.net

Attention: Ron Arnold

Dear Ron:

Re: Aztec Copper Inc. ("Aztec" or the "Company")

We have been requested to provide a brief written summary of the results of the corporate review of Aztec undertaken by Harder & Company in its former capacity as corporate counsel.

We were retained in May, 2009 by Aztec to review its corporate records and business issues. The Company was facing a number of problems and had not been properly maintained for some time. Aztec had received a Notice of Dissolution from the Arizona Corporation Commission and was in the process of being dissolved as a corporate entity. Many required corporate filings had not been made and many supporting records were missing or had been destroyed. We traced, confirmed and filed the interim information, restoring Aztec to good standing in Arizona. In November 2009 the first shareholder's meeting since 2006 was held.

A much more difficult and contentious task was determining the many shareholders of Aztec and their respective shareholdings. The initial records of the Company maintained in Edmonton until 2005 were reasonably easy to follow; however, from 2005 the records became extremely difficult to understand.

Respecting the post-2005 records, we contacted registered shareholders and often became aware of unregistered shareholders when they contacted us wondering why they had not been contacted as well. Many of those shareholders ultimately provided information which we reviewed against records of cash subscription receipts by the Company. In many cases, the person who had sold the shares was Mr. Bob Butler and he had issued subscription agreements, share certificates and receipts to the purchasers purportedly acting as the authorized representative of Aztec. The documentation provided by those unregistered shareholders was often confusing or contradictory. In addition to the paperwork clearly being the same as that used in previous share issuances, there were no records of cash receipts by Aztec from any of the unregistered shareholders.

Predictably, there was a huge outcry by people who had paid money and not received official recognition as Aztec shareholders. In many cases, the purchasers were able to settle some of their

issues by ultimately receiving a transfer of shares directly from Mr. Butler's shareholdings and the Company authorized certain transfers from the shareholdings of Mr. Butler to allow this.

In addition to being illegal for a company to issue an unpaid share, it is highly unfair to the other shareholders who have paid their money. As you know, Mr. Butler has continued to maintain that he is entitled to the registration of large blocks of Aztec shares in his own name and in the names of related entities, relatives and friends. Mr. Butler also claims commission shares for sales for which there are no records of money ever being received by the Company. I made considerable attempts to work with Mr. Butler to correct matters and was always rebuffed with hostility. I understand that the Company's continued efforts to obtain verifications and other documents from him have also been stonewalled.

After the middle of 2006, it appears that Mr. Butler was no longer authorized to conduct any activities on behalf of Aztec, yet share sales by him apparently continued. This has resulted in numerous unresolved claims from previously unregistered shareholders and the related confusion.

As you know, when Aztec was originally conceived and founded in November of 2001, the intention was for it to maintain and fund the development of a portfolio of highly prospective mineral properties owned by Fierce. Annual tax payments and other property holding expenses are prohibitively high for small entities and it was clear that financial assistance would be required. Accordingly, Aztec sold shares to friends, relatives and business associates to raise funds. Fierce entered into an option agreement with Aztec whereby Fierce optioned its properties to Aztec and in return was issued 40,000,000 at a deemed value of \$1.00 per share. A key component of the option agreement was a covenant made by Aztec to pay all of the taxes (and other property carrying charges) on behalf of Fierce in order to keep the properties in good standing. Aztec was properly fund the properties and the titles to the same were ultimately in danger of being lost. The result was that the option agreement was terminated, Fierce found other parties to fill the funding gaps and the properties now being actively being explored and developed by Fierce and its partners.

At the point of termination, Aztec had no money and no interest in any properties - Fierce remained the owner of 40,000,000 shares of Aztec. Although unfortunate, this is not unusual in an industry where a funding default under an option agreement will typically result in the immediate termination of all property rights and the forfeiture of all consideration paid to such time.

Although he was entirely within his legal rights to terminate the option agreement, Mr. Hermiston recognized that most Aztec shareholders invested their money in good faith. It seemed inequitable that they would end up with nothing and, accordingly, a trust agreement was prepared and executed. This entrenched a 5% share of the proceeds from the properties in which Aztec had an interest under the original option agreement.

In addition, in a similar act of good faith, Fierce voluntarily cancelled its 40,000,000 Aztec shares and no longer has an equity position or management influence in Aztec. The 5% carried interest will can now be spread among the remaining shareholders of Aztec as determined management.

I trust you will find the foregoing summary useful; however, should you require additional clarification, please contact the writer.

Yours truly,

HARDER & COMPANY

Per: 

GLEN D. HARDER

cc: Fierce Investment Corp.