



IVS Associates, Inc. is the duly appointed inspector of election for the Quality Systems, Inc. Annual Meeting held September 21, 2005. We are submitting this response to challenges made to our Preliminary Voting Report at a review session held September 30, 2005. The session was held at the Hotel DuPont in Wilmington, Delaware and was attended by IVS and representatives of Quality Systems management and representatives of Mr. Hussein who solicited proxies in opposition to management.

1) **Challenge** made on behalf of the Hussein proxy committee- (paraphrased)

The votes submitted by ADP to management on the form dated September 20, 2005 contained "uninstructed votes" which were improperly tabulated by the Inspectors in favor of management's nominees. It is clear that New York Stock Exchange rule 452 forbids such voting in contested situations (as was this meeting). We have filed two letters and an 85-page document with IVS, which fully document the facts of the uninstructed shares, the effect of, and the rules that restrict such voting.

Further, ADP sent a note to the beneficial holders informing them they would have to instruct their vote in order for it to be counted. However ADP still submitted some 800,000 shares with out receiving instructions from the beneficial holders.

The inspectors duties under California law (as cited in the letter to IVS) include determining the "right to vote" and since the uninstructed shares had no such rights, IVS should deduct the uninstructed shares from the vote totals. By counting these disputed shares, Mr. Hussein will get only two seats on the board of directors rather than the three he would otherwise win.

Response: Our ruling is not based on the veracity of the facts as presented in the letters and attachments previously submitted. Rather if we were to take them in to account we would violate the duties of inspector of election. In determining the "right to vote" we are limited to the books and records of the corporation, the record date list and omnibus proxies and the proxies themselves, We are not permitted to consider any further evidence or information in determining the right to vote except for the limited purpose of resolving bank/broker over-vote situations. The challenge is over ruled.


2) **Challenge** made on behalf of the Company's proxy committee to the opposition proxy card for the account of "IDX Inc, Attn. Jack Kane." The signatory had no authority to sign the proxy.

Response: Jack Kane is listed on the registration and has authority to sign the proxy which he did. The challenge is over ruled.


3) **Challenge** made on behalf of the Company's proxy committee to the opposition proxy card for the account of "Claude H. Maxwell & William C. Maxwell Jt Ten." The signatory had no authority to sign the proxy.

Response: The card is signed by William Maxwell in his individual capacity and as power of attorney for Claude. Either or both signatures are valid for this account. The challenge is over ruled.

October 3, 2005
IVS Associates, Inc.



William A. Marsh



James J. Raitt

IVS ASSOCIATES INC.

INDEPENDENT
VOTING
SERVICES

111 CONTINENTAL DRIVE
SUITE 210
NEWARK
DELAWARE 19713

T 302 369 377
F 302 369 848

INFO@IVSASSOCIATES.COM