

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549
FORM 10-Q**

QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the quarterly period ended June 30, 2010

or

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission File Number: 001-31458

Newcastle Investment Corp.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Maryland

(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

1345 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY
(Address of principal executive offices)

81-0559116
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

10105
(Zip Code)

(212) 798-6100

(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

(Former name, former address and former fiscal year, if changed since last report)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulations S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Non-accelerated filer (Do not check if a smaller reporting company)
Smaller reporting company

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the issuer's classes of common stock, as of the last practicable date.

Common stock, \$0.01 par value per share: 62,024,945 shares outstanding as of August 4, 2010.

CAUTIONARY NOTE REGARDING FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

This report contains certain “forward-looking statements” within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Such forward-looking statements relate to, among other things, the operating performance of our investments, the stability of our earnings, and our financing needs. Forward-looking statements are generally identifiable by use of forward-looking terminology such as “may,” “will,” “should,” “potential,” “intend,” “expect,” “endeavor,” “seek,” “anticipate,” “estimate,” “overestimate,” “underestimate,” “believe,” “could,” “project,” “predict,” “continue” or other similar words or expressions. Forward-looking statements are based on certain assumptions, discuss future expectations, describe future plans and strategies, contain projections of results of operations or of financial condition or state other forward-looking information. Our ability to predict results or the actual outcome of future plans or strategies is inherently uncertain. Although we believe that the expectations reflected in such forward-looking statements are based on reasonable assumptions, our actual results and performance could differ materially from those set forth in the forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements involve risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause our actual results in future periods to differ materially from forecasted results. Factors that could materially affect our operations and prospects include, but are not limited to:

- our ability to take advantage of opportunities in additional asset classes at attractive risk-adjusted prices;
- our ability to deploy capital accretively;
- the risks that default and recovery rates on our loan portfolios exceed our underwriting estimates;
- the relationship between yields on assets which are paid off and yields on assets in which such monies can be reinvested;
- the relative spreads between the yield on the assets we invest in and the cost of financing;
- changes in economic conditions generally and the real estate and bond markets specifically;
- adverse changes in the financing markets we access affecting our ability to finance our investments or our ability to maintain our historic net spreads;
- changing risk assessments by lenders that potentially lead to increased margin calls, not extending our repurchase agreements or other financings in accordance with their current terms or entering into new financings with us;
- changes in interest rates and/or credit spreads, as well as the success of any hedging strategy we may undertake in relation to such changes;
- the quality and size of the investment pipeline and the rate at which we can invest our cash, including cash inside our CDOs;
- impairments in the value of the collateral underlying our investments and the relation of any such impairments to our judgments as to whether changes in the market value of our securities, loans or real estate are temporary or not and whether circumstances bearing on the value of such assets warrant changes in carrying values;
- legislative/regulatory changes, including, but not limited to, any modification of the terms of loans or requirements with respect to asset-backed securities that we may issue;
- reductions in cash flows received from our investments, particularly our CDOs;
- completion of pending investments;
- the availability and cost of capital for future investments;
- competition within the finance and real estate industries; and
- other risks detailed from time to time below, particularly under the heading “Risk Factors,” and in our other SEC reports.

Although we believe that the expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot guarantee future results, levels of activity, performance or achievements. The factors noted above could cause our actual results to differ significantly from those contained in any forward-looking statement.

Readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on any of these forward-looking statements, which reflect our management’s views only as of the date of this report. We are under no duty to update any of the forward-looking statements after the date of this report to conform these statements to actual results.

SPECIAL NOTE REGARDING EXHIBITS

In reviewing the agreements included as exhibits to this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, please remember they are included to provide you with information regarding their terms and are not intended to provide any other factual or disclosure information about the Company or the other parties to the agreements. The agreements contain representations and warranties by each of the parties to the applicable agreement. These representations and warranties have been made solely for the benefit of the other parties to the applicable agreement and:

- should not in all instances be treated as categorical statements of fact, but rather as a way of allocating the risk tone of the parties if those statements provide to be inaccurate;
- have been qualified by disclosures that were made to the other party in connection with the negotiation of the applicable agreement, which disclosures are not necessarily reflected in the agreement;
- may apply standards of materiality in a way that is different from what may be viewed as material to you or other investors; and
- were made only as of the date of the applicable agreement or such other date or dates as may be specified in the agreement and are subject to more recent developments.

Accordingly, these representations and warranties may not describe the actual state of affairs as of the date they were made or at any other time. Additional information about the Company may be found elsewhere in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and the Company's other public filings, which are available without charge through the SEC's website at <http://www.sec.gov>.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP.
FORM 10-Q

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
PART I.	FINANCIAL INFORMATION
Item 1.	Financial Statements
	Consolidated Balance Sheets as of June 30, 2010 (unaudited) and December 31, 2009 1
	Consolidated Statements of Operations (unaudited) for the three and six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009 2
	Consolidated Statements of Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) (unaudited) for the six months ended June 30, 2010 3
	Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows (unaudited) for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009 4
	Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (unaudited) 5
Item 2.	Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations 26
Item 3.	Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk 49
Item 4.	Controls and Procedures 52
PART II.	OTHER INFORMATION
Item 1.	Legal Proceedings 53
Item 1A.	Risk Factors 53
Item 2.	Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds 71
Item 3.	Defaults upon Senior Securities 71
Item 4.	Reserved 71
Item 5.	Other Information 71
Item 6.	Exhibits 72
	SIGNATURES 73

PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

ITEM 1. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(dollars in thousands, except share data)

	June 30, 2010 (Unaudited)	December 31, 2009
Assets		
<u>Non-Recourse VIE Financing Structures</u>		
Real estate securities, available for sale	\$ 1,872,612	\$ 1,784,487
Real estate related loans, held for sale, net	671,657	554,367
Residential mortgage loans, held for investment, net	131,084	—
Residential mortgage loans, held for sale, net	258,373	380,123
Subprime mortgage loans subject to call option	403,383	403,006
Restricted cash	145,366	200,251
Receivables and other assets	32,769	36,643
	<u>3,515,244</u>	<u>3,358,877</u>
<u>Recourse Financing Structures and Unlevered Assets</u>		
Real estate securities, available for sale	3,467	46,308
Real estate related loans, held for sale, net	23,001	19,495
Residential mortgage loans, held for sale, net	4,182	3,524
Operating real estate, held for sale	9,906	9,966
Cash and cash equivalents	37,684	68,300
Receivables and other assets	1,016	8,158
	<u>79,256</u>	<u>155,751</u>
	<u>\$ 3,594,500</u>	<u>\$ 3,514,628</u>
Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity (Deficit)		
Liabilities		
<u>Non-Recourse VIE Financing Structures</u>		
CDO bonds payable	\$ 3,481,618	\$ 4,058,928
Other bonds payable	275,933	303,697
Notes payable	4,582	—
Financing of subprime mortgage loans subject to call option	403,383	403,006
Derivative liabilities	203,274	203,054
Accrued expenses and other liabilities	7,415	2,992
	<u>4,376,205</u>	<u>4,971,677</u>
<u>Recourse Financing Structures and Other Liabilities</u>		
Repurchase agreements	—	71,309
Junior subordinated notes payable	51,256	103,264
Derivative liabilities	—	4,100
Due to affiliates	1,419	1,497
Accrued expenses and other liabilities	3,086	3,433
	<u>55,761</u>	<u>183,603</u>
	<u>4,431,966</u>	<u>5,155,280</u>
Stockholders' Equity (Deficit)		
Preferred stock, \$0.01 par value, 100,000,000 shares authorized, 1,347,321 and 2,500,000 shares of 9.75% Series B Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock, 496,000 and 1,600,000 shares of 8.05% Series C Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock, and 620,000 and 2,000,000 shares of 8.375% Series D Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock, liquidation preference \$25.00 per share, issued and outstanding as of June 30, 2010 and December 31, 2009, respectively	61,583	152,500
Common stock, \$0.01 par value, 500,000,000 shares authorized, 62,024,945 and 52,912,513 shares issued and outstanding at June 30, 2010 and December 31, 2009, respectively	620	529
Additional paid-in capital	1,065,362	1,033,520
Accumulated deficit	(1,690,870)	(2,193,383)
Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss)	(274,161)	(633,818)
	<u>(837,466)</u>	<u>(1,640,652)</u>
	<u>\$ 3,594,500</u>	<u>\$ 3,514,628</u>

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS (Unaudited)

(dollars in thousands, except share data)

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2010	2009	2010	2009
Interest income	\$ 74,183	\$ 87,338	\$ 144,275	\$ 211,811
Interest expense	43,141	54,172	88,730	114,716
Net interest income	31,042	33,166	55,545	97,095
Impairment				
Valuation allowance (reversal) on loans	(91,534)	(30,869)	(187,308)	90,019
Other-than-temporary impairment on securities	33,925	209,554	98,781	396,136
Portion of other-than-temporary impairment on securities recognized in other comprehensive income (loss), net of the reversal of other comprehensive loss into net income (loss)	15,114	(55,278)	(22,000)	(55,278)
	(42,495)	123,407	(110,527)	430,877
Net interest income (loss) after impairment	73,537	(90,241)	166,072	(333,782)
Other Income (Loss)				
Gain on settlement of investments, net	8,954	17,544	18,631	9,497
Gain on extinguishment of debt	46,728	26,830	95,074	53,675
Other income (loss), net	(2,298)	10,911	(3,778)	4,430
	53,384	55,285	109,927	67,602
Expenses				
Loan and security servicing expense	1,322	1,370	2,357	2,772
General and administrative expense	1,938	2,965	4,976	4,591
Management fee to affiliate	4,258	4,492	8,735	8,983
Depreciation and amortization	62	73	125	145
	7,580	8,900	16,193	16,491
Income (loss) from continuing operations	119,341	(43,856)	259,806	(282,671)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	13	(142)	(27)	(175)
Net Income (Loss)	119,354	(43,998)	259,779	(282,846)
Preferred dividends	(1,395)	(3,376)	(4,663)	(6,751)
Excess of carrying amount of exchanged preferred stock over fair value of consideration paid - Note 9	—	—	43,043	—
Income (Loss) Applicable to Common Stockholders	\$ 117,959	\$ (47,374)	\$ 298,159	\$ (289,597)
Income (Loss) Per Share of Common Stock				
Basic	\$ 1.90	\$ (0.90)	\$ 5.16	\$ (5.48)
Diluted	\$ 1.90	\$ (0.90)	\$ 5.16	\$ (5.48)
Income (loss) from continuing operations per share of common stock, after preferred dividends and excess of carrying amount of exchanged preferred stock over fair value of consideration paid				
Basic	\$ 1.90	\$ (0.90)	\$ 5.16	\$ (5.48)
Diluted	\$ 1.90	\$ (0.90)	\$ 5.16	\$ (5.48)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations per share of common stock				
Basic	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —
Diluted	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —
Weighted Average Number of Shares of Common Stock Outstanding				
Basic	62,010,570	52,836,208	57,838,286	52,821,800
Diluted	62,010,570	52,836,208	57,838,286	52,821,800
Dividends Declared per Share of Common Stock	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —

See notes to consolidated financial statements

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY (DEFICIT) (Unaudited)

FOR THE SIX MONTHS ENDED JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in thousands)

	Preferred Stock		Common Stock		Additional Paid-in Capital	Accumulated Deficit	Accum. Other Comp. Income (Loss)	Total Stockholders' Equity (Deficit)
	Shares	Amount	Shares	Amount				
Stockholders' equity (deficit) - December 31, 2009	6,100,000	\$152,500	52,912,513	\$ 529	\$1,033,520	\$(2,193,383)	\$ (633,818)	\$ (1,640,652)
Preferred dividends declared	—	—	—	—	—	(19,484)	—	(19,484)
Exchange of preferred stock for common stock and cash	(3,636,679)	(90,917)	9,091,668	91	31,782	43,043	—	(16,001)
Issuance of common stock to directors	—	—	20,764	—	60	—	—	60
Deconsolidation of CDO VII:								
Cumulative net loss	—	—	—	—	—	219,175	—	219,175
Deconsolidation of unrealized loss on securities	—	—	—	—	—	—	40,715	40,715
Deconsolidation of unrealized loss on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges	—	—	—	—	—	—	28,514	28,514
Comprehensive income:								
Net income (loss)	—	—	—	—	—	259,779	—	259,779
Net unrealized gain on securities	—	—	—	—	—	—	262,032	262,032
Reclassification of net realized loss on securities into earnings	—	—	—	—	—	—	54,930	54,930
Net unrealized (loss) on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges	—	—	—	—	—	—	(32,680)	(32,680)
Reclassification of net realized loss on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges into earnings	—	—	—	—	—	—	6,146	6,146
Total comprehensive income (loss)								550,207
Stockholders' equity (deficit) - June 30, 2010	<u>2,463,321</u>	<u>\$ 61,583</u>	<u>62,024,945</u>	<u>\$ 620</u>	<u>\$1,065,362</u>	<u>\$(1,690,870)</u>	<u>\$ (274,161)</u>	<u>\$ (837,466)</u>

See notes to consolidated financial statements

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS (Unaudited)

(dollars in thousands)

	<u>Six Months Ended June 30,</u>	
	<u>2010</u>	<u>2009</u>
Cash Flows From Operating Activities		
Net income (loss)	\$ 259,779	\$(282,846)
Adjustments to reconcile net income (loss) to net cash provided by (used in) operating activities (inclusive of amounts related to discontinued operations):		
Depreciation and amortization	125	150
Accretion of discount and other amortization	(8,377)	(29,466)
Interest income in CDOs redirected for reinvestment or CDO bonds paydown	(3,793)	(6,447)
Valuation allowance on loans	(187,308)	90,019
Non-cash directors' compensation	60	91
(Gain) loss on sale of investments	(18,631)	(9,497)
Unrealized (gain) loss on non-hedge derivatives and hedge ineffectiveness	4,299	(4,197)
Other-than-temporary impairment on securities	76,781	340,858
Impairment on real estate held for sale	60	250
(Gain) loss on extinguishment of debt	(95,074)	(53,675)
Change in:		
Restricted cash	(215)	3,760
Receivables and other assets	2,967	2,343
Due to affiliates	(78)	(35)
Accrued expenses and other liabilities	(1,346)	(1,674)
Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities	<u>29,249</u>	<u>49,634</u>
Cash Flows From Investing Activities		
Purchase of real estate securities	(2,291)	(1,800)
Proceeds from sale of real estate securities	48,367	135,999
Purchase of and advances on loans	—	(14,723)
Repayments of loan and security principal	105,748	51,635
Margin received on derivative instruments	5,073	3,550
Return of margin deposits on total rate of return swaps (treated as derivative instruments)	—	37
Payments on settlement of derivative instruments	(11,394)	(11,610)
Proceeds from sale of real estate held for sale	—	1,350
Distributions of capital from equity method investees	159	48
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities	<u>145,662</u>	<u>164,486</u>
Cash Flows From Financing Activities		
Repayments and repurchases of CDO bonds payable	(89,975)	(23,675)
Repurchase of CDO bonds payable	(9,927)	(3,069)
Issuance of other bonds payable	97,650	—
Repayments of other bonds payable	(124,104)	(51,472)
Repayments of repurchase agreements	(71,309)	(159,048)
Margin deposits under repurchase agreements	—	(7,303)
Return of margin deposits under repurchase agreements	—	7,586
Cash consideration paid in exchange for junior subordinated notes	(9,715)	—
Cash consideration paid to redeem preferred stock	(16,001)	—
Dividends paid	(19,484)	—
Payment of deferred financing costs	(1,677)	(1,900)
Restricted cash returned from refinancing activities	39,015	41,643
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	<u>(205,527)</u>	<u>(197,238)</u>
Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash and Cash Equivalents	<u>(30,616)</u>	<u>16,882</u>
Cash and Cash Equivalents, Beginning of Period	<u>68,300</u>	<u>49,746</u>
Cash and Cash Equivalents, End of Period	<u>\$ 37,684</u>	<u>\$ 66,628</u>
Supplemental Disclosure of Cash Flow Information		
Cash paid during the period for interest expense	\$ 65,946	\$ 87,067
Supplemental Schedule of Non-Cash Investing and Financing Activities		
Common stock issued to redeem preferred stock	\$ 28,457	\$ —
Face amount of CDO bonds issued in exchange for previously issued junior subordinated notes of \$52,094	\$ 37,625	\$ —

See notes to consolidated financial statements

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

1. GENERAL

Newcastle Investment Corp. (and its subsidiaries, "Newcastle") is a Maryland corporation that was formed in 2002. Newcastle conducts its business through four primary segments: (i) investments financed with non-recourse collateralized debt obligations ("CDOs"), (ii) investments financed with other non-recourse debt, (iii) investments financed with recourse debt, including FNMA / FHLMC securities, and (iv) unlevered investments.

Newcastle is organized and conducts its operations to qualify as a real estate investment trust ("REIT") for U.S. federal income tax purposes. As such, Newcastle will generally not be subject to U.S. federal corporate income tax on that portion of its net income that is distributed to stockholders if it distributes at least 90% of its REIT taxable income to its stockholders by prescribed dates and complies with various other requirements.

Newcastle is party to a management agreement (the "Management Agreement") with FIG LLC (the "Manager"), a subsidiary of Fortress Investment Group LLC ("Fortress"), under which the Manager advises Newcastle on various aspects of its business and manages its day-to-day operations, subject to the supervision of Newcastle's board of directors. For its services, the Manager receives an annual management fee and incentive compensation, both as defined in the Management Agreement.

Approximately 3.8 million shares of Newcastle's common stock were held by Fortress, through its affiliates, and its principals at June 30, 2010. In addition, Fortress, through its affiliates, held options to purchase approximately 1.7 million shares of Newcastle's common stock at June 30, 2010.

The accompanying consolidated financial statements and related notes of Newcastle have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States for interim financial reporting and the instructions to Form 10-Q and Rule 10-01 of Regulation S-X. Accordingly, certain information and footnote disclosures normally included in financial statements prepared under U.S. generally accepted accounting principles have been condensed or omitted. In the opinion of management, all adjustments considered necessary for a fair presentation of Newcastle's financial position, results of operations and cash flows have been included and are of a normal and recurring nature. The operating results presented for interim periods are not necessarily indicative of the results that may be expected for any other interim period or for the entire year. These financial statements should be read in conjunction with Newcastle's consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2009 and notes thereto included in Newcastle's Annual Report on Form 10-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Capitalized terms used herein, and not otherwise defined, are defined in Newcastle's consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2009.

Change in Presentation

Newcastle has changed the format of its consolidated balance sheets for all periods presented to reflect the requirements of new guidance which became effective January 1, 2010. This change in format did not have any effect on any of the reported line items within the balance sheets, other than breaking them out by financing type, or on the statement of consolidated equity (deficit).

2. INFORMATION REGARDING BUSINESS SEGMENTS

Newcastle conducts its business through four primary segments: (i) investments financed with non-recourse collateralized debt obligations ("CDOs"), (ii) investments financed with other non-recourse debt, (iii) investments financed with recourse debt, and (iv) unlevered investments.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Summary financial data on Newcastle's segments is given below, together with a reconciliation to the same data for Newcastle as a whole:

	<u>CDOs (A)</u>	<u>Other Non-Recourse (A) (B)</u>	<u>Recourse</u>	<u>Unlevered</u>	<u>Unallocated</u>	<u>Total</u>
Six Months Ended June 30, 2010						
Interest income	\$ 105,721	\$ 36,806	\$ 976	\$ 742	\$ 30	\$ 144,275
Interest expense	56,174	29,901	645	356	1,654	88,730
Net interest income (expense)	49,547	6,905	331	386	(1,624)	55,545
Impairment	(60,308)	(34,229)	(60)	(15,930)	—	(110,527)
Other income (loss)	115,730	(3,781)	(663)	(1,014)	(345)	109,927
Depreciation and amortization	—	—	—	—	125	125
Other operating expenses	789	1,626	4	10	13,639	16,068
Income (loss) from continuing operations	224,796	35,727	(276)	15,292	(15,733)	259,806
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	—	—	—	(27)	—	(27)
Net income (loss)	224,796	35,727	(276)	15,265	(15,733)	259,779
Preferred dividends	—	—	—	—	(4,663)	(4,663)
Excess of carrying amount of exchanged preferred stock over fair value of consideration paid - Note 9	—	—	—	—	43,043	43,043
Income (loss) applicable to common stockholders	<u>\$ 224,796</u>	<u>\$ 35,727</u>	<u>\$ (276)</u>	<u>\$ 15,265</u>	<u>\$ 22,647</u>	<u>\$ 298,159</u>
Three Months Ended June 30, 2010						
Interest income	\$ 54,778	\$ 18,760	\$ 117	\$ 519	\$ 9	\$ 74,183
Interest expense	27,308	14,862	18	356	597	43,141
Net interest income (expense)	27,470	3,898	99	163	(588)	31,042
Impairment	(29,462)	3,063	—	(16,096)	—	(42,495)
Other income (loss)	56,008	(2,383)	—	104	(345)	53,384
Depreciation and amortization	—	—	—	—	62	62
Other operating expenses	437	948	—	9	6,124	7,518
Income (loss) from continuing operations	112,503	(2,496)	99	16,354	(7,119)	119,341
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	—	—	—	13	—	13
Net income (loss)	112,503	(2,496)	99	16,367	(7,119)	119,354
Preferred dividends	—	—	—	—	(1,395)	(1,395)
Excess of carrying amount of exchanged preferred stock over fair value of consideration paid - Note 9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Income (loss) applicable to common stockholders	<u>\$ 112,503</u>	<u>\$ (2,496)</u>	<u>\$ 99</u>	<u>\$ 16,367</u>	<u>\$ (8,514)</u>	<u>\$ 117,959</u>
June 30, 2010						
Investments (C) (D)	\$ 2,591,198	\$ 745,911	\$ —	\$ 40,556	\$ —	\$ 3,377,665
Cash and restricted cash	145,366	—	—	347	37,337	183,050
Other assets	32,769	—	—	221	795	33,785
Total assets	<u>2,769,333</u>	<u>745,911</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>41,124</u>	<u>38,132</u>	<u>3,594,500</u>
Debt (D)	(3,486,200)	(679,316)	—	—	(51,256)	(4,216,772)
Derivative liabilities	(184,839)	(18,435)	—	—	—	(203,274)
Other liabilities	(6,649)	(766)	—	(771)	(3,734)	(11,920)
Total liabilities	<u>(3,677,688)</u>	<u>(698,517)</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>(771)</u>	<u>(54,990)</u>	<u>(4,431,966)</u>
Preferred stock	—	—	—	—	(61,583)	(61,583)
GAAP book value (E)	<u>\$ (908,355)</u>	<u>\$ 47,394</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ 40,353</u>	<u>\$ (78,441)</u>	<u>\$ (899,049)</u>

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

	CDOs (A)	Other Non-Recourse (A) (B)	Recourse	Unlevered	Unallocated	Total
Six Months Ended June 30, 2009						
Interest income	\$ 166,939	\$ 38,859	\$ 4,802	\$ 1,168	\$ 43	\$ 211,811
Interest expense	73,567	34,917	2,188	—	4,044	114,716
Net interest income (expense)	93,372	3,942	2,614	1,168	(4,001)	97,095
Impairment	399,176	(6,557)	32,471	5,787	—	430,877
Other income (loss)	58,873	4,515	4,311	(98)	1	67,602
Depreciation and amortization	—	—	—	—	145	145
Other operating expenses	882	1,870	25	1	13,568	16,346
Income (loss) from continuing operations	(247,813)	13,144	(25,571)	(4,718)	(17,713)	(282,671)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	—	—	—	(175)	—	(175)
Net income (loss)	(247,813)	13,144	(25,571)	(4,893)	(17,713)	(282,846)
Preferred dividends	—	—	—	—	(6,751)	(6,751)
Income (loss) applicable to common stockholders	<u>\$ (247,813)</u>	<u>\$ 13,144</u>	<u>\$ (25,571)</u>	<u>\$ (4,893)</u>	<u>\$ (24,464)</u>	<u>\$ (289,597)</u>
Three Months Ended June 30, 2009						
Interest income	\$ 66,176	\$ 18,517	\$ 2,284	\$ 339	\$ 22	\$ 87,338
Interest expense	35,253	15,761	991	—	2,167	54,172
Net interest income (expense)	30,923	2,756	1,293	339	(2,145)	33,166
Impairment	119,235	(10,153)	11,177	3,148	—	123,407
Other income (loss)	45,073	10,196	78	(61)	(1)	55,285
Depreciation and amortization	—	—	—	—	73	73
Other operating expenses	442	929	3	—	7,453	8,827
Income (loss) from continuing operations	(43,681)	22,176	(9,809)	(2,870)	(9,672)	(43,856)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	—	—	—	(142)	—	(142)
Net income (loss)	(43,681)	22,176	(9,809)	(3,012)	(9,672)	(43,998)
Preferred dividends	—	—	—	—	(3,376)	(3,376)
Income (loss) applicable to common stockholders	<u>\$ (43,681)</u>	<u>\$ 22,176</u>	<u>\$ (9,809)</u>	<u>\$ (3,012)</u>	<u>\$ (13,048)</u>	<u>\$ (47,374)</u>

- (A) Assets held within CDOs and other non-recourse structures are not available to satisfy obligations outside of such financings, except to the extent Newcastle receives net cash flow distributions from such structures. Furthermore, economic losses from such structures cannot exceed Newcastle's invested equity in them. Therefore, economically their book value cannot be less than zero, except for the amounts described in note (B) below.
- (B) Includes all of the manufactured housing loan financing, of which \$1.4 million (carrying value) was recourse as of June 30, 2010.
- (C) The following table summarizes the investments in the unlevered segment as of June 30, 2010:

	Outstanding Face Amount	Carrying Value
Real estate securities	\$ 175,607	\$ 3,467
Real estate related loans	236,486	23,001
Residential mortgage loans	5,460	4,182
Operating real estate	N/A	9,906
	<u>\$ 417,553</u>	<u>\$ 40,556</u>

- (D) Included in the other non-recourse segment were \$403.4 million of Investments and Debt at June 30, 2010, representing the loans subject to call option of the two subprime securitizations and the corresponding financing.
- (E) Newcastle cannot economically lose more than its investment amount in any given non-recourse financing structure. Therefore, impairment recorded in excess of such investment, which results in negative GAAP book value for a given non-recourse financing structure, cannot economically be incurred and will eventually be reversed through amortization, sales at gains, or as gains at the deconsolidation or termination of such non-recourse financing structure. For non-recourse financing structures with negative GAAP book value, except as noted in (B) above, the aggregate negative GAAP book value which will eventually be recorded as an increase to GAAP book value is \$641 million as of June 30, 2010.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Comprehensive Income

The following table summarizes our comprehensive income for the interim periods presented:

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2010	2009	2010	2009
Net income (loss)	\$119,354	\$ (43,998)	\$259,779	\$(282,846)
Net unrealized gain on securities	144,104	131,196	262,032	49,531
Reclassification of net realized loss on securities into earnings	40,144	137,078	54,930	331,891
Net unrealized gain (loss) on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges	(24,152)	86,834	(32,680)	108,817
Reclassification of net realized loss on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges into earnings	1,267	(9,433)	6,146	2,517
	<u>\$280,717</u>	<u>\$301,677</u>	<u>\$550,207</u>	<u>\$ 209,910</u>

Variable Interest Entities (“VIEs”)

In June 2009, the FASB issued new guidance which changes the definition of a VIE and changes the methodology to determine who is the primary beneficiary of, or in other words who consolidates, a VIE. Furthermore, it eliminates the scope exception for qualified special purpose entities (QSPEs), which are now subject to the VIE consolidation rules. This guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2009.

Under the new guidance, a primary beneficiary is defined as the party who has the power to direct the activities of a VIE that most significantly impact the VIE’s economic performance and will absorb a significant portion of the VIE’s expected losses or receive a significant portion of the expected residual returns as a result of holding variable interests.

The VIEs in which Newcastle has a significant interest include (i) Newcastle’s CDOs, in which Newcastle has been determined to be the primary beneficiary and therefore consolidates them (with the exception of CDO VII as described below), since it has the power to direct the activities that most significantly impact the CDOs’ economic performance and would absorb a significant portion of their expected losses and receive a significant portion of their expected residual returns, and (ii) the manufactured housing loan financing structures, which are similar to the CDOs in analysis. Newcastle’s CDOs and manufactured housing loan financings are held in special purpose entities whose debt is treated as non-recourse secured borrowings of Newcastle. Newcastle’s subprime securitizations are also considered VIE’s, but Newcastle does not control their activities and no longer receives a significant portion of their returns. These subprime securitizations were not consolidated under the current or prior guidance.

In addition, Newcastle’s investments in CMBS, CDO securities and loans may be deemed to be variable interests in VIEs, depending on their structure. Newcastle is not obligated to provide, nor has it provided, any financial support to these VIEs. Newcastle monitors these investments and, to the extent Newcastle determines that it potentially owns a majority of the currently controlling class, it analyzes them for potential consolidation. As of June 30, 2010, Newcastle has not consolidated these potential VIEs due to the determination that, based on the nature of Newcastle’s investments and the provisions governing these structures, Newcastle does not have the power to direct the activities that most significantly impact their economic performance. Newcastle will continue to analyze future investments, as well as reconsideration events in existing entities, pursuant to the VIE requirements. These analyses require considerable judgment in determining the primary beneficiary of a VIE since they involve subjective determinations of significance, with respect to both power and economics. The result could be the consolidation of an entity that would otherwise not have been consolidated or the non-consolidation of an entity that would otherwise have been consolidated.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

On January 1, 2010, as a result of the adoption of the new guidance, Newcastle deconsolidated a non-recourse financing structure, CDO VII. Newcastle determined that it does not have the current power to direct the relevant activities of CDO VII as an event of default had occurred and we may be removed as the collateral manager by a single party. The deconsolidation reduced Newcastle's gross assets by \$149.4 million, reduced liabilities by \$437.8 million and increased equity by \$288.4 million. The deconsolidation also reduced revenues and expenses, but its impact was not material to the net income applicable to common stockholders. As a result of this new guidance, Newcastle has interests in the following unconsolidated VIE at June 30, 2010, in which it has a significant interest, in addition to the subprime securitizations which are described in Note 4:

Entity	Gross Assets (A)	Debt (B)	Carrying Value of Newcastle's Investment (C)
CDO VII	\$ 486,633	\$470,489	\$ —

(A) Face amount.

(B) Includes \$60.5 million face amount of debt owned by Newcastle with a carrying value of zero at June 30, 2010.

(C) Represent's Newcastle's maximum exposure to loss from these entities.

Gain (Loss) on Settlement of Investments, Net and Other Income (Loss), Net

These items are comprised of the following:

	Three Months Ended		Six Months Ended	
	June 30,		June 30,	
	2010	2009	2010	2009
Gain (loss) on settlement of investments, net				
Gain on settlement of real estate securities	\$14,289	\$18,082	\$28,106	\$ 25,470
Loss on settlement of real estate securities	(5,335)	(884)	(6,196)	(16,503)
Gain on disposition of loans held for sale	—	346	—	526
Realized gain (loss) on termination of derivative instruments	—	—	(3,279)	4
	<u>\$ 8,954</u>	<u>\$17,544</u>	<u>\$18,631</u>	<u>\$ 9,497</u>
Other income (loss), net				
Gain (loss) on non-hedge derivative instruments	\$(2,383)	\$10,196	\$(4,131)	\$ 13,312
Unrealized (loss) recognized at de-designation of hedges	—	—	—	(8,797)
Hedge ineffectiveness	(167)	510	(168)	(318)
Other income (loss)	252	205	521	233
	<u>\$(2,298)</u>	<u>\$10,911</u>	<u>\$(3,778)</u>	<u>\$ 4,430</u>

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

3. REAL ESTATE SECURITIES

The following is a summary of Newcastle's real estate securities at June 30, 2010, all of which are classified as available for sale and are, therefore, reported at fair value with changes in fair value recorded in other comprehensive income, except for securities that are other-than-temporarily impaired.

Asset Type	Amortized Cost Basis				Gross Unrealized		Carrying Value (B)	Number of Securities	Weighted Average			Maturity (Years) (D)	Principal Subordination (E)
	Outstanding Face Amount	Before Impairment	Other-Than-Temporary Impairment (A)	After Impairment	Gains	Losses			Rating (C)	Coupon	Yield		
CMBS-Conduit	\$1,492,299	\$1,281,193	\$ (486,844)	\$ 794,349	\$ 88,187	\$(124,113)	\$ 758,423	196	BB+	5.75%	11.14%	3.3	12.1%
CMBS- Single Borrower	538,964	522,973	(32,494)	490,479	27,163	(74,862)	442,780	66	BB-	4.27%	6.44%	2.0	8.2%
CMBS-Large Loan	60,378	60,374	—	60,374	—	(21,165)	39,209	10	BB	2.09%	2.14%	0.9	16.5%
REIT Debt	389,550	389,115	—	389,115	16,360	(14,672)	390,803	46	BB+	6.14%	5.88%	3.5	N/A
ABS-Subprime (F)	395,087	373,363	(199,820)	173,543	16,809	(9,101)	181,251	89	B-	1.68%	13.40%	4.4	20.9%
ABS-Manufactured Housing	49,345	47,961	—	47,961	785	(2,193)	46,553	9	BBB+	6.68%	7.26%	6.0	37.2%
ABS-Franchise	31,218	31,527	(21,234)	10,293	342	(2,484)	8,151	13	CCC+	3.78%	9.91%	2.7	15.3%
FNMA/FHLMC (G)	3,759	4,100	—	4,100	51	—	4,151	1	AAA	5.71%	3.91%	3.5	N/A
CDO (H)	79,643	14,734	(14,734)	—	—	—	—	4	C	4.21%	0.00%	—	N/A
Debt Security Total /Average (I)	<u>3,040,243</u>	<u>2,725,340</u>	<u>(755,126)</u>	<u>1,970,214</u>	<u>149,697</u>	<u>(248,590)</u>	<u>1,871,321</u>	<u>434</u>	<u>BB</u>	<u>4.89%</u>	<u>8.74%</u>	<u>3.1</u>	
Equity Securities		<u>1,388</u>	<u>(276)</u>	<u>1,112</u>	<u>3,646</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>4,758</u>	<u>2</u>					
Total		<u>\$2,726,728</u>	<u>\$ (755,402)</u>	<u>\$1,971,326</u>	<u>\$153,343</u>	<u>\$(248,590)</u>	<u>\$ 1,876,079</u>	<u>\$ 436</u>					

- (A) Represents the cumulative impairment against amortized cost basis recorded through earnings, net of the effect of the cumulative adjustment as a result of the adoption of new accounting guidance on impairment in 2009.
- (B) See Note 6 regarding the estimation of fair value, which is equal to carrying value for all securities.
- (C) Represents the weighted average of the ratings of all securities in each asset type, expressed as an S&P equivalent rating. For each security rated by multiple rating agencies, the lowest rating is used. FNMA/FHLMC securities have an implied AAA rating. Ratings provided were determined by third party rating agencies as of a particular date, may not be current and are subject to change (including a "negative watch" assignment) at any time.
- (D) The weighted average maturity is based on the timing of expected principal reduction on the assets.
- (E) Percentage of the outstanding face amount of securities that is subordinate to Newcastle's investments.
- (F) Includes the retained bonds with face amount of \$40.5 million and carrying value of \$2.1 million from Securitization Trust 2006 and Securitization Trust 2007 (Note 4). The residual interests were fully written off in the first quarter of 2010.
- (G) Amortized cost basis and carrying value include principal receivable of \$0.1 million.
- (H) Includes one CDO bond issued by a third party and three CDO bonds issued by CDO VII, which has been deconsolidated, and held as investments by Newcastle.
- (I) The total outstanding face amount of fixed rate securities was \$2.2 billion, and of floating rate securities was \$0.8 billion.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Unrealized losses that are considered other-than-temporary are recognized currently in income. During the six months ended June 30, 2010, Newcastle recorded other-than-temporary impairment charges ("OTTI") of \$98.8 million (gross of \$22.0 million of the portion of other-than-temporary impairment recognized in other comprehensive income) with respect to real estate securities. Based on management's analysis of these securities, the performance of the underlying loans and changes in market factors, Newcastle noted adverse changes in the expected cash flows on certain of these securities and concluded that they were other-than-temporarily impaired. Any remaining unrealized losses on Newcastle's securities were primarily the result of changes in market factors, rather than issue-specific credit impairment. The following table summarizes Newcastle's securities in an unrealized loss position as of June 30, 2010.

Securities in an Unrealized Loss Position	Amortized Cost Basis				Gross Unrealized		Carrying Value	Number of Securities	Weighted Average			
	Outstanding Face Amount	Before Impairment	Other-than-Temporary Impairment	After Impairment	Gains	Losses			Rating	Coupon	Yield	Maturity (Years)
Less Than Twelve Months	\$ 244,766	\$ 228,462	\$ (81,272)	\$ 147,190	\$—	\$ (7,241)	139,949	29	BB+	4.68%	9.08%	3.3
Twelve or More Months	1,178,656	1,170,154	(138,654)	1,031,500	—	(241,349)	790,151	183	BB	4.85%	5.68%	3.0
Total	\$1,423,422	\$1,398,616	\$(219,926)	\$1,178,690	\$—	\$(248,590)	\$930,100	212	BB	4.82%	6.11%	3.0

Newcastle performed an assessment of all of its debt securities that are in an unrealized loss position (unrealized loss position exists when a security's amortized cost basis, excluding the effect of OTTI, exceeds its fair value) and determined the following:

	June 30, 2010			
	Fair Value	Amortized Cost Basis	Unrealized Losses	
			Credit (B)	Non-Credit (C)
Securities Newcastle intends to sell	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	N/A
Securities Newcastle is more likely than not to be required to sell (A)	—	—	—	N/A
Securities Newcastle has no intent to sell and is not more likely than not to be required to sell:				
Credit impaired securities	69,574	95,905	(209,952)	(26,331)
Non credit impaired securities	860,526	1,082,785	—	(222,259)
Total debt securities in an unrealized loss position	\$930,100	\$1,178,690	\$(209,952)	\$ (248,590)

- (A) Newcastle may, at times, be more likely than not to be required to sell certain securities for liquidity purposes. While the amount of the securities to be sold may be an estimate, and the securities to be sold have not yet been identified, Newcastle must make its best estimate, which is subject to significant judgment regarding future events, and may differ materially from actual future sales.
- (B) Excluding the effect of previously recorded OTTI. This amount is required to be recorded as other-than-temporary impairment through earnings. In measuring the portion of credit losses, Newcastle's management estimates the expected cash flow for each of the securities. This evaluation includes a review of the credit status and the performance of the collateral supporting those securities, including the credit of the issuer, key terms of the securities and the effect of local, industry and broader economic trends. Significant inputs in estimating the cash flows include management's expectations of prepayment speeds, default rates and loss severities. Credit losses are measured as the decline in the present value of the expected future cash flows discounted at the investment's effective interest rate.
- (C) This amount represents unrealized losses on securities that are due to non-credit factors and is required to be recorded through other comprehensive income.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

The following table summarizes the activity related to credit losses on debt securities for the six months ended June 30, 2010:

Beginning balance of credit losses on debt securities for which a portion of an OTTI was recognized in other comprehensive income	\$(408,782)
Additions for credit losses on securities for which an OTTI was not previously recognized	(23,617)
Increases to credit losses on securities for which an OTTI was previously recognized and a portion of an OTTI was recognized in other comprehensive income	(37,618)
Additions for credit losses on securities for which an OTTI was previously recognized without any portion of OTTI recognized in other comprehensive income	(42,480)
Reduction for credit losses on securities for which no OTTI was recognized in other comprehensive income at June 30, 2010	143,189
Reduction for securities sold during the period	40,590
Reduction for securities deconsolidated during the period	112,409
Reduction for increases in cash flows expected to be collected that are recognized over the remaining life of the security	6,357
Ending balance of credit losses on debt securities for which a portion of an OTTI was recognized in other comprehensive income	<u>\$(209,952)</u>

The table below summarizes the geographic distribution of the collateral securing our CMBS and ABS at June 30, 2010 (in thousands):

Geographic Location	CMBS		ABS	
	Outstanding Face Amount	Percentage	Outstanding Face Amount	Percentage
Western U.S.	\$ 521,909	25.0%	\$ 133,985	28.2%
Northeastern U.S.	479,786	22.9%	87,068	18.3%
Southeastern U.S.	414,064	19.8%	110,883	23.3%
Midwestern U.S.	284,208	13.6%	63,369	13.3%
Southwestern U.S.	243,966	11.7%	50,123	10.5%
Other	126,406	6.0%	30,213	6.4%
Foreign	21,302	1.0%	9	0.0%
	<u>\$ 2,091,641</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>\$ 475,650</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Geographic concentrations of investments expose Newcastle to the risk of economic downturns within the relevant regions, particularly given the current unfavorable market conditions. These market conditions may make regions more vulnerable to downturns in certain market factors. Any such downturn in a region where Newcastle holds significant investments could have a material, negative impact on Newcastle.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

4. REAL ESTATE RELATED LOANS, RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS AND SUBPRIME MORTGAGE LOANS

All of Newcastle's loan investments, other than the manufactured housing loans Portfolio I as described below, were classified as held for sale as of June 30, 2010 and December 31, 2009 and marked to the lower of carrying value or fair value. The portfolio of manufactured housing loans, refinanced in April 2010 through a securitization transaction (see Note 5), with a face amount of \$159.4 million as of June 30, 2010 was reclassified from held for sale to held for investment for the three months ended June 30, 2010.

The following is a summary of real estate related loans, residential mortgage loans and subprime mortgage loans at June 30, 2010. The loans contain various terms, including fixed and floating rates, self-amortizing and interest only. They are generally subject to prepayment.

Loan Type	Outstanding Face Amount	Carrying Value (A)	Loan Count	Wtd. Avg. Yield	Weighted Average Coupon	Weighted Average Maturity (Years) (B)	Floating Rate Loans as a % of Face Amount	Delinquent Face Amount (C)
Mezzanine Loans	\$ 716,286	\$313,879	20	23.21%	4.73%	2.1	85.4%	\$ 132,795
Corporate Bank Loans	306,909	205,631	9	14.95%	8.50%	3.6	64.8%	—
B-Notes	283,830	125,092	10	20.59%	4.35%	2.0	78.5%	132,413
Whole Loans	85,110	50,056	4	8.75%	3.30%	4.0	97.6%	—
Total Real Estate Related Loans Held for Sale, Net	\$1,392,135	\$694,658	43	19.25%	5.40%	2.5	80.2%	\$ 265,208
Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio I	\$ 159,355	\$131,084	4,120	9.64%	8.75%	7.8	1.2%	\$ 1,421
Residential Mortgage Loans, Held for Investment, Net	\$ 159,355	\$131,084	4,120	9.64%	8.75%	7.8	1.2%	\$ 1,421
Residential Loans	\$ 66,275	\$ 50,548	231	3.89%	2.40%	5.9	100.0%	\$ 6,307
Manufactured Housing Loans	1,665	563	41	47.30%	8.43%	0.7	0.0%	936
Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio II	227,197	211,444	7,534	8.76%	9.72%	5.9	17.3%	2,692
Total Residential Mortgage Loans Held for Sale, Net	\$ 295,137	\$262,555	7,806	7.91%	8.07%	5.9	35.8%	\$ 9,935
Subprime Mortgage Loans Subject to Call Option	\$ 406,217	\$403,383						

- (A) Carrying value includes interest receivable of \$0.1 million for the residential housing loans and principal and interest receivable of \$7.5 million for the manufactured housing loans.
- (B) The weighted average maturity is based on the timing of expected principal reduction on the assets.
- (C) Includes loans that are non-performing, in foreclosure, under bankruptcy, or considered real estate owned.

The following is a summary of real estate related loans by maturities at June 30, 2010:

Year of Maturity ⁽¹⁾	Outstanding Face Amount	Carrying Value	Number of Loans
Delinquent ⁽²⁾	\$ 265,209	\$ 20,372	8
Period from July 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010	141,482	63,401	3
2011	531,614	343,442	16
2012	132,195	62,995	5
2013	17,077	4,375	2
2014	125,672	60,056	3
2015	160,029	122,473	5
Thereafter	18,857	7,544	1
Total	\$1,392,135	684,658	43

- (1) Based on the final extended maturity date of each loan investment as of June 30, 2010.
- (2) Includes loans that are non-performing, in foreclosure, or under bankruptcy.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

The following is a reconciliation of the related loss allowance.

	Held For Sale		Held For Investment
	Real Estate Related Loans	Residential Mortgage Loans	Residential Mortgage Loans
Balance at December 31, 2009	\$ (822,409)	\$ (96,409)	\$ —
Charge-offs (A)	32,432	5,004	—
Deconsolidation of CDO VII	5,263	—	—
Transfer to held for investment	—	21,884	(21,884)
Recoveries	—	—	—
Valuation (allowance) reversal on loans	153,265	34,712	(669)
Balance at June 30, 2010	\$ (631,449)	\$ (34,809)	\$ (22,553)

(A) The charge-offs of \$32.4 million in real estate related loans for the six months ended June 30, 2010 represent three loans which were either sold, restructured or paid off at a discounted price during the period.

Securitization of Subprime Mortgage Loans

The following table presents information on the retained interests in Newcastle's securitizations of subprime mortgage loans at June 30, 2010:

	Subprime Portfolio	
	I	II
Total securitized loans (unpaid principal balance) (A)	\$556,930	\$733,920
Loans subject to call option (carrying value)	\$299,176	\$104,207
Retained interests (fair value) (B)	\$ 1,947	\$ 129

(A) Average loan seasoning of 59 months and 41 months for Subprime Portfolios I and II, respectively, at June 30, 2010.

(B) The retained interests include retained bonds of the securitizations. Newcastle's residual interests were written off in the first quarter of 2010. Fair value is estimated based on pricing models.

The following table summarizes certain characteristics of the underlying subprime mortgage loans, and related financing, in the securitizations as of June 30, 2010:

	Subprime Portfolio	
	I	II
Loan unpaid principal balance (UPB)	\$556,930	\$733,920
Weighted average coupon rate of loans	6.57%	6.27%
Delinquencies of 60 or more days (UPB) (A)	\$132,426	\$246,915
Net credit losses for the six months ended June 30, 2010	\$ 18,874	\$ 37,136
Cumulative net credit losses	\$144,401	\$140,383
Cumulative net credit losses as a % of original UPB	9.61%	12.90%
Percentage of ARM loans (B)	53.3%	66.1%
Percentage of loans with original loan-to-value ratio >90%	10.40%	17.20%
Percentage of interest-only loans	22.9%	4.0%
Face amount of debt (C)	\$540,517	\$709,806
Weighted average funding cost of debt (D)	1.60%	1.72%

(A) Delinquencies include loans 60 or more days past due, in foreclosure, under bankruptcy filing or real estate owned.

(B) ARM loans are adjustable-rate mortgage loans. An option ARM is an adjustable-rate mortgage that provides the borrower with an option to choose from several payment amounts each month for a specified period of the loan term. None of the loans in the subprime portfolios are an option ARM.

(C) Excludes face amount of \$16.4 million and \$24.1 million of retained notes for Subprime Portfolios I and II, respectively, at June 30, 2010.

(D) Includes the effect of applicable hedges.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Newcastle received net cash inflows of \$0.2 million and \$0.4 million from the retained interests of Subprime Portfolios I and II, respectively, during the six months ended June 30, 2010 and \$0.5 million and \$0.8 million from I and II, respectively, during the six months ended June 30, 2009.

The weighted average yield of the retained notes of Subprime Portfolios I and II was 27.6%, as of June 30, 2010. The loans subject to call option and the corresponding financing recognize interest income and expense based on the expected weighted average coupons of the loans subject to call option at the call date of 9.24% and 8.68% for Subprime Portfolio's I and II, respectively.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

5. DEBT OBLIGATIONS

The following table presents certain information regarding Newcastle's debt obligations and related hedges at June 30, 2010:

Debt Obligation/Collateral	Month Issued	Outstanding		Unhedged Weighted Average Funding Cost (A)	Final Stated Maturity	Weighted Average Funding Cost (B)	Weighted Average Maturity (Years)	Face Amount of Floating Rate Debt	Collateral			Weighted Average Maturity (Years)	Floating Rate Face Amount (C)	Aggregate Notional Amount of Current Hedges	
		Face Amount	Carrying Value						Outstanding Face Amount (C)	Amortized Cost Basis (C)	Carrying Value (C)				
CDO Bonds Payable															
CDO IV (D)	Mar 2004	\$ 360,666	\$ 359,669	1.44%	Mar 2039	3.01%	2.7	\$ 336,684	\$ 411,503	\$ 340,073	\$ 291,739	3.0	\$ 168,289	\$ 163,700	
CDO V	Sep 2004	387,220	385,807	1.26%	Sep 2039	3.10%	2.7	375,220	443,457	320,761	276,183	3.3	162,351	188,298	
CDO VI (D)	Apr 2005	410,885	409,530	0.86%	Apr 2040	3.21%	3.8	402,875	450,569	226,427	215,549	2.6	137,876	214,595	
CDO VIII	Nov 2006	618,313	618,059	0.98%	Nov 2052	2.25%	3.3	610,713	829,325	491,458	505,294	3.6	533,850	161,655	
CDO IX	May 2007	530,125	534,731	0.35%	May 2052	1.67%	4.4	530,125	759,356	472,430	487,601	2.7	522,900	91,651	
CDO X	Jul 2007	1,175,000	1,173,822	0.63%	Jul 2052	4.46%	5.1	1,175,000	1,322,198	983,399	962,696	3.5	268,305	932,231	
		<u>3,482,209</u>	<u>3,481,618</u>			<u>3.19%</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3,430,617</u>	<u>4,216,408</u>	<u>2,834,548</u>	<u>2,739,062</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>1,793,571</u>	<u>1,752,130</u>	
Other Bonds Payable															
MH loans Portfolio I (E)	Apr 2010	93,913	92,385	4.74%	Jul 2035	5.36%	3.7	—	159,355	131,084	131,084	7.8	1,964	—	
MH loans Portfolio II (F)	Aug 2006	183,985	183,548	LIBOR+ 0.89%	Aug 2011	6.10%	1.0	183,985	227,197	211,444	211,444	5.9	39,437	—	
		<u>277,898</u>	<u>275,933</u>			<u>5.85%</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>183,985</u>	<u>386,552</u>	<u>342,528</u>	<u>342,528</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>41,401</u>	<u>—</u>	
Notes Payable (G)															
Residential Mortgage Loans	Aug 2004	4,582	4,582	LIBOR+ 0.90%	Dec 2034	1.25%	6.0	4,582	4,582	4,582	4,582	6.0	4,582	—	
		<u>4,582</u>	<u>4,582</u>			<u>1.25%</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>4,582</u>	<u>4,582</u>	<u>4,582</u>	<u>4,582</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>4,582</u>	<u>—</u>	
Corporate															
Junior subordinated notes payable	Mar 2006	51,004	51,256	7.57% (I)	Apr 2035	7.42%	24.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		<u>51,004</u>	<u>51,256</u>			<u>7.42%</u>	<u>24.8</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	
Subtotal debt obligations		<u>3,815,693</u>	<u>3,813,389</u>			<u>3.44%</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>\$3,619,184</u>	<u>\$ 4,607,542</u>	<u>\$ 3,181,658</u>	<u>\$3,086,172</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>\$ 1,839,554</u>	<u>\$1,752,130</u>	
Financing on subprime mortgage loans subject to call option	(H)	406,217	403,383												
Total debt obligations		<u>\$ 4,221,910</u>	<u>\$4,216,772</u>												

(A) Weighted average, including floating and fixed rate classes and excluding the amortization of deferred financing costs.

(B) Including the effect of applicable hedges.

(C) Including restricted cash held for reinvestment in CDOs.

(D) CDOs IV and VI were not in compliance with their applicable over collateralization tests as of June 30, 2010. Newcastle is not receiving cash flows from these CDOs (other than senior management fees) and expects these CDOs to remain out of compliance for the foreseeable future.

(E) See further description below.

(F) Of which \$1.4 million face amount is recourse financing and was subsequently repaid in full in July 2010.

(G) Notes payable issued to CDO VII, which was eliminated in consolidation through December 31, 2009.

(H) Issued in April 2006 and July 2007. See Note 4 regarding the securitizations of Subprime Portfolios I and II.

(I) LIBOR + 2.25% after April 2016.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

See Note 2 regarding the deconsolidation of CDO VII.

In the first six months of 2010, Newcastle repurchased \$119.9 million face amount of CDO bonds for \$24.1 million. As a result, Newcastle extinguished \$119.9 million face amount of CDO debt and recorded a gain on extinguishment of debt of \$95.1 million.

On January 29, 2010, Newcastle entered into an Exchange Agreement, dated as of January 29, 2010 (the "Exchange Agreement"), with Taberna Capital Management, LLC and certain of its affiliates (collectively, "Taberna"), pursuant to which Newcastle and Taberna agreed to exchange (the "Exchange") approximately \$52.1 million aggregate principal amount of junior subordinated notes due 2035 for approximately \$37.6 million face amount of previously issued CDO securities and approximately \$9.7 million of cash held by Newcastle. In other words, \$52.1 million face amount of Newcastle's debt, in the form of junior subordinated notes payable, was repurchased and extinguished for GAAP purposes in exchange for (i) the payment of \$9.7 million of cash and (ii) the reissuance of \$37.6 million face amount of CDO bonds payable (which had previously been repurchased by Newcastle). In connection with the Exchange, Newcastle paid or reimbursed \$0.6 million of expenses incurred by Taberna, various indenture trustees and their respective advisors in accordance with the terms of the Exchange Agreement. Newcastle accounted for this exchange as a troubled debt restructuring involving the partial repayment of debt. As a result, Newcastle recorded no gain or loss. The following table presents certain information regarding the exchange, as of the date of the exchange:

	Repurchased junior subordinated notes	Consideration		
		Cash	Reissued CDO bonds	Total
Outstanding face amount	\$ 52,094	\$9,715	\$ 37,625	\$47,340
Weighted average coupon	7.574% (A)	N/A	LIBOR + 0.66% (B)	
Maturity	April 2035		June 2052	
Collateral	General credit of Newcastle		Assets within the respective CDOs	

(A) LIBOR + 2.25% after April 2016

(B) Weighted average effective interest rate of approximately LIBOR+0.35% after the Exchange.

The fair value of the consideration paid approximated the fair value of the repurchased junior subordinated notes of \$16.7 million.

In March 2010, Newcastle sold \$22.8 million face amount of FHLMC securities and repaid the corresponding repurchase agreements in the amount of \$22.6 million. Concurrent with the sales, Newcastle terminated the related interest rate swap agreements. As a result, the gain on sale recorded from these assets was offset by the loss on the termination of the derivatives.

On April 15, 2010, Newcastle completed a securitization transaction to refinance its Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio I (the "Portfolio"). Newcastle sold approximately \$164.1 million outstanding principal balance of manufactured housing loans to Newcastle MH I LLC (the "Issuer"). The Issuer issued approximately \$134.5 million aggregate principal amount of asset-backed notes (the "Notes"), of which \$97.6 million was sold to third parties and \$36.9 million was sold to certain CDOs managed and consolidated by Newcastle. At the closing of the securitization transaction, Newcastle used the gross proceeds received from the issuance of the Notes to repay the previously existing financing on this portfolio in full, terminate the related interest rate swap contracts, pay the related transaction costs and increase its unrestricted cash by approximately \$14 million. Under the applicable accounting guidance, the securitization transaction is accounted for as a secured borrowing. As a result, no gain or loss is recorded for the transaction. Newcastle continues to recognize the portfolio of manufactured housing loans as pledged assets, which have been classified as loans held for investment at securitization, and records the notes issued to third parties as a secured borrowing. The associated assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses are presented in the non-recourse financing structure sections of the consolidated financial statements.

In April 2010, Newcastle repaid in full all of its outstanding repurchase agreements.

In July 2010, Newcastle repaid in full the remaining \$1.4 million of recourse debt on its Manufactured Housing Loan Portfolio II.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

6. FAIR VALUE OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

Fair Value Summary Table

Newcastle held the following financial instruments at June 30, 2010:

	Principal Balance or Notional Amount	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Fair Value Method (A)	Weighted Average Yield/Funding Cost	Weighted Average Maturity (Years)
Assets						
<u>Non-Recourse VIE Financing Structures (F)</u>						
Financial instruments:						
Real estate securities, available for sale*	\$2,864,635	\$1,872,612	\$1,872,612	Broker quotations, counterparty quotations, pricing services, pricing models	8.69%	3.3
Real estate related loans, held for sale, net	1,155,949	671,657	671,657	Broker quotations, counterparty quotations, pricing services, pricing models	18.73%	2.8
Residential mortgage loans, held for investment, net	159,355	131,084	131,444	Pricing models	9.64%	7.8
Residential mortgage loans, held for sale, net	289,677	258,373	258,373	Pricing models	7.95%	5.9
Subprime mortgage loans subject to call option (B)	406,217	403,383	403,383	(B)	9.09%	(B)
Restricted cash*	145,366	145,366	145,366			
Receivables and other assets		32,769	32,769			
		<u>\$3,515,244</u>	<u>\$3,515,604</u>			
<u>Recourse Financing Structures and Unlevered Assets</u>						
Financial instruments:						
Real estate securities, available for sale*	\$ 175,608	\$ 3,467	\$ 3,467	Broker quotations, counterparty quotations, pricing services, pricing models	38.09%	0.3
Real estate related loans, held for sale, net	236,186	23,001	23,001	Broker quotations, counterparty quotations, pricing services, pricing models	34.54%	1.3
Residential mortgage loans, held for sale, net	5,460	4,182	4,182	Pricing models	8.25%	2.13
Cash and cash equivalents*	37,684	37,684	37,684			
Operating real estate, held for sale		9,906	9,906			
Receivables and other assets		1,016	1,016			
		<u>\$ 79,256</u>	<u>\$ 79,256</u>			
Liabilities						
<u>Non-Recourse VIE Financing Structures (F) (G)</u>						
Financial instruments:						
CDO bonds payable	\$3,482,209	\$3,481,618	\$2,143,736	Pricing models	3.19%	4.0
Other bonds payable (\$1.4 million face amount is recourse)	277,899	275,933	254,844	Pricing models	5.85%	1.9
Notes payable	4,582	4,582	3,732	Broker quotation	1.25%	6.0
Financing of subprime mortgage loans subject to call option (B)	406,217	403,383	403,383	(B)	9.09%	(B)
Interest rate swaps, treated as hedges (C) (E)*	1,752,130	184,839	184,839	Counterparty quotations	N/A	(C)
Non-hedge derivatives (D)(E)*	139,825	18,435	18,435	Counterparty quotations	N/A	(D)
Accrued expenses and other liabilities		7,415	7,415			
		<u>\$4,376,205</u>	<u>\$3,016,384</u>			
<u>Recourse Financing Structures and Other Liabilities (G)</u>						
Financial instruments:						
Junior subordinated notes payable	\$ 51,004	\$ 51,256	\$ 16,963	Pricing models	7.42%	24.8
Due to affiliates		1,419	1,419			
Accrued expenses and other liabilities		3,086	3,086			
		<u>\$ 55,761</u>	<u>\$ 21,468</u>			

* Measured at fair value on a recurring basis.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

- (A) Methods are listed in order of priority. In the case of real estate securities and real estate related loans, broker quotations are obtained if available and practicable, otherwise counterparty quotations or pricing service valuations are obtained or, finally, internal pricing models are used. Internal pricing models are only used for (i) securities and loans that are not traded in an active market, and, therefore, have little or no price transparency, and for which significant unobservable inputs must be used in estimating fair value, or (ii) loans or debt obligations which are private and untraded.
- (B) These two items result from an option, not an obligation, to repurchase loans from Newcastle's subprime mortgage loan securitizations (Note 4), are noneconomic until such option is exercised, and are equal and offsetting.
- (C) Represents current swap agreements as follows:

<u>Year of Maturity</u>	<u>Weighted Average Month of Maturity</u>	<u>Aggregate Notional Amount</u>	<u>Weighted Average Fixed Pay Rate</u>	<u>Aggregate Fair Value Liability, Net</u>
Agreements which receive 1-Month LIBOR:				
2011	Dec	\$ 91,651	5.00%	\$ (5,621)
2014	Oct	16,073	5.09%	(2,153)
2015	Sep	938,219	5.31%	(91,080)
2016	May	180,155	5.04%	(24,267)
2017	Aug	174,034	5.24%	(31,599)
Agreements which receive 3-Month LIBOR:				
2014	Jun	351,998	4.20%	(30,119)
		<u>\$ 1,752,130</u>		<u>\$(184,839)</u>

- (D) This represents an interest rate swap with a notional balance of \$139.8 million, maturing in June 2016. Newcastle entered into this swap agreement to reduce its exposure to interest rate changes on the floating rate financings of its manufactured housing loan portfolio II. This swap was not designated as a hedge for hedge accounting purposes.
- (E) Newcastle's derivatives fall into two categories. Derivatives held within Newcastle's nonrecourse debt structures (primarily CDOs), all of which were liabilities at period end, are not subject to Newcastle's credit risk as they are senior to all the debt obligations of the related CDO. As a result, no adjustments have been made to the fair value quotations received related to credit risk. Newcastle's significant derivative counterparties include Bank of America, Deutsche Bank, Wachovia and Credit Suisse.
- (F) Assets held within CDOs and other non-recourse structures are not available to satisfy obligations outside of such financings, except to the extent Newcastle receives net cash flow distributions from such structures. Furthermore, our economic losses from such structures cannot exceed Newcastle's invested equity in them. Therefore, economically, their net book value cannot be less than zero and as a result, the fair value of Newcastle's net investments in these non-recourse financing structures is equal to the present value of their expected future net cash flows.
- (G) Newcastle notes that the unrealized gain on the liabilities within such structures cannot be fully realized.

Valuation Hierarchy

The methodologies used for valuing such instruments have been categorized into three broad levels which form a hierarchy. Newcastle follows this hierarchy for its financial instruments measured at fair value on a recurring basis. The classifications are based on the lowest level of input that is significant to the fair value measurement.

The following table summarizes such financial assets and liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis at June 30, 2010:

	<u>Principal Balance or Notional Amount</u>	<u>Carrying Value</u>	<u>Fair Value</u>			<u>Total</u>
			<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3A (1)</u>	<u>Level 3B (2)</u>	
Assets:						
Real estate securities, available for sale:						
CMBS	\$ 2,091,641	\$ 1,240,412	\$ —	\$ 1,089,606	\$ 150,806	\$ 1,240,412
REIT debt	389,550	390,803	390,803	—	—	390,803
ABS - subprime	395,087	181,251	—	89,693	91,558	181,251
ABS - other real estate	80,563	54,704	—	47,058	7,646	54,704
FNMA / FHLMC	3,759	4,151	4,151	—	—	4,151
CDO	79,643	—	—	—	—	—
Debt security total	<u>3,040,243</u>	<u>1,871,321</u>	<u>394,954</u>	<u>1,226,357</u>	<u>250,010</u>	<u>1,871,321</u>
Equity securities		1,112	—	—	4,758	4,758
Total		<u>\$ 1,872,433</u>	<u>\$ 394,954</u>	<u>\$ 1,226,357</u>	<u>\$ 254,768</u>	<u>\$ 1,876,079</u>
Liabilities:						
Interest rate swaps, treated as hedges	1,752,130	184,839	184,839	—	—	184,839
Non-hedge derivatives	139,825	18,435	18,435	—	—	18,435

- (1) Third party pricing sources with significant unobservable inputs.
(2) Internal models with significant unobservable inputs.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Newcastle's investments in instruments measured at fair value on a recurring basis using Level 3 inputs changed during the six months ended June 30, 2010 as follows:

	Level 3A					Total
	CMBS		ABS		Equity/Other Securities	
	Conduit	Other	Subprime	Other		
Balance at December 31, 2009	\$536,092	\$397,407	\$ 87,883	\$46,059	\$ —	\$1,067,441
Transfers (C)						
Transfers from Level 3B	310	1,637	—	—	—	1,947
Transfers into Level 3B	(39,541)	(17,427)	(10,538)	—	—	(67,506)
CDO VII Deconsolidation	(32,858)	(3,379)	(10,685)	—	—	(46,922)
Total gains (losses) (A)						
Included in net income (loss) (B)	5,614	300	59	—	—	5,973
Included in other comprehensive income (loss)	102,163	56,903	(2,103)	4,183	—	161,146
Amortization included in interest income	6,384	3,557	4,621	87	—	14,649
Purchases, sales and settlements						
Purchases	127,029	17,958	39,013	—	—	184,000
Proceeds from sales	(25,679)	(6,934)	(6,478)	—	—	(39,091)
Proceeds from repayments	(4,385)	(35,545)	(12,079)	(3,271)	—	(55,280)
Balance at June 30, 2010	<u>\$675,129</u>	<u>\$414,477</u>	<u>\$ 89,693</u>	<u>\$47,058</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$1,226,357</u>

	Level 3B					Total
	CMBS		ABS		Equity/Other Securities	
	Conduit	Other	Subprime	Other		
Balance at December 31, 2009	\$ 95,376	\$ 32,744	\$ 85,377	\$10,719	\$ 2,620	\$ 226,836
Transfers (C)						
Transfers from Level 3A	39,541	17,427	10,538	—	—	67,506
Transfers into Level 3A	(310)	(1,637)	—	—	—	(1,947)
CDO VII Deconsolidation	(48,665)	—	(17,890)	(457)	—	(67,012)
Total gains (losses) (A)						
Included in net income (loss) (B)	(67,616)	9,459	(5,092)	(2,675)	(279)	(66,203)
Included in other comprehensive income (loss)	71,980	69,428	26,194	1,083	2,414	171,099
Amortization included in interest income	7,417	153	4,892	272	—	12,734
Purchases, sales and settlements						
Purchases	—	—	—	—	3	3
Proceeds from sales	(435)	(21,646)	(1,063)	—	—	(23,144)
Proceeds from repayments	(13,995)	(38,415)	(11,398)	(1,296)	—	(65,104)
Balance at June 30, 2010	<u>\$ 83,293</u>	<u>\$ 67,513</u>	<u>\$ 91,558</u>	<u>\$ 7,646</u>	<u>\$ 4,758</u>	<u>\$ 254,768</u>

(A) None of the gains (losses) recorded in earnings during the period is attributable to the change in unrealized gains (losses) relating to Level 3 assets still held at the reporting dates.

(B)

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2010	
	Level 3A	Level 3B
Gain (loss) on settlement of investments, net	\$ 6,705	\$ 9,844
Other income (loss), net	—	—
OTTI	(732)	(76,047)
Total	<u>\$ 5,973</u>	<u>\$(66,203)</u>
Gain (loss) on settlement of investments, net, from investments transferred into Level 3 during the period	\$ —	\$ —

(C) Transfers are assumed to occur at the beginning of the quarter.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Securities Valuation

As of June 30, 2010, Newcastle's securities valuation methodology and results are further detailed as follows:

Asset Type	Outstanding Face Amount (A)	Amortized Cost Basis (B)	Fair Value			Total
			Multiple Quotes (C)	Single Quote (D)	Internal Pricing Models (E)	
CMBS	\$ 2,091,641	\$ 1,345,202	\$ 923,193	\$ 166,413	\$ 150,806	\$ 1,240,412
REIT debt	389,550	389,115	348,953	41,850	—	390,803
ABS – subprime	395,087	173,543	45,888	43,805	91,558	181,251
ABS – other real estate	80,563	58,254	4,426	42,632	7,646	54,704
FNMA / FHLMC	3,759	4,100	—	4,151	—	4,151
CDO	79,643	—	—	—	—	—
Debt security total	\$ 3,040,243	1,970,214	1,322,460	298,851	250,010	1,871,321
Equity securities		1,112	—	—	4,758	4,758
Total	\$ 3,040,243	\$ 1,971,326	\$ 1,322,460	\$ 298,851	\$ 254,768	\$ 1,876,079

- (A) Net of incurred losses.
- (B) Net of discounts (or gross of premiums) and after OTTI, including impairment taken during the period ended June 30, 2010.
- (C) Management generally obtained pricing service quotations or broker quotations from two sources, one of which was generally the seller (the party that sold us the security). Management selected one of the quotes received as being most representative of fair value and did not use an average of the quotes. Newcastle's methodology is to not use quotes from selling brokers, unless those quotes are the only marks available, or unless the quotes provided by other (non-selling) brokers are, in management's judgment, not representative of fair value. Even if Newcastle receives two or more quotes on a particular security that come from non-selling brokers, it does not use an average because management believes using an actual quote more closely represents a transactable price for the security than an average level. Furthermore, in some cases there is a wide disparity between the quotes Newcastle receives. Management believes using an average of the quotes in these cases would generally not represent the fair value of the asset. Based on Newcastle's own fair value analysis using internal models, management selects one of the quotes which is believed to more accurately reflect fair value. Newcastle never adjusts quotes received.
- (D) Management was unable to obtain quotations from more than one source on these securities. The one source was generally the seller (the party that sold us the security) or a pricing service.
- (E) Securities whose fair value was estimated based on internal pricing models are further detailed as follows:

	Amortized Cost Basis	Fair Value	Impairment Recorded In Current Year	Unrealized Gains (Losses) in Accumulated OCI	Assumption Ranges			
					Discount Rate	Prepayment Speed (F)	Cumulative Default Rate	Loss Severity
CMBS – Conduit	\$ 95,795	\$ 83,293	\$ 63,605	\$ (12,502)	18%	N/A	3% - 73%	31% - 51%
CMBS – Large loan / Single borrower	59,999	67,513	—	7,514	7% - 16%	N/A	0% - 100%	0% - 100%
ABS – subprime	84,022	91,558	5,520	7,536	10%	2% - 9%	26% - 91%	60% - 100%
ABS – other RE	8,486	7,646	2,675	(840)	15%	0% - 8%	40% - 73%	57% - 90%
CDO	—	—	3	—	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
Debt security total	\$248,302	\$250,010	\$ 71,803	\$ 1,708				
Equity securities	1,112	4,758	276	3,646				
Total	\$249,414	\$254,768	\$ 72,079	\$ 5,354				

All of the assumptions listed have some degree of market observability, based on Newcastle's knowledge of the market, relationships with market participants, and use of common market data sources. Collateral prepayment, default and loss severity projections are in the form of "curves" or "vectors" that vary for each monthly collateral cash flow projection. Methods used to develop these projections vary by asset class (e.g., CMBS projections are developed differently than home equity ABS projections) but conform to industry conventions. Newcastle uses assumptions that generate its best estimate of future cash flows of each respective security.

The prepayment vector specifies the percentage of the collateral balance that is expected to voluntarily pay off at each point in the future. The prepayment vector is based on projections from a widely published investment bank model which considers factors such as collateral FICO score, loan-to-value ratio, debt-to-income ratio, and vintage on a loan level basis. This vector is scaled up or down to match recent collateral-specific prepayment experience, as obtained from remittance reports and market data services.

Loss severities are based on recent collateral-specific experience with additional consideration given to collateral characteristics. Collateral age is taken into consideration because severities tend to initially increase with collateral age before eventually stabilizing. Newcastle typically uses projected severities that are higher than the historic experience for collateral that is relatively new (e.g., 2007 vintage origination) to account for this effect. Collateral characteristics such as loan size, lien position, and location (state) also effect loss severity. Newcastle considers whether a collateral pool has experienced a significant change in its composition with respect to these factors when assigning severity projections.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Default rates are determined from the current “pipeline” of loans that are more than 90 days delinquent, in foreclosure, or are real estate owned (REO). These significantly delinquent loans determine the first 24 months of the default vector. Beyond month 24, the default vector transitions to a steady-state value that is generally equal to or greater than that given by the widely published investment bank model.

The discount rates Newcastle uses are derived from a range of observable pricing on securities backed by similar collateral and offered in a live market. As the markets in which Newcastle transacts have become less liquid, Newcastle has had to rely on fewer data points in this analysis.

(F) Projected annualized average prepayment rate.

Loan Valuation

Loans which Newcastle does not have the ability to hold into the foreseeable future are classified as held-for-sale. As a result, these held-for-sale loans are carried at the lower of amortized cost or fair value and are therefore recorded at fair value on a non-recurring basis. During the six months ended June 30, 2010, Newcastle recorded (\$153.3) million and (\$34.7) million of valuation allowance (reversal) on real estate related loans and residential mortgage loans (Note 4), respectively. These loans were written down to fair value at the time of the impairment, based on broker quotations, pricing service quotations or internal pricing models. All the loans were within Level 3 of the fair value hierarchy. For real estate related loans, the most significant inputs used in the valuations are the amount and timing of expected future cash flows, market yields and the estimated collateral value of such loan investments. For residential mortgage loans, significant inputs include management’s expectations of prepayment speeds, default rates, loss severities and discount rates that market participants would use in determining the fair values of similar pools of residential mortgage loans.

The following tables summarize the fair value information of real estate related loans and residential mortgage loans:

Loan Type	Outstanding Face Amount	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Valuation Allowance/ (Reversal) In Current Year	Significant Input Ranges	
					Discount Rate	Loss Severity
Mezzanine	\$ 716,286	\$ 313,879	\$ 313,879	\$ (80,683)	15.0% - 62.7%	0.0% - 100.0%
Bank Loan	306,909	205,631	205,631	(14,722)	8.9% - 22.5%	0.0% - 58.0%
B-Note	283,830	125,092	125,092	(66,168)	17.0% - 25.0%	0.0% - 100.0%
Whole Loan	85,110	50,056	50,056	8,308	1.8% - 19.6%	0.0% - 50.0%
Loans	<u>\$ 1,392,135</u>	<u>\$ 694,658</u>	<u>\$ 694,658</u>	<u>\$ (153,265)</u>		

Loan Type	Outstanding Face Amount	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Valuation Allowance/ (Reversal) In Current Year	Significant Input Ranges			
					Discount Rate	Prepayment Speed	Cumulative Default Rate	Loss Severity
Residential Loans	\$ 66,275	\$ 50,548	\$ 50,548	\$ 213	3.8% - 8.2%	7% - 30%	0.3% - 5.0%	30% - 35%
Manufactured Housing Loans I	1,665	563	563	(26)	47.30%	3.00%	4.00%	75.0%
Manufactured Housing Loans II	227,197	211,444	211,444	(34,899)	8.76%	6.00%	3.50%	75.0%
Loans	<u>\$ 295,137</u>	<u>\$ 262,555</u>	<u>\$ 262,555</u>	<u>\$ (34,712)</u>				

Derivatives

Newcastle is exposed to certain risks relating to its ongoing business operations. The primary risk managed by Newcastle using derivative instruments is interest rate risk. Newcastle enters into interest rate swap agreements to reduce the impact of fluctuating interest rates on its earnings. Newcastle designates certain interest rate swap agreements as cash flow hedges of its floating rate financings. For derivative instruments that are designated and qualify as a cash flow hedge (i.e. hedging the exposure to variability in expected future cash flows that is attributable to a particular risk), the effective portion of the gain or loss, and net payments received or made, on the derivative instrument are reported as a component of other comprehensive income and reclassified into earnings in the same period or periods during which the hedged transaction affects earnings. The remaining gain or loss on the derivative instrument is recognized in current earnings during the period of change.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

Newcastle's derivative instruments are valued using counterparty quotations. These quotations are generally based on valuation models with model inputs that can generally be verified and which do not involve significant judgment. The significant observable inputs used in determining the fair value of our Level 2 derivative contracts are contractual cash flows and market based interest rate curves. Newcastle's derivatives are recorded on its balance sheet as follows:

	Balance sheet location	Fair Value	
		June 30, 2010	December 31, 2009
Interest rate swaps, designated as hedges	Derivative liabilities	\$ 184,839	\$ 178,037
Interest rate swaps, not designated as hedges	Derivative liabilities	18,435	29,117
		<u>\$ 203,274</u>	<u>\$ 207,154</u>

The following table summarizes information related to derivatives:

	June 30, 2010	December 31, 2009
Cash flow hedges		
Notional amount of interest rate swap agreements	\$1,752,130	\$2,099,435
Amount of (loss) recognized in OCI on effective portion	(174,402)	(173,683)
Deferred hedge gain (loss) related to anticipated financings, which have subsequently occurred, net of amortization	384	832
Deferred hedge gain (loss) related to dedesignation, net of amortization	(4,897)	(8,045)
Expected reclassification of deferred hedges from AOCI into earnings over the next 12 months	(3,760)	(4,234)
Expected reclassification of current hedges from AOCI into earnings over the next 12 months	(74,133)	(90,666)
Non-hedge Derivatives		
Notional amount of interest rate swap agreements	139,825	296,243

The following table summarizes gains (losses) recorded in relation to derivatives:

	Income statement location	Six Months Ended June 30,	
		2010	2009
Cash flow hedges			
Gain (loss) on the ineffective portion	Other income (loss)	\$ (168)	\$ (318)
Gain (loss) immediately recognized at dedesignation	Other income (loss)	(3,279)	(8,797)
Amount of gain (loss) reclassified from AOCI into income, related to effective portion	Interest expense	(43,122)	(48,701)
Deferred hedge gain reclassified from AOCI into income, related to anticipated financings	Interest expense	447	49
Deferred hedge gain (loss) reclassified from AOCI into income, related to effective portion of dedesignated hedges	Interest expense	(3,147)	(6,763)
Non-hedge derivatives gain (loss)	Other income (loss)	(4,131)	13,312

Table of Contents

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

7. EARNINGS PER SHARE

Newcastle is required to present both basic and diluted earnings per share (“EPS”). Basic EPS is calculated by dividing net income (loss) applicable to common stockholders by the weighted average number of shares of common stock outstanding during each period. Diluted EPS is calculated by dividing net income available for common stockholders by the weighted average number of shares of common stock outstanding plus the additional dilutive effect of common stock equivalents during each period. Newcastle’s common stock equivalents are its outstanding stock options. During the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, Newcastle had no dilutive common stock equivalents. Net income (loss) applicable to common stockholders is equal to net income (loss) less preferred dividends plus excess of carrying amount of exchanged preferred stock over fair value of consideration paid.

As of June 30, 2010, Newcastle’s outstanding options were summarized as follows:

Held by the Manager	1,686,447
Issued to the Manager and subsequently transferred to certain of the Manager’s employees	798,162
Held by the independent directors	14,000
Total	<u>2,498,609</u>

8. COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

Litigation — Newcastle is, from time to time, a defendant in legal actions from transactions conducted in the ordinary course of business. Management, after consultation with legal counsel, believes the ultimate liability arising from such actions which existed at June 30, 2010, if any, will not materially affect Newcastle’s consolidated results of operations or financial position.

Preferred Dividends in Arrears — As of June 30, 2010, \$0.9 million of dividends of Newcastle’s cumulative preferred stock were unpaid and in arrears.

Contingent Gain in CDOs — Newcastle cannot economically lose more than its investment amount in any given non-recourse financing structure. Therefore, impairment recorded in excess of such investment, which results in negative GAAP book value for a given non-recourse financing structure, cannot economically be incurred. For non-recourse financing structures with negative GAAP book value, the aggregate negative GAAP book value will eventually be recorded as an increase to GAAP book value. As of June 30, 2010, Newcastle has recorded \$641 million of losses in its CDOs in excess of its economic exposure which must eventually be reversed through amortization, sales at gains, or as reductions to accumulated deficit at the deconsolidation or termination of the CDOs.

9. RECENT ACTIVITIES

These financial statements include a discussion of material events which have occurred subsequent to June 30, 2010 (referred to as “subsequent events”) through the issuance of these consolidated financial statements. Events subsequent to that date have not been considered in these financial statements.

On March 23, 2010, Newcastle announced the final results of its offer to exchange (the “Exchange Offer”) shares of its common stock and cash for up to (i) 1,725,000 shares of its outstanding 9.75% Series B Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock (“Series B Preferred Stock”), (ii) 1,104,000 shares of its outstanding 8.05% Series C Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock (“Series C Preferred Stock”), and (iii) 1,380,000 shares of its outstanding 8.375% Series D Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock (“Series D Preferred Stock,” and, together with Series B Preferred Stock and Series C Preferred Stock, the “Preferred Stock”).

On March 25, 2010, Newcastle settled the Exchange Offer. In the aggregate, Newcastle issued 9,091,668 shares of its common stock (approximately 17.2% of Newcastle’s outstanding shares of common stock prior to the issuance of shares in the Exchange Offer). A total of 2,881,694 shares of common stock were issued in exchange for 1,152,679 shares of Series B Preferred Stock, a total of 2,759,989 shares of common stock were issued in exchange for 1,104,000 shares of Series C Preferred Stock, and a total of 3,449,985 shares of common stock were issued in exchange for 1,380,000 shares of Series D Preferred Stock. The shares of Preferred Stock acquired by Newcastle in the Exchange Offer were retired upon receipt. After settlement of the Exchange Offer, 1,347,321 shares of Series B Preferred Stock, 496,000 shares of Series C Preferred Stock and 620,000 shares of Series D Preferred Stock remain outstanding for trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

[Table of Contents](#)

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)

JUNE 30, 2010

(dollars in tables in thousands, except share data)

The shares of common stock were issued in the Exchange Offer in reliance on the exemption set forth in Section 3(a)(9) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, for securities exchanged by an issuer with its existing security holders exclusively where no commission or other remuneration is paid or given directly or indirectly for soliciting such exchange.

In connection with the Exchange Offer, all of Newcastle's preferred stock dividends in arrears were paid, and all cumulative preferred stock dividends accrued through April 30, 2010 have been paid. The \$43.0 million excess of the \$87.5 million carrying value of the exchanged preferred stock over the \$44.5 million fair value of consideration paid (which included \$28.5 million of common stock and \$16.0 million of cash) was recorded as an increase to Net Income (Loss) Applicable to Common Stockholders.

See Note 5 regarding certain recent financing-related transactions.

In April 2010, Newcastle, through two of its CDOs, made a cash investment of \$75.0 million in a new real estate related loan to a portfolio company of a private equity fund managed by an affiliate of Newcastle's manager. Newcastle's chairman is an officer of the borrower. This investment improves the applicable CDOs' results under some of their respective tests, and is expected to yield approximately 22%. The loan will initially mature in April 2013, with two one-year extensions, and is secured by subordinated interests in the properties of the borrower. Interest on the loan will be accrued and deferred until maturity.

[Table of Contents](#)

ITEM 2. MANAGEMENT’S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following should be read in conjunction with the unaudited consolidated financial statements and notes included herein, and with Part II, Item 1A, “Risk Factors.”

GENERAL

Newcastle Investment Corp. is a real estate investment and finance company. We invest in, and actively manage, a portfolio of real estate securities, loans and other real estate related assets. Our objective is to maximize the difference between the yield on our investments and the cost of financing these investments while hedging our interest rate risk. We emphasize portfolio management, asset quality, liquidity, diversification, match funded financing and credit risk management.

We currently own a diversified portfolio of credit sensitive real estate debt investments, including securities and loans. Our portfolio of real estate securities includes commercial mortgage backed securities (CMBS), senior unsecured debt issued by REITs, real estate related asset backed securities (ABS), and FNMA/FHLMC securities. Mortgage backed securities are interests in or obligations secured by pools of mortgage loans. We generally target investments rated A through BB, except for our FNMA/FHLMC securities, which have an implied AAA rating. We also own, directly and indirectly, interests in loans and pools of loans, including real estate related loans, commercial mortgage loans, residential mortgage loans, manufactured housing loans, and subprime mortgage loans.

We employ leverage as part of our investment strategy. We do not have a predetermined target debt to equity ratio as we believe the appropriate leverage for the particular assets we are financing depends on the credit quality of those assets. As a result of our negative GAAP equity, our GAAP debt to equity ratio is not a meaningful measure as of June 30, 2010. Our general investment guidelines adopted by our board of directors limit total leverage (as defined under the governing documents) to a maximum 9.0 to 1 debt to equity ratio. As of June 30, 2010, our debt to equity ratio, as computed under this method, was approximately 3.8 to 1.0. We utilize leverage for the sole purpose of financing our portfolio and not for the purpose of speculating on changes in interest rates.

We strive to maintain access to a broad array of capital resources in an effort to insulate our business from potential fluctuations in the availability of capital. We seek to utilize multiple forms of financing including collateralized debt obligations (CDOs), other securitizations, term loans, and trust preferred securities, as well as short term financing in the form of loans and repurchase agreements. As we discuss in more detail under “–Market Considerations” below, the continued challenging credit and liquidity conditions have limited the array of capital resources available to us and made the terms of capital resources we are able to obtain generally less favorable to us relative to the terms we were able to obtain prior to the onset of challenging conditions. However, credit and liquidity conditions have continued to improve during 2010, and, as a result, we have recently been able to access more types of capital – and on better terms than we had been able to access during 2008 and 2009.

We seek to match fund our investments with respect to interest rates and maturities in order to reduce the impact of interest rate fluctuations on earnings and reduce the risk of refinancing our liabilities prior to the maturity of the investments. We seek to finance a substantial portion of our real estate securities and loans through the issuance of term debt, which generally represents obligations issued in multiple classes secured by an underlying portfolio of assets. Specifically, our CDO financings offer us the structural flexibility to buy and sell certain investments to manage risk and, subject to certain limitations, to optimize returns.

We conduct our business through four primary segments: (i) investments financed with non-recourse collateralized debt obligations (CDOs), (ii) investments financed with other non-recourse debt, (iii) investments financed with recourse debt, securities, and (iv) unlevered investments. Revenues attributable to each segment are disclosed below (in thousands).

<u>For the Six Months Ended June 30,</u>	<u>Other</u>					<u>Total</u>
	<u>CDOs</u>	<u>Non-Recourse</u>	<u>Recourse</u>	<u>Unlevered</u>	<u>Unallocated</u>	
2010	\$105,721	\$ 36,806	\$ 976	\$ 742	\$ 30	\$144,275
2009	\$166,939	\$ 38,859	\$ 4,802	\$ 1,168	\$ 43	\$211,811

[Table of Contents](#)

Market Considerations

Financial Markets in which We Operate

Our ability to generate income is dependent on our ability to invest our capital on a timely basis at attractive levels. The two primary market factors that affect this ability are (1) credit spreads and (2) the availability of financing on favorable terms.

Generally speaking, widening credit spreads reduce any unrealized gains on our current investments (or cause or increase unrealized losses) and increase our costs for new financings, but increase the yields available on potential new investments, while tightening credit spreads increase the unrealized gains (or reduce unrealized losses) on our current investments and reduce our costs for new financings, but reduce the yields available on potential new investments. By reducing unrealized gains (or causing unrealized losses), widening credit spreads also impact our ability to realize gains on existing investments if we were to sell such assets.

During the first six months of 2010, credit spreads tightened. This tightening of credit spreads caused the net unrealized losses on our securities to decrease.

Despite signs of improvement, market conditions remain significantly challenging, and we do not know how recent changes in market conditions will affect our business over the long-term.

Liquidity

Credit and liquidity conditions have continued to improve in 2010, but such conditions are still less favorable than those we experienced prior to 2007. The continued challenging credit and liquidity conditions have adversely affected us and the markets in which we operate in a number of other ways. For example, they have reduced the market trading activity for many real estate securities and loans, resulting in less liquid markets for those securities and loans. As the securities held by us and many other companies in our industry are marked to market at the end of each quarter, the decreased liquidity and concern over market conditions have resulted in significant reductions in mark to market valuations of many real estate securities and loans and the collateral underlying them. These lower valuations, and decreased expectations of future cash flows, have affected us by, among other things:

- decreasing our net book value;
- contributing to our decision to record significant impairment charges;
- prompting us to negotiate the removal of certain financial covenants from our non-CDO financings;
- reducing the amount, which we refer to as cushion, by which we satisfy the over collateralization and interest coverage tests of our CDOs (sometimes referred to as CDO “triggers”) or contributing to several of our CDOs failing their over collateralization tests (see “– Liquidity and Capital Resources” and “– Debt Obligations” below); and
- requiring us to pay additional amounts under certain financing arrangements.

In some cases, we have sold, and may continue to sell, assets at prices below what we believed to be their value in order to meet liquidity requirements under certain financing arrangements. Failed CDO triggers, impairments resulting from incurred losses, and asset sales made at prices significantly below face amount while the related debt is being repaid at its full face amount, as well as the retention of cash, further contribute to reductions in future earnings, cash flow and liquidity. As a result, we expect that our future cash flow from operations will be significantly reduced relative to previous periods.

In order to maintain liquidity, we have elected not to declare any common dividends since the third quarter of 2008 or any preferred dividends since the second quarter of 2010. We may elect to adjust or not to pay any future dividend payments to reflect our current and expected cash from operations or to satisfy future liquidity needs.

In addition, we note that the recent reduction in the number of financial institutions has impacted our liquidity options and sources of capital. The consolidation or elimination of Lehman Brothers, Bear Stearns and several other counterparties has increased our concentration of counterparty risk, decreased the universe of potential counterparties and reduced our ability to obtain competitive financing rates and terms. For a more detailed discussion of our counterparty default and concentration risk, see Part II, Item 1A, “Risk Factors – Risks Related to the Financial Services Industry and Financial Markets – We are subject to counterparty default and concentration risk.”

Extent of Market Disruption

We do not currently know the full extent to which this market disruption will affect us or the markets in which we operate, and we are unable to predict its length or ultimate severity. If the disruption continues, particularly with respect to

Table of Contents

commercial real estate, we will likely experience additional impairment charges, potential reductions in cash flows from our investments and additional challenges in raising capital and obtaining investment financing on attractive terms. Moreover, we will likely need to continue to place a high priority on managing our liquidity. If we raised capital or issued unsecured debt in the current market, it could be significantly dilutive to our current shareholders. Certain aspects of these effects are more fully described in Part I, Item 2, "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations – Interest Rate, Credit and Spread Risk" and "– Liquidity and Capital Resources" as well as in Part I, Item 3, "Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk."

APPLICATION OF CRITICAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Management's discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operations is based upon our consolidated financial statements, which have been prepared in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP"). The preparation of financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires the use of estimates and assumptions that could affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses. Actual results could differ from these estimates. Management believes that the estimates and assumptions utilized in the preparation of the consolidated financial statements are prudent and reasonable. Actual results have been in line with management's estimates and judgments used in applying each of the accounting policies described below, as modified periodically to reflect current market conditions. The following is a summary of our accounting policies that are most effected by judgments, estimates and assumptions.

Variable Interest Entities

Variable interest entities ("VIEs") are defined as entities in which equity investors do not have the characteristics of a controlling financial interest or do not have sufficient equity at risk for the entity to finance its activities without additional subordinated financial support from other parties. The guidance for consolidating a VIE was changed effective January 1, 2010. A VIE is now required to be consolidated by its primary beneficiary, and only by its primary beneficiary, which is defined as the party who has the power to direct the activities of a VIE that most significantly impact its economic performance and who has the obligation to absorb losses or the right to receive benefits from the VIE that could potentially be significant to the VIE.

The VIEs in which we have a significant interest include (i) our CDOs, and (ii) our manufactured housing loan financing structures. Our CDOs were all consolidated under prior guidance; however, under current guidance we do not have the power to direct the relevant activities of CDO VII, as a result of the event of default which allows us to be removed as collateral manager of CDO VII and prevents us from purchasing or selling collateral within CDO VII, and therefore we have deconsolidated CDO VII as of January 1, 2010. Similar events of default in the future, if they occur, could cause us to deconsolidate additional financing structures. Our manufactured housing loan financing structures were consolidated under prior guidance and continue to be consolidated under the new guidance. However, as discussed in "– Liquidity and Capital Resources – Debt Obligations", we completed a securitization transaction to refinance our Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio I. We analyzed the securitization under the applicable accounting guidance and concluded that the securitization transaction should be accounted for as a secured borrowing. As a result, we continue to recognize the portfolio of manufactured housing loans as pledged assets, which have been classified as loans held for investment at securitization, and recorded the notes issued to third parties as a secured borrowing.

Our subprime securitizations are also considered VIEs, but we do not control their activities and no longer receive a significant portion of their returns. These subprime securitizations were not consolidated under the current or prior guidance.

In addition, our investments in CMBS, CDO securities and loans may be deemed to be variable interests in VIEs, depending on their structure. We are not obligated to provide, nor have we provided, any financial support to these VIEs. We monitor these investments and, to the extent we determine that we potentially own a majority of the currently controlling class, analyze them for potential consolidation. As of June 30, 2010, we have not consolidated these potential VIEs due to the determination that, based on the nature of Newcastle's investments and the provisions governing these structures, we do not have the power to direct the activities that most significantly impact their economic performance.

We will continue to analyze future investments, as well as reconsideration events in existing entities, pursuant to the VIE requirements. These analyses require considerable judgment in determining the primary beneficiary of a VIE since they involve subjective determinations of significance, with respect to both power and economics. The result could be the consolidation of an entity that would otherwise not have been consolidated or the non-consolidation of an entity that would otherwise have been consolidated.

Table of Contents

Valuation and Impairment of Securities

We have classified all our real estate securities as available for sale. As such, they are carried at fair value with net unrealized gains or losses reported as a component of accumulated other comprehensive income, to the extent impairment losses are considered temporary as described below. Fair value may be based upon the sources described above, counterparty quotations or pricing services quotations, which provide valuation estimates based upon reasonable market order indications or a good faith estimate thereof and are subject to significant variability based on market conditions, such as interest rates, credit spreads and market liquidity. A significant portion of our securities are currently not traded in active markets and therefore have little or no price transparency. For a further discussion of this trend, see “– Market Considerations” above. As a result, we have estimated the fair value of these illiquid securities based on internal pricing models rather than the sources described above. The determination of estimated cash flows used in pricing models is inherently subjective and imprecise. Changes in market conditions, as well as changes in the assumptions or methodology used to determine fair value, could result in a significant and immediate increase or decrease in our book equity. For securities valued with pricing models, these inputs include the discount rate, assumptions relating to prepayments, default rates and loss severities, as well as other variables.

See Note 6 to our consolidated financial statements in Part I, Item 1, “Financial Statements and Supplementary Data” for information regarding the fair value of our investments, and its estimation methodology, as of June 30, 2010.

Our estimation of the fair value of level 3B assets (as described below) involves significant judgment. Changes in market conditions, as well as changes in the assumptions or methodology used to determine fair value, could result in a significant increase or decrease in our book equity. We validated the inputs and outputs of our models by comparing them to available independent third party market parameters and models for reasonableness. We believe the assumptions we used are within the range that a market participant would use and factor in the slight improvement in liquidity currently in the markets. In the first six months of 2010, we have generally used lower discount rates as inputs to our models in order to reflect current market conditions. The other inputs to our models, including prepayment speeds, default rates and severity assumptions, have generally remained consistent with the assumptions used at year-end, other than certain modifications we have made to the assumptions to reflect conditions relevant to specific assets.

For debt securities valued with internal models, which have an aggregate fair value of \$253.8 million as of June 30, 2010, a 10% unfavorable change in our assumptions would result in the following decreases in such aggregate fair value:

	CMBS	ABS
Outstanding face amount	\$721,795	\$320,247
Fair value	\$150,806	\$ 99,204
Effect on fair value with 10% unfavorable change in:		
Discount rate	\$ (3,643)	\$ (3,529)
Prepayment rate	N/A	\$ (1,142)
Default rate	\$ (15,369)	\$ (6,780)
Loss severity	\$ (7,787)	\$ (12,421)

The sensitivity analysis is hypothetical and should be used with caution. In particular, the results are calculated by stressing a particular economic assumption independent of changes in any other assumption; in practice, changes in one factor may result in changes in another, which might counteract or amplify the sensitivities. Also, changes in the fair value based on a 10% variation in an assumption generally may not be extrapolated because the relationship of the change in the assumption to the change in fair value may not be linear.

Our securities must be categorized by the “level” of inputs used in estimating their fair values. Level 1 would be assets valued based on quoted prices for identical instruments in active markets. We have no level 1 assets. Level 2 would be assets valued based on quoted prices in active markets for similar instruments, on quoted prices in less active or inactive markets, or on other “observable” market inputs. Level 3 would be assets valued based significantly on “unobservable” market inputs. We have further broken level 3 into level 3A, third party indications, and level 3B, internal models. Fair value under GAAP represents an exit price in the normal course of business, not a forced liquidation price. If we were forced to sell assets in a short period to meet liquidity needs, the prices we receive could be substantially less than the recorded fair values.

We generally classify the broker and pricing service quotations we receive as level 3A inputs, except for certain liquid securities. They are quoted prices in generally inactive and illiquid markets for identical or similar securities. These quotations are generally received via email and contain disclaimers which state that they are “indicative” and not “actionable” – meaning that the party giving the quotation is not bound to actually purchase the security at the quoted price.

Table of Contents

These quotations are generally based on models prepared by the brokers and we have little visibility into the inputs they use. Based on procedures we have performed with respect to prior quotations received from these brokers in comparison to the outputs generated from our internal pricing models and transactions we have completed with respect to these securities, as well as on our knowledge and experience of these markets, we have generally determined that these quotes represent a reasonable estimate of fair value. In addition, management performs its own quarterly analysis of fair value, based on internal pricing models, to confirm that each of the quotations received represented a reasonable estimate of fair value as defined under GAAP. For the \$1.6 billion carrying value of securities valued using quotations, a 100 basis point change in credit spreads would impact estimated fair value at period and by approximately \$46.3 million.

We must also assess whether unrealized losses on securities, if any, reflect a decline in value which is other-than-temporary and, if so, write the impaired security down to its fair value through earnings. A decline in value is deemed to be other-than-temporary if (i) it is probable that we will be unable to collect all amounts due according to the contractual terms of a security which was not impaired at acquisition (there is an expected credit loss), or (ii) if we have the intent to sell a security in an unrealized loss position or it is more likely than not we will be required to sell a security in an unrealized loss position prior to its anticipated recovery (if any). For the purposes of performing this analysis, we assume the anticipated recovery period is until the respective security's expected maturity. Also, for certain securities which represent "beneficial interests in securitized financial assets," whenever there is a probable adverse change in the timing or amounts of estimated cash flows of a security from the cash flows previously projected, an other-than-temporary impairment is considered to have occurred. These securities are also analyzed for other-than-temporary impairment under the guidelines applicable to all securities as described herein. We note that primarily all of our securities, except our FNMA/FHLMC securities, fall within the definition of beneficial interests in securitized financial assets.

Temporary declines in value generally result from changes in market factors, such as market interest rates and credit spreads, or from certain macroeconomic events, including market disruptions and supply changes, which do not directly impact our ability to collect amounts contractually due. We continually evaluate the credit status of each of our securities and the collateral supporting our securities. This evaluation includes a review of the credit of the issuer of the security (if applicable), the credit rating of the security, the key terms of the security (including credit support), debt service coverage and loan to value ratios, the performance of the pool of underlying loans and the estimated value of the collateral supporting such loans, including the effect of local, industry and broader economic trends and factors. These factors include loan default expectations and loss severities, which are analyzed in connection with a particular security's credit support, as well as prepayment rates. These factors are also analyzed in relation to the amount of the unrealized loss and the period elapsed since it was incurred. The result of this evaluation is considered when determining management's estimate of cash flows, particularly with respect to developing the necessary inputs and assumptions. Each security is impacted by different factors and in different ways; generally the more negative factors which are identified with respect to a given security, the more likely we are to determine that we do not expect to receive all contractual payments when due with respect to that security. Significant judgment is required in this analysis.

During the six months ended June 30, 2010, we had 121, or \$320.6 million carrying amount of, securities that were downgraded and recorded a net other-than-temporary impairment charge of \$29.3 million on these securities in 2010. However, we do not depend on credit ratings in underwriting our securities, either at acquisition or on an ongoing basis. As mentioned above, a credit rating downgrade is one factor that we monitor and consider in our analysis regarding other-than-temporary impairment, however it is not determinative. Our securities generally benefit from the support of one or more subordinate classes of securities or equity or other forms of credit support. Therefore, credit rating downgrades, even to the extent they relate to an expectation that a securitization we have invested in, on an overall basis, has credit issues, may not ultimately impact cash flow estimates for the class of securities in which we are invested.

Furthermore, the analysis of whether it is more likely than not that we will be required to sell securities in an unrealized loss position prior to an expected recovery in value (if any), the amount of such expected required sales, and the projected identification of which securities would be sold is also be subject to significant judgment, particularly in times of market illiquidity such as we are currently experiencing.

Revenue Recognition on Securities

Income on these securities is recognized using a level yield methodology based upon a number of cash flow assumptions that are subject to uncertainties and contingencies. Such assumptions include the rate and timing of principal and interest receipts (which may be subject to prepayments and defaults). These assumptions are updated on at least a quarterly basis to reflect changes related to a particular security, actual historical data, and market changes. These uncertainties and contingencies are difficult to predict and are subject to future events, and economic and market conditions, which may alter the assumptions. For securities acquired at a discount for credit losses, the net income recognized is based on a "loss adjusted yield" whereby a gross interest yield is recorded to Interest Income, offset by a provision for probable, incurred credit losses which is accrued on a periodic basis to Provision for Credit Losses on Loan Pools. The provision is determined based on an evaluation of the credit status of securities, as described in connection with the analysis of impairment above.

Table of Contents

Valuation of Derivatives

Similarly, our derivative instruments are carried at fair value. Fair value is based on counterparty quotations. Newcastle reports the fair value of derivative instruments gross of cash paid or received pursuant to credit support agreements and fair value is reflected on a net by counterparty basis when Newcastle believes a legal right of offset exists under an enforceable netting agreement. To the extent they qualify as cash flow hedges, net unrealized gains or losses are reported as a component of accumulated other comprehensive income; otherwise, they are reported currently in income. To the extent they qualify as fair value hedges, net unrealized gains or losses on both the derivative and the related portion of the hedged item are reported currently in income. Fair values of such derivatives are subject to significant variability based on many of the same factors as the securities discussed above, including counterparty credit risk. The results of such variability could be a significant increase or decrease in our GAAP equity and/or earnings.

Impairment of Loans

We own, directly and indirectly, real estate related, commercial mortgage and residential mortgage loans, including manufactured housing loans and subprime mortgage loans. To the extent that they are classified as held for investment, we must periodically evaluate each of these loans or loan pools for possible impairment. Impairment is indicated when it is deemed probable that we will be unable to collect all amounts due according to the contractual terms of the loan, or, for loans acquired at a discount for credit losses, when it is deemed probable that we will be unable to collect as anticipated. Upon determination of impairment, we would establish a specific valuation allowance with a corresponding charge to earnings. We continually evaluate our loans receivable for impairment. Our residential mortgage loans, including manufactured housing loans, are aggregated into pools for evaluation based on like characteristics, such as loan type and acquisition date. Individual loans are evaluated based on an analysis of the borrower's performance, the credit rating of the borrower, debt service coverage and loan to value ratios, the estimated value of the underlying collateral, the key terms of the loan, and the effect of local, industry and broader economic trends and factors. Pools of loans are also evaluated based on similar criteria, including historical and anticipated trends in defaults and loss severities for the type and seasoning of loans being evaluated. This information is used to estimate specific impairment charges on individual loans as well as provisions for estimated unidentified incurred losses on pools of loans. Significant judgment is required both in determining impairment and in estimating the resulting loss allowance. Furthermore, we must assess our intent and ability to hold our loan investments on a periodic basis. If we do not have the intent to hold a loan for the foreseeable future or until its expected payoff, the loan must be classified as "held for sale" and recorded at the lower of cost or estimated fair value.

Revenue Recognition on Loans Held for Investment

Income on these loans is recognized similarly to that on our securities and is subject to similar uncertainties and contingencies, which are also analyzed on at least a quarterly basis. For loan pools acquired at a discount for credit losses, the net income recognized is based on a "loss adjusted yield" whereby a gross interest yield is recorded to Interest Income, offset by a provision for probable, incurred credit losses which is accrued on a periodic basis to Provision for Credit Losses. The provision is determined based on an evaluation of the loans as described under "Impairment of Loans" above.

Revenue Recognition on Loans Held for Sale

Real estate related, commercial mortgage and residential mortgage loans that are considered held for sale are carried at the lower of amortized cost or market value determined on either an individual method basis, or in the aggregate for pools of similar loans. Interest income is recognized based on the loan's coupon rates to the extent management believes it is collectible. Purchase discounts are not amortized as interest income during the period the loans are held for sale. A change in the market value of the loans, to the extent that the value is not above the cost basis, is recorded in Valuation Allowance.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In June 2009, the FASB issued new guidance on transfers of financial assets which eliminates the concept of qualified special purpose entities (QSPEs), changes the requirements for reporting a transfer of a portion of financial assets as a sale, clarifies other sale accounting criteria and changes the initial measurement of a transferor's interest in transferred financial assets. Furthermore, it requires additional disclosures. This guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2009. The adoption of this guidance did not have a material impact on our financial position, liquidity or results of operations.

In June 2009, the FASB issued new guidance which changes the definition of a variable interest entity ("VIE") and changes the methodology to determine who is the primary beneficiary of, or in other words who consolidates, a VIE. Furthermore, it eliminates the scope exception for qualified special purpose entities (QSPEs), which are now subject to the VIE consolidation rules. This guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2009. Generally, the changes are expected to cause more entities to be defined as VIEs and to require consolidation by the entity that exercises day-to-

Table of Contents

day control over a VIE, such as servicers and collateral managers. As discussed under “Variable Interest Entities” above, this guidance resulted in changes in our consolidated entities. Changes to consolidation conclusions impact our gross assets, liabilities, equity, revenues and expenses but are not material to the net income applicable to our common stockholders.

RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following table summarizes the changes in our results of operations for the three and six months ended June 30, 2009 to the three and six months ended June 30, 2010 (dollars in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2010 / 2009		Six Months Ended June 30, 2010 / 2009		Explanations of Material Changes
	Amount Change	Percent Change	Amount Change	Percent Change	
Interest income	\$ (13,155)	(15.1%)	\$ (67,536)	(31.9%)	(1)
Interest expense	(11,031)	(20.4%)	(25,986)	(22.7%)	(1)
Valuation allowance (reversal) on loans	(60,665)	N.M.	(277,327)	N.M.	(2)
Other-than-temporary impairment on securities, net	(105,237)	N.M.	(264,077)	N.M.	(3)
Gain (loss) on settlement of investments, net	(8,590)	N.M.	9,134	N.M.	(4)
Gain (loss) on extinguishment of debt	19,898	N.M.	41,399	N.M.	(5)
Other income (loss), net	(13,209)	N.M.	(8,208)	N.M.	(6)
Loan and security servicing expense	(48)	(3.5%)	(415)	(15.0%)	(7)
General and administrative expense	(1,027)	(34.6%)	385	8.4%	(8)
Management fee to affiliate	(234)	(5.2%)	(248)	(2.8%)	(9)
Depreciation and amortization	(11)	(15.1%)	(20)	(13.8%)	N/A
Income (loss) from continuing operations	<u>\$ 163,197</u>	<u>372.1%</u>	<u>\$ 542,477</u>	<u>191.9%</u>	

N.M.—Not meaningful

- (1) Changes in interest income and expense are primarily related to our acquisition and disposition during these periods of interest bearing assets and related financings, as follows:

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2010 / 2009		Six Months Ended June 30, 2010 / 2009	
	Period to Period Increase (Decrease)		Period to Period Increase (Decrease)	
	Interest Income	Interest Expense	Interest Income	Interest Expense
Disposition of securities and loans	\$ (661)	\$ (564)	\$ (1,087)	\$ (825)
Deconsolidation of CDO VII	(5,997)	(4,537)	(11,225)	(9,473)
Paydowns	(715)	(734)	(3,482)	(1,499)
Amortization of deferred hedge loss	—	(233)	—	(3,676)
Prepayment of deferred hedge loss	(6,253)	—	(6,254)	—
Junior subordinated notes	—	(1,215)	—	(2,398)
Other (see below)	471	(3,748)	(45,488)	(8,115)
	<u>\$ (13,155)</u>	<u>\$ (11,031)</u>	<u>\$ (67,536)</u>	<u>\$ (25,986)</u>

The change in the amortization of deferred hedge loss is the result of the dedesignation of certain interest rate swaps in one of the manufactured housing loan pools in early 2009.

Approximately \$43.9 million of the change in Other – Interest Income during the six months ended June 30, 2010 is due to interest income recorded in the first quarter of 2009 as a result of the accretion of discounts on securities impaired due to non-credit factors. Changes in the remaining Other are primarily due to changes in interest rates.

- (2) This change is primarily the result of increases in fair values of the real estate related loans and the manufactured housing loan pools during the six months ended June 30, 2010.
- (3) This change is due to the higher impairment charges recorded to write down a significant portion of our securities portfolio in the six months ended June 30, 2009 as we were not able to express the intent and ability to hold our investments through maturity or recovery.

Table of Contents

- (4) The change for the three months ended June 30, 2010 is primarily the result of a higher loss recorded on sale of two securities in the second quarter of 2010. The change for the six months ended June 30, 2010 is primarily the result of a higher net gain on sale of securities recorded in the first half of 2010.
- (5) This change is a result of the increased amount of CDO debt repurchased in 2010. We repurchased \$119.9 million face amount of CDO debt in the first half of 2010 compared to \$59.8 million face amount of CDO debt repurchased in the first half of 2009.
- (6) This change is primarily due to unrealized loss recorded through earnings during the six months ended June 30, 2010 for certain interest rate swaps that were not designated as hedges for accounting purposes.
- (7) This change in loan and security servicing expense is due to the dispositions and paydowns.
- (8) The change for the six months ended June 30, 2010 is due to the higher legal fees incurred in connect with (i) the exchange offer on our preferred stocks, as described in “Liquidity and Capital Resources – Preferred Stock” below, and (ii) the exchange of \$52.1 million of our junior subordinated notes in the first quarter of 2010, as described in “Liquidity and Capital Resources – Debt Obligations” below. The change for the three months ended is due to higher legal fees incurred in the second quarter of 2009 in connection with the modification of the trust preferred securities.
- (9) This change is due to a decrease in management fee paying equity as a result of the exchange of preferred stock in the first quarter of 2010.

LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES

Overview

Liquidity is a measurement of our ability to meet potential cash requirements, including ongoing commitments to repay borrowings, fund and maintain investments, and other general business needs. Additionally, to maintain our status as a REIT under the Code, we must distribute annually at least 90% of our REIT taxable income. We note that up to 90% of this requirement may be met in future years through stock dividends, rather than cash, subject to limitations based on the value of our stock. Our primary sources of funds for liquidity consist of net cash provided by operating activities, sales or repayments of investments, potential refinancing of existing debt and the issuance of equity securities, when feasible. Our debt obligations are generally secured directly by our investment assets, except for the junior subordinated notes payable.

Sources of Liquidity and Uses of Capital

As of the date of this filing, we currently have no recourse liabilities other than our junior subordinated notes payable, which are long-term obligations. With respect to the next twelve months, we expect that our cash on hand combined with our cash flow provided by operations will be sufficient to satisfy our anticipated liquidity needs with respect to our current investment portfolio, including related financings, hedging activity, potential margin calls and operating expenses. While it is inherently more difficult to forecast beyond the next twelve months, we currently expect to meet our long term liquidity requirements, specifically the repayment of our recourse debt obligations, through our cash on hand and, if needed, additional borrowings, proceeds received from repurchase agreements and similar financings, and the liquidation or refinancing of our assets.

These short-term and long-term expectations are forward-looking and subject to a number of uncertainties and assumptions, which are described below under “Factors That Could Impact Our Liquidity” as well as Part II, Item 1A, “Risk Factors.” If our assumptions about our liquidity prove to be incorrect, we could be subject to a shortfall in liquidity in the future, and this short-fall may occur rapidly and with little or no notice, which would limit our ability to address the shortfall on a timely basis.

Cash flow provided by operations constitutes a critical component of our liquidity. Essentially, our cash flow provided by operations is equal to (i) the net cash flow from our CDOs that have not failed their over collateralization or interest coverage tests, plus (ii) the net cash flow from our non-CDO investments that are not subject to mandatory debt repayment, including principal and sales proceeds, less (iii) operating expenses (primarily management fees, professional fees and insurance), and less (iv) interest on the junior subordinated notes payable.

Our cash flow provided by operations differs from our net income (loss) due to these primary factors: (i) accretion of discount or premium on our real estate securities and loans (including the accrual of interest and fees payable at maturity), discount on our debt obligations, deferred financing costs, and deferred hedge gains and losses, (ii) gains and losses from sales of assets financed with CDOs, (iii) the provision for credit losses and valuation allowance recorded in connection with our loan assets, as well as other-than-temporary impairment on our securities, (iv) unrealized gains or losses on our non-hedge derivatives, (v) the non-cash charges associated with our early extinguishment of debt, and (vi) net income (loss) generated within CDOs that have failed their over collateralization or interest coverage tests. Proceeds from the sale of assets that serve as collateral for our CDO financings, including gains thereon, are required to be retained in the CDO structure until the related bonds are retired and are, therefore, not available to fund current cash needs outside of these structures.

Table of Contents

Update on Liquidity, Capital Resources and Capital Obligations

Certain details regarding our liquidity, current financings and capital obligations as of August 4, 2010 are set forth below:

- *Cash* – We had unrestricted cash of \$41.1 million. In addition, we had \$121.6 million of restricted cash for reinvestments in our CDOs;
- *Margin Exposure* – We had no financings or interest rate swap agreements subject to margin calls; and
- *Recourse Financings* – We currently do not have any short-term recourse debt. The following table compares the face amount of our recourse financings, excluding the junior subordinated notes payable:

	August 4, 2010	June 30, 2010	December 31, 2009
Real Estate Securities, Loans and Properties	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 31,672
Manufactured Housing Loans	—	1,423	10,606
Non-FNMA/FHLMC recourse financings	—	1,423	42,278
FNMA/FHLMC Securities	—	—	39,637
Total Recourse Financings	\$ —	\$ 1,423	\$ 81,915

It is important for readers to understand that our liquidity, available capital resources and capital obligations could change rapidly due to a variety of factors, many of which are beyond our control. Set forth below is a discussion of some of the factors that could impact our liquidity, available capital resources and capital obligations.

Factors That Could Impact Our Liquidity, Capital Resources and Capital Obligations

The following factors could affect our liquidity, access to capital resources and our capital obligations. As such, if their outcomes do not fall within our expectations, changes in these factors could negatively affect our liquidity.

- *Access to Financing from Counterparties* – Decisions by investors, counterparties and lenders to enter into transactions with us will depend upon a number of factors, such as our historical and projected financial performance, compliance with the terms of our current credit and derivative arrangements, industry and market trends, the availability of capital and our investors', counterparties' and lenders' policies and rates applicable thereto, and the relative attractiveness of alternative investment or lending opportunities. As we discuss in more detail under "–Market Considerations" above, the continued challenging credit and liquidity conditions have limited the array of capital resources available to us and made the terms of capital resources we are able to obtain generally less favorable to us relative to the terms we were able to obtain prior to the onset of challenging conditions. Our core business strategy is dependent upon our ability to finance our real estate securities, loans and other real estate related assets with match funded debt at rates that provide a positive net spread. Currently, spreads for such liabilities have widened relative to historical levels and demand for such liabilities has been limited, therefore restricting our ability to execute future financings.
- *Impact of Rating Downgrades on CDO Cash Flows* – Ratings downgrades of assets in our CDOs can negatively impact compliance with the CDOs' over collateralization tests. Generally, the over collateralization test measures the principal balance of the specified pool of assets in a CDO against the corresponding liabilities issued by the CDO. However, based on ratings downgrades, the principal balance of an asset or of a specified percentage of assets in a CDO may be deemed to be reduced below their current balance to levels set forth in the related CDO documents for purposes of calculating the over collateralization test. As a result, ratings downgrades can reduce the assumed principal balance of the assets used in the over collateralization test relative to the corresponding liabilities in the test, thereby reducing the over collateralization percentage. In addition, actual defaults of assets would also negatively impact compliance with the over collateralization tests. Failure to satisfy an over collateralization test could result in the redirection of cashflows, or, in certain cases, in the potential removal of Newcastle as collateral manager of the affected CDO. See "Debt Obligations" below for a summary of assets on negative watch for possible downgrade in our CDOs.
- *Impact of Expected Repayment or Forecasted Sale on Cash Flows* – The timing of and proceeds from the repayment or sale of certain investments may be different than expected or may not occur as expected. Proceeds from sales of assets in the current illiquid market environment are unpredictable and may vary materially from their estimated fair value and their carrying value.

Table of Contents

Investment Portfolio

The following summarizes our investment portfolio at June 30, 2010 (dollars in millions).

	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis (1)	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis	Number of Investments	Credit (2)	Weighted Average Life (years) (3)
Investment (6)						
Commercial (4)						
CMBS	\$ 2,092	\$ 1,345	44.1%	272	BB	2.9
Mezzanine Loans	716	314	10.3%	20	71%	2.1
B-Notes	284	125	4.1%	10	77%	2.0
Whole Loans	85	50	1.6%	4	84%	4.0
Total Commercial Assets	<u>3,177</u>	<u>1,834</u>	<u>60.1%</u>			<u>2.7</u>
Residential						
Manufactured Housing and Residential Mortgage Loans	454	387	12.7%	11,926	699	6.6
Subprime Securities	395	174	5.7%	89	B-	4.4
Real Estate ABS	81	58	1.9%	22	BB	4.7
	930	619	20.3%			5.5
FNMA/FHLMC securities	4	4	0.1%	1	AAA	3.5
Total Residential Assets	<u>934</u>	<u>623</u>	<u>20.4%</u>			<u>5.5</u>
Corporate						
REIT Debt	390	389	12.8%	46	BB+	3.5
Corporate Bank Loans	306	206	6.7%	9	C	3.6
Total Corporate Assets	<u>696</u>	<u>595</u>	<u>19.5%</u>			<u>3.5</u>
TOTAL / WA	<u>\$ 4,807</u>	<u>\$ 3,052</u>	<u>100.0%</u>			<u>3.3</u>
Reconciliation to GAAP total assets:						
Net unrealized loss recorded in accumulated other comprehensive income		(95)				
Other assets						
Subprime mortgage loans subject to call option (5)		403				
Real estate held for sale		10				
Cash and restricted cash		183				
Other		42				
GAAP total assets		<u>\$ 3,595</u>				

WA – Weighted average, in all tables.

- (1) Net of impairment.
- (2) Credit represents weighted average of minimum rating for rated assets, loan-to-value ratio (based on the appraised value at the time of purchase) for non-rated commercial assets, or the FICO score for non-rated residential assets and an implied AAA rating for FNMA/FHLMC securities. Ratings provided above were determined by third party rating agencies as of a particular date, may not be current and are subject to change (including a “negative watch” assignment) at any time.
- (3) Weighted average life is based on the timing of expected principal reduction on the asset.
- (4) Excludes four CDO securities with an aggregate face amount of \$79.6 million and a zero basis. One CDO bond was issued by a third party and three CDO bonds were issued by CDO VII, which was deconsolidated, and held as investments by Newcastle.
- (5) Our subprime mortgage loans subject to call option are excluded from the statistics because they result from an option, not an obligation, to repurchase such loans, are noneconomic until such option is exercised, and are offset by an equal liability on the consolidated balance sheet.
- (6) The following tables summarize certain supplemental data relating to our investments (dollars in tables in thousands):

Table of Contents

CMBS

Deal Vintage (A)	Average Minimum Rating (B)	Number	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis	Delinquency 60+/FC/REO (C)	Principal Subordination (D)	Weighted Average Life (years) (E)
Pre 2004	BBB	86	\$ 433,623	\$ 400,710	29.8%	7.0%	13.0%	2.5
2004	BB	63	437,986	270,437	20.1%	3.3%	5.7%	2.9
2005	BB	36	351,783	155,254	11.5%	5.2%	8.3%	2.8
2006	BB+	53	506,181	350,407	26.1%	3.6%	11.0%	3.1
Post 2007	B+	34	362,068	168,394	12.5%	6.2%	12.8%	3.2
Total / WA	BB	272	\$2,091,641	\$1,345,202	100.0%	5.0%	10.2%	2.9

- (A) The year in which the securities were issued.
 (B) Ratings provided above were determined by third party rating agencies as of a particular date, may not be current and are subject to change (including a “negative watch” assignment) at any time. We had approximately \$220 million of CMBS assets that were on negative watch for possible downgrade by at least one rating agency as of June 30, 2010.
 (C) The percentage of underlying loans that are 60+ days delinquent, in foreclosure or considered real estate owned (REO).
 (D) The percentage of the outstanding face amount of securities that is subordinate to our investments.
 (E) Weighted average life is based on the timing of expected principal reduction on the asset.

Mezzanine Loans, B-Notes and Whole Loans

	Number	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis	Weighted Average First Dollar Loan to Value (A)	Weighted Average Last Dollar to Loan Value (A)	Delinquency (B)
Mezzanine Loans	20	\$ 716,286	\$313,879	64.2%	56.1%	71.1%	18.5%
B-Notes	10	283,830	125,092	25.6%	61.9%	76.6%	46.7%
Whole Loans	4	85,110	50,043	10.2%	0.0%	83.7%	0.0%
Total/WA	34	\$1,085,226	\$489,014	100.0%	53.2%	73.5%	24.4%

- (A) Loan to value is based on the appraised value at the time of purchase.
 (B) The percentage of underlying loans that are non-performing, in foreclosure, under bankruptcy filing or considered real estate owned.

Manufactured Housing and Residential Loans

Deal	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis	Average Loan Age (months)	Original Balance	Delinquency 90+/FC/REO (A)	Cumulative Loss to Date
Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio I	\$ 161,020	\$130,466	33.7%	105	\$ 327,855	1.2%	6.2%
Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio II	227,197	206,087	53.3%	135	434,743	1.0%	4.3%
Residential Loans Portfolio I	62,480	46,808	12.1%	85	646,357	9.1%	0.3%
Residential Loans Portfolio II	3,795	3,612	0.9%	68	83,950	0.0%	0.0%
Total / WA	\$ 454,492	\$386,973	100.0%	117	\$1,492,905	2.1%	4.4%

- (A) The percentage of loans that are 90+ days delinquent, or in foreclosure or considered real estate owned (REO).

Subprime Securities (A)

Vintage (B)	Security Characteristics						
	Average Minimum Rating (C)	Number of Securities	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis	Principal Subordination (D)	Excess Spread (E)
2003	B	15	\$ 20,643	\$ 12,198	7.0%	21.9%	3.9%
2004	B	28	88,584	33,479	19.3%	16.9%	4.0%
2005	B	26	101,574	31,022	17.9%	27.4%	4.5%
2006	CCC+	11	99,905	47,764	27.5%	20.9%	4.8%
Post 2007	B+	9	84,381	49,080	28.3%	17.2%	3.4%
Total / WA	B-	89	\$ 395,087	\$173,543	100.0%	20.9%	4.2%

Table of Contents

Vintage (B)	Collateral Characteristics				Losses to Date
	Average Loan Age (months)	Collateral Factor (F)	3 month CPR (G)	Delinquency (H)	
2003	88	0.10	8.4%	17.6%	3.0%
2004	75	0.14	9.2%	19.8%	3.3%
2005	62	0.21	11.1%	33.5%	8.1%
2006	50	0.42	11.2%	36.0%	14.1%
Post 2007	36	0.50	8.8%	24.0%	11.2%
Total / WA	58	0.31	10.1%	28.2%	8.9%

Real Estate ABS

Asset Type	Security Characteristics						
	Average Minimum Rating (C)	Number	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis Amount	Percentage of Total Amortized Basis	Principal Subordination (D)	Excess Spread (E)
Manufactured Housing	BBB+	9	\$ 49,345	\$ 47,961	82.3%	37.6%	1.6%
Small Business Loans	CCC+	13	31,218	10,293	17.7%	15.3%	3.0%
Total / WA	BB	22	\$ 80,563	\$ 58,254	100.0%	29.0%	2.1%

Asset Type	Collateral Characteristics				
	Average Loan Age (months)	Collateral Factor (F)	3 Month CPR (G)	Delinquency (H)	Cumulative Loss to Date
Manufactured Housing	115	0.36	8.5%	3.2%	10.6%
Small Business Loans	69	0.57	7.2%	26.6%	5.6%
Total / WA	97	0.44	8.0%	12.3%	8.6%

- (A) Includes subprime retained securities in the securitizations of Subprime Portfolios I and II. For further information on these securitizations, see Note 4 to our consolidated financial statements included herein.
- (B) The year in which the securities were issued.
- (C) Ratings provided above were determined by third party rating agencies as of a particular date, may not be current and are subject to change (including a “negative watch” assignment) at any time. We had approximately \$224 million of ABS assets that were on negative watch for possible downgrade by at least one rating agency as of June 30, 2010.
- (D) The percentage of the outstanding face amount of securities and residual interests that is subordinate to our investments.
- (E) The annualized amount of interest received on the underlying loans in excess of the interest paid on the securities, as a percentage of the outstanding collateral balance.
- (F) The ratio of original unpaid principal balance of loans still outstanding.
- (G) Three month average constant prepayment rate.
- (H) The percentage of underlying loans that are 90+ days delinquent, or in foreclosure or considered real estate owned (REO).

REIT Debt

Industry	Average Minimum Rating (A)	Number	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis
Retail	BBB+	11	\$ 80,660	\$ 76,901	19.8%
Diversified	CCC	10	101,836	102,644	26.4%
Office	BBB	11	115,469	117,215	30.1%
Multifamily	BBB	3	12,765	12,830	3.3%
Hotel	BBB	4	30,220	30,683	7.9%
Healthcare	BBB-	5	41,600	41,706	10.7%
Storage	A-	1	5,000	5,063	1.3%
Industrial	BB-	1	2,000	2,073	0.5%
Total / WA	BB+	46	\$ 389,550	\$389,115	100.0%

Table of Contents

Corporate Bank Loans

Industry	Average Minimum Rating (A)	Number	Outstanding Face Amount	Amortized Cost Basis	Percentage of Total Amortized Cost Basis
Real Estate	C	3	\$ 42,087	\$ 40,591	19.7%
Media	CC	2	111,764	46,427	22.6%
Resorts	NR	1	107,903	77,903	37.9%
Restaurant	B	2	18,160	15,335	7.5%
Transportation	NR	1	26,995	25,375	12.3%
Total / WA	C	9	\$ 306,909	\$205,631	100.0%

(A) Ratings provided above were determined by third party rating agencies as of a particular date, may not be current and are subject to change (including a “negative watch” assignment) at any time. We had approximately \$2 million of REIT assets or bank loans that were on negative watch for possible downgrade by at least one rating agency as of June 30, 2010.

Debt Obligations

Our debt obligations, as summarized in Note 5 to our consolidated financial statements included herein, existing at June 30, 2010 (gross of \$5.1 million of discounts) had contractual maturities as follows (in thousands):

	Nonrecourse	Recourse	Total
Period from July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010	\$ —	\$ 1,423	\$ 1,423
2011	182,562	—	182,562
2012	—	—	—
2013	—	—	—
2014	—	—	—
2015	—	—	—
Thereafter	3,986,921	51,004	4,037,925
Total	\$4,169,483	\$52,427	\$4,221,910

Certain of the debt obligations included above are obligations of our consolidated subsidiaries which own the related collateral. In some cases, including the CDO and Other Bonds Payable, such collateral is not available to other creditors of ours.

Our non-CDO debt obligations contain various customary loan covenants. We were in compliance with all of the covenants in our non-CDO financings as of June 30, 2010.

In the first six months of 2010, we repurchased \$119.9 million face amount of CDO bonds for \$24.1 million. As a result, we extinguished \$119.9 million face amount of CDO debt and recorded a gain on extinguishment of debt of \$95.1 million.

On January 29, 2010, Newcastle entered into an Exchange Agreement, dated as of January 29, 2010 (the “Exchange Agreement”), with Taberna Capital Management, LLC and certain of its affiliates (collectively, “Taberna”), pursuant to which Newcastle and Taberna agreed to exchange (the “Exchange”) approximately \$52.1 million aggregate principal amount of junior subordinated notes due 2035 for approximately \$37.6 million face amount of previously issued CDO securities and approximately \$9.7 million of cash held by Newcastle. In other words, \$52.1 million face amount of Newcastle’s debt, in the form of junior subordinated notes payable, was repurchased and extinguished for GAAP purposes in exchange for (i) the payment of \$9.7 million of cash and (ii) the reissuance of \$37.6 million face amount of CDO bonds payable (which had previously been repurchased by Newcastle). In connection with the Exchange, Newcastle paid or reimbursed \$0.6 million of expenses incurred by Taberna, various indenture trustees and their respective advisors in accordance with the terms of the Exchange Agreement. Newcastle accounted for this exchange as a troubled debt restructuring involving the partial repayments of debt. As a result, Newcastle recorded no gain or loss. The following table presents certain information regarding the Exchange, as of the date of the exchange:

	Repurchased junior subordinated notes	Consideration		
		Cash	Reissued CDO bonds	Total
Outstanding face amount	\$ 52,094	\$9,715	\$ 37,625	\$47,340
Weighted average coupon	7.574% (A)	N/A	LIBOR + 0.66% (B)	
Maturity	April 2035		June 2052	
Collateral	General credit of Newcastle		Assets within the respective CDOs	

Table of Contents

The fair value of the consideration paid approximated the fair value of the repurchased junior subordinated notes of \$16.7 million.

On April 15, 2010, Newcastle completed a securitization transaction to refinance its Manufactured Housing Loans Portfolio I (the "Portfolio"). Newcastle sold approximately \$164.1 million outstanding principal balance of manufactured housing loans to Newcastle MH I LLC (the "Issuer"). The Issuer issued approximately \$134.5 million aggregate principal amount of asset-backed notes (the "Notes"), of which \$97.6 million was sold to third parties and \$36.9 million was sold to certain CDOs managed and consolidated by Newcastle. At the closing of the securitization transaction, Newcastle used the gross proceeds received from the issuance of the Notes to repay the previously existing financing on this portfolio in full, terminate the related interest rate swap contracts, pay the related transaction costs and increase its unrestricted cash by approximately \$14 million. Under the applicable accounting guidance, the securitization transaction is accounted for as a secured borrowing. As a result, no gain or loss is recorded for the transaction. Newcastle continues to recognize the portfolio of manufactured housing loans as pledged assets, which have been classified as loans held for investment at securitization, and records the notes issued to third parties as a secured borrowing. The associated assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses are presented in the non-recourse financing structure sections of the consolidated financial statements.

In April 2010, Newcastle repaid in full all of its outstanding repurchase agreements.

Table of Contents

The following table summarizes additional information related to our consolidated CDO financings as of June 30, 2010 (dollars in thousands). The amounts reflect data at the CDO level and thus is different from the GAAP balance sheet due to intercompany amounts eliminated in Newcastle's consolidated balance sheet.

	CDO IV		CDO V		CDO VI		CDO VIII		CDO IX		CDO X							
Balance Sheet:																		
Assets Face Amount	\$	411,503	\$	443,457	\$	450,568	\$	938,197	\$	826,386	\$	1,373,836						
Assets Fair Value		290,291		275,041		215,550		548,364		511,995		963,246						
Issued Debt Face Amount (1)		380,815		407,720		410,885		670,063		580,125		1,224,250						
Issued Debt Basis (1)		397,817		406,307		409,530		669,481		584,731		1,223,034						
Quarterly net cash receipts (2)	\$	153	\$	868	\$	126	\$	5,915	\$	5,693	\$	2,572						
Collateral Composition (3):																		
	Face	Fair Value	Face	Fair Value	Face	Fair Value	Face	Fair Value	Face	Fair Value	Face	Fair Value						
CMBS	\$251,834	\$ 149,409	BB	\$292,427	\$ 161,113	BB	\$290,830	\$ 101,783	BB-	\$242,637	\$ 138,058	BB	\$ 105,104	\$ 94,739	BB	\$ 889,291	\$ 593,053	BBB-
REIT Debt	94,585	99,127	BBB-	74,404	76,410	BBB-	59,200	58,119	BB+	—	—	—	—	—	—	161,361	157,147	BB-
ABS	49,047	27,893	B+	72,867	33,366	B-	83,424	39,125	B	89,405	64,173	BB-	3,232	2,697	BBB+	194,122	136,081	BBB
FNMA/FHLMC	—	—	—	3,759	4,152	AAA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bank Loans	6,305	6,104	C	—	—	—	17,114	16,523	CC	121,149	75,936	CC	133,152	94,942	D	29,188	12,125	CC
Mezzanine Loans / B-Notes / Whole Loans	9,732	7,758	BB+	—	—	—	—	—	—	353,980	199,337	CCC+	485,328	258,931	CCC+	—	—	—
CDO	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	90,438	30,272	B-	66,000	22,358	BB-	35,210	176	C
Equity Securities	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,758	—	—	—	—
Restricted Cash for Reinvestment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	40,588	40,588	—	33,570	33,570	—	64,664	64,664	—
Total	\$411,503	\$ 290,291	BB	\$443,457	\$ 275,041	BB	\$450,568	\$ 215,550	BB-	\$938,197	\$ 548,364	B	\$826,386	\$ 511,995	CCC+	\$1,373,836	\$ 963,246	BB+
Collateral on Negative Watch (4)	\$	87,911		\$133,823		\$ 17,042		\$ 90,438		\$ 68,000		\$ 113,015						
CDO Cash Flow Triggers (5):																		
Over Collateralization (6):																		
As of June 2010 remittance																		
Cushion (Deficit) (\$)	\$	(28,647)	\$	3,173	\$	(162,467)	\$	102,585	\$	60,531	\$	28,892						
As of July 2010 remittance																		
Cushion (Deficit) (\$)		—		—		\$ (166,380)		\$ 103,683		\$ 62,727		\$ 27,546						
Interest Coverage (6):																		
As of June 2010 remittance																		
Cushion (Deficit) (%)		109.5%		230.1%		183.5%		211.1%		163.4%		87.3%						
As of July 2010 remittance																		
Cushion (Deficit) (%)		—		—		64.2%		253.5%		172.2%		152.5%						
CDO Overview:																		
Effective Reinvestment Period		Sep-04		Feb-05		Aug-05		Mar-07		Jul-07		Dec-07						
End (7)		Passed		Passed		Passed		Nov-11		May-12		Jul-12						
Optional Call (8)		Jun-17		Dec-07		May-08		Dec-09		Jun-10		Aug-10						
Auction Call (9)		Mar-14		Sep-14		Apr-15		Nov-16		May-17		Jul-17						
WA Debt Spread (bps) (10)		69		56		39		43		57		34						
Asset Average Life		3.1		3.4		2.6		4.0		2.9		3.7						
Debt Average Life		2.7		2.7		3.8		3.5		4.6		5.2						

(1) Includes only CDO bonds issued to third parties and other Newcastle CDOs.

(2) Represents net cash received from each CDO based on all of our interests in such CDO (including senior management fees) for the six months ended June 30, 2010. Cash receipts for this period included \$5.0 million of non-recurring interest, prepayment penalty, extension fees and yield maintenance fees, and \$1.8 million of senior collateral management fees, and may not be indicative of cash receipts for subsequent periods. See "Cautionary Note Regarding Forward Looking Statements" for risks and uncertainties that could cause our receipts for subsequent periods to differ materially from these amounts.

Notes continued on next page.

Table of Contents

- (3) Collateral composition is calculated as a percentage of the face amount of collateral and includes CDOs bonds of \$191.6 million and other bonds of \$92.9 million issued by Newcastle, which are eliminated in consolidation. The fair value of these CDO bonds and other bonds was \$107.4 million and \$83.7 million at June 30, 2010, respectively. Also reflected are weighted average credit ratings, which were determined by third party rating agencies as of a particular date, may not be current and are subject to change (including a “negative watch” assignment) at any time.
- (4) Represents the face amount of collateral on negative watch for possible downgrade by at least one rating agency (Moody’s, S&P or Fitch) as of the determination date of June 17, 2010 for CDOs IV and V, as these deals only report actual over collateralization excess percentages on a quarterly basis, and as of the determination date of July 19, 2010 for all other CDOs. The amounts include bonds of \$212.5 million issued by Newcastle, which are eliminated in consolidation and not reflected in our investment portfolio segments.
- (5) Each of our CDO financings contains tests that measure the amount of over collateralization and excess interest in the transaction. Failure to satisfy these tests would cause the principal and/or interest cashflow that would otherwise be distributed to more junior classes of securities (including those held by Newcastle) to be redirected to pay down the most senior class of securities outstanding until the tests are satisfied. As a result, our cash flow and liquidity are negatively impacted upon such a failure, and the impact could be material. Each CDO contains tests at various over collateralization and interest coverage percentage levels. The trigger percentages used above represent the first threshold at which cashflows would be redirected as described in this footnote. The data presented is as of the most recent remittance date on or before June 30, 2010 or July 31, 2010, as applicable, and may change or have changed subsequent to that date. CDO IV and V only report on a quarterly basis and, therefore, no updated July 31, 2010 information is available. In addition, our CDOs may also contain specific over collateralization tests that, if failed, can result in the occurrence of an event of default or our being removed as collateral manager of the CDO. Failure of the over collateralization tests can also cause a “phantom income” issue if cash that constitutes income is diverted to pay down debt instead of distributed to us. As of the June 2010 remittance date for CDO IV and as of the July 2010 remittance date for CDO VI, these CDOs were not in compliance with their applicable over collateralization tests and, consequently, we are not receiving cash flows from these CDOs (other than senior management fees). Based upon our current calculations, we expect these portfolios to remain out of compliance for the foreseeable future. Moreover, given current market conditions, it is possible that all of our CDOs could be out of compliance with their over collateralization tests as of one or more measurement dates within the next twelve months. Our ability to rebalance will depend upon the availability of suitable securities, market prices, whether the reinvestment period of the applicable CDO has ended, and other factors that are beyond our control. Such rebalancing efforts may be extremely difficult given current market conditions and we cannot assure you that we will be successful in our rebalancing efforts. If the liabilities of our CDOs are downgraded by Moody’s to certain predetermined levels, our discretion to rebalance the applicable CDO portfolios may be negatively impacted. Moreover, if we bring these coverage tests into compliance, we cannot assure you that they will not fall out of compliance in the future or that we will be able to correct any noncompliance. For a more detailed discussion of the impact of CDO financings on our cash flows, see Part II, Item 1A, “Risk Factors – The use of CDO financings with coverage tests may have a negative impact on our operating results and cash flows.”
- (6) Represents excess or deficiency under the applicable over collateralization or interest coverage tests to the first threshold at which cash flow would be redirected. We generally do not receive material cash flow from the CDO until a deficiency is corrected. Ratings downgrades of assets in our CDOs can negatively impact compliance with the over collateralization tests. Generally, the over collateralization test measures the principal balance of the specified pool of assets in a CDO against the corresponding liabilities issued by the CDO. However, based on ratings downgrades, the principal balance of an asset or of a specified percentage of assets in a CDO may be deemed reduced below their current balance to levels set forth in the related CDO documents for purposes of calculating the over collateralization test. As a result, ratings downgrades can reduce the principal balance of the assets used in the over collateralization test relative to the corresponding liabilities in the test, thereby reducing the over collateralization percentage. In addition, actual defaults of an asset would also negatively impact compliance with the over collateralization tests. Failure to satisfy an over collateralization test could result in the redirection of cashflows as described in footnote 5 above or, in certain instances, in our removal as manager of the applicable portfolio.
- (7) Our CDO financings typically have a 5 year reinvestment period. Generally, after such period ends, principal payments on the collateral are used to paydown the most senior debt outstanding. Prior to the end of the reinvestment period, principal payments received on the collateral are reinvested.
- (8) At the option call date, Newcastle, as the equity holder, has the right to payoff the CDO bonds at their related redemption price.
- (9) At the auction call date, there is a mandatory auction of the assets. If the prices are sufficient to pay off the outstanding CDO bonds, the assets will be sold and the CDO bonds will be redeemed.
- (10) Debt spread represents the spread above the benchmark interest rate (LIBOR or U.S. Treasuries) that Newcastle pays on its debt.

[Table of Contents](#)

The following table sets forth further information with respect to the bonds of our consolidated CDO financings as of June 30, 2010 (dollars in thousands):

Class	Original Face Amount	Current Face Amount (1)				Stated Interest Rate
		Third Parties	Held By		Total	
			Newcastle CDOs (2)	Newcastle Outside of its CDOs (3)		
CDO IV						
Class I	\$ 353,250	\$ 307,776	\$ —	\$ 1,752	\$ 309,528	LIBOR + 0.40%
Class II-FL	13,000	13,091	—	—	13,091	LIBOR + 0.65%
Class II-FX	7,250	2,072	5,438	—	7,510	4.73%
Class III-FL	7,500	7,604	—	—	7,604	LIBOR + 1.00%
Class III-FX	15,000	12,325	—	389	12,714	5.11%
Class IV-FL	9,000	8,214	—	—	8,214	LIBOR + 2.25%
Class IV-FX	9,000	9,585	—	—	9,585	6.34%
Class V	13,500	—	14,710	—	14,710	8.67%
Preferred	22,500	—	—	22,500	22,500	N/A
	<u>\$450,000</u>	<u>\$ 360,667</u>	<u>\$ 20,148</u>	<u>\$ 24,641</u>	<u>\$405,456</u>	
CDO V						
Class I	\$ 388,000	\$ 324,720	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 324,720	LIBOR + 0.34%
Class II-FL	23,500	23,500	—	—	23,500	LIBOR + 0.55%
Class III-FL	23,000	23,000	—	—	23,000	LIBOR + 0.90%
Class IV-FL	8,000	4,000	—	4,000	8,000	LIBOR + 1.90%
Class IV-FX	12,000	12,000	—	—	12,000	6.26%
Class V	20,500	—	20,500	—	20,500	6.94%
Preferred	25,000	—	—	25,000	25,000	N/A
	<u>\$500,000</u>	<u>\$ 387,220</u>	<u>\$ 20,500</u>	<u>\$ 29,000</u>	<u>\$436,720</u>	
CDO VI						
Class I-MM LT	\$ 323,000	\$ 285,510	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 285,510	LIBOR + 0.25%
Class I-B	59,000	59,000	—	—	59,000	LIBOR + 0.40%
Class II	33,000	33,277	—	—	33,277	LIBOR + 0.50%
Class III-FL	15,000	15,225	—	—	15,225	LIBOR + 0.80%
Class III-FX	5,000	5,392	—	—	5,392	5.67%
Class IV-FL	9,600	9,863	—	—	9,863	LIBOR + 1.70%
Class IV-FX	2,400	2,618	—	—	2,618	6.55%
Class V	21,000	—	—	23,297	23,297	7.81%
Preferred	32,000	—	—	32,000	32,000	N/A
	<u>\$500,000</u>	<u>\$ 410,885</u>	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ 55,297</u>	<u>\$466,182</u>	
CDO VIII (4)						
Class I-A	\$ 462,500	\$ 462,500	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 462,500	LIBOR + 0.28%
Class I-AR	60,000	60,000	—	—	60,000	LIBOR + 0.34%
Class I-B	38,000	4,000	—	34,000	38,000	LIBOR + 0.36%
Class II	42,750	—	29,000	13,750	42,750	LIBOR + 0.42%
Class III	42,750	20,000	22,750	—	42,750	LIBOR + 0.50%
Class IV	28,500	—	—	—	—	LIBOR + 0.60%
Class V	28,500	28,500	—	—	28,500	LIBOR + 0.75%
Class VI	27,313	—	—	—	—	LIBOR + 0.80%
Class VII	21,375	—	—	—	—	LIBOR + 0.90%
Class VIII	22,562	11,063	—	—	11,063	LIBOR + 1.45%
Class IX-FL	6,000	6,000	—	11,500	17,500	LIBOR + 1.80%
Class IX-FX	7,600	7,600	—	—	7,600	6.80%
Class X	19,650	18,650	—	—	18,650	LIBOR + 2.25%
Class XI	26,125	—	—	24,125	24,125	LIBOR + 2.50%
Class XII	28,500	—	—	28,500	28,500	7.50%
Preferred	87,875	—	—	87,875	87,875	N/A
	<u>\$950,000</u>	<u>\$ 618,313</u>	<u>\$ 51,750</u>	<u>\$ 199,750</u>	<u>\$869,813</u>	

Continued on next page.

[Table of Contents](#)

Class	Original Face Amount	Current Face Amount (1)				Total	Stated Interest Rate	
		Held By						
		Third Parties	Newcastle CDOs (2)	Newcastle Outside of its CDOs (3)				
CDO IX (4)								
Class A-1	\$ 379,500	\$ 379,500	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 379,500	LIBOR +	0.26%	
Class A-2	115,500	115,500	—	—	115,500	LIBOR +	0.47%	
Class B	37,125	35,125	—	2,000	37,125	LIBOR +	0.65%	
Class C	33,000	—	—	—	—	LIBOR +	0.93%	
Class D	20,625	—	—	—	—	LIBOR +	1.00%	
Class E	24,750	—	—	24,750	24,750	LIBOR +	1.10%	
Class F	18,562	—	—	18,562	18,562	LIBOR +	1.30%	
Class G	18,562	—	—	11,262	11,262	LIBOR +	1.50%	
Class H	21,656	—	8,751	9,305	18,056	LIBOR +	2.50%	
Class J	21,656	—	21,656	—	21,656	LIBOR +	3.00%	
Class K	19,593	—	19,593	—	19,593	LIBOR +	3.50%	
Class L	23,718	—	—	23,718	23,718		7.50%	
Class M	39,187	—	—	39,187	39,187		8.00%	
Preferred	51,566	—	—	51,566	51,566		N/A	
	<u>\$ 825,000</u>	<u>\$ 530,125</u>	<u>\$ 50,000</u>	<u>\$ 180,350</u>	<u>\$ 760,475</u>			
CDO X (4)								
Class A-1	\$ 980,000	\$ 980,000	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 980,000	LIBOR +	0.26%	
Class A-2	140,000	140,000	—	—	140,000	LIBOR +	0.35%	
Class A-3	99,750	55,000	10,000	—	65,000	LIBOR +	0.60%	
Class B	28,000	—	—	—	—	LIBOR +	1.25%	
Class C	40,250	—	39,250	—	39,250	LIBOR +	1.75%	
Class D	22,000	—	—	22,000	22,000	LIBOR +	2.50%	
Class E	13,500	—	—	13,500	13,500	LIBOR +	3.00%	
Class F	14,000	—	—	14,000	14,000		9.04%	
Preferred	62,500	—	—	62,500	62,500		N/A	
	<u>\$ 1,400,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,175,000</u>	<u>\$ 49,250</u>	<u>\$ 112,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,336,250</u>			

- (1) The amounts presented in these columns exclude the face amount of any cancelled bonds within an applicable class.
- (2) Amounts in this column represent the amount of bonds of the applicable class held by Newcastle's consolidated CDOs. These bonds are eliminated in Newcastle's consolidated balance sheet.
- (3) Amounts in this column represent the amount of bonds of the applicable class held as investments by Newcastle outside of its non-recourse financing structures.
- (4) These CDOs issued the following interest only fixed-rate notes with a 5-year maturity from inception:
 - CDO VIII Class S with a notional amount of \$33.9 million at 5.41%
 - CDO IX Class S with a notional amount of \$33.5 million at 5.45%
 - CDO X Class S with a notional amount of \$24.2 million at 5.783%

Stockholders' Equity

Common Stock

The following table presents information on shares of our common stock issued during the six months ended June 30, 2010:

Shares Issued	Range of Issue Prices (1)	Net Proceeds (millions)	Options Granted to Manager
9,112,432	\$3.13	\$28.5	N/A

- (1) Excludes prices of shares issued pursuant to the exercise of options and of shares issued to our independent directors. Includes prices of shares issued in exchange for preferred shares.

At June 30, 2010, we had 62,024,945 shares of common stock outstanding. See "Preferred Stock" below for a discussion of common stock issued in exchange for preferred stock.

Table of Contents

As of June 30, 2010, our outstanding options had a weighted average strike price of \$26.64 and were summarized as follows:

Held by the Manager	1,686,447
Issued to the Manager and subsequently transferred to certain of the Manager's employees	798,162
Held by the independent directors	14,000
Total	<u>2,498,609</u>

As of June 30, 2010, approximately 3.8 million shares of our common stock were held by Fortress, through its affiliates, and its principals.

No dividends were declared with respect to our common stock related to the six months ended June 30, 2010.

Preferred Stock

On March 23, 2010, Newcastle announced the final results of its offer to exchange (the "Exchange Offer") shares of its common stock and cash for up to (i) 1,725,000 shares of its outstanding 9.75% Series B Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock ("Series B Preferred Stock"), (ii) 1,104,000 shares of its outstanding 8.05% Series C Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock ("Series C Preferred Stock"), and (iii) 1,380,000 shares of its outstanding 8.375% Series D Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Stock ("Series D Preferred Stock," and, together with Series B Preferred Stock and Series C Preferred Stock, the "Preferred Stock").

On March 25, 2010, Newcastle settled the Exchange Offer. In the aggregate, Newcastle issued 9,091,668 shares of its common stock (approximately 17.2% of Newcastle's outstanding shares of common stock prior to the issuance of shares in the Exchange Offer). A total of 2,881,694 shares of common stock were issued in exchange for 1,152,679 shares of Series B Preferred Stock, a total of 2,759,989 shares of common stock were issued in exchange for 1,104,000 shares of Series C Preferred Stock, and a total of 3,449,985 shares of common stock were issued in exchange for 1,380,000 shares of Series D Preferred Stock. The shares of Preferred Stock acquired by Newcastle in the Exchange Offer were retired upon receipt. After settlement of the Exchange Offer, 1,347,321 shares of Series B Preferred Stock, 496,000 shares of Series C Preferred Stock and 620,000 shares of Series D Preferred Stock remain outstanding for trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

The shares of common stock were issued in the Exchange Offer in reliance on the exemption set forth in Section 3(a)(9) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, for securities exchanged by an issuer with its existing security holders exclusively where no commission or other remuneration is paid or given directly or indirectly for soliciting such exchange.

In connection with the Exchange Offer, all of Newcastle's preferred stock dividends in arrears were paid, and all cumulative preferred stock dividends accrued through April 30, 2010 have been paid. The \$43.0 million excess of the \$87.5 million carrying value of the exchanged preferred stock over the \$44.5 million fair value of consideration paid (which included \$28.5 million of common stock and \$16.0 million of cash) was recorded as an increase to Net Income (Loss) Applicable to Common Stockholders.

As of June 30, 2010, \$0.9 million of dividends on Newcastle's cumulative preferred stock were unpaid and in arrears.

Table of Contents

Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (Loss)

During the six months ended June 30, 2010, our accumulated other comprehensive income (loss) changed due to the following factors (in thousands):

	<u>Gains (Losses) on Cash Flow Hedges</u>	<u>Gains (Losses) on Securities</u>	<u>Total Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (Loss)</u>
Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss), December, 31, 2009	\$ (180,895)	\$ (452,923)	\$ (633,818)
Deconsolidation of unrealized loss on securities in CDO VII	—	40,715	40,715
Deconsolidation of unrealized loss on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges in CDO VII	28,514	—	28,514
Net unrealized gain (loss) on securities	—	262,032	262,032
Reclassification of net realized (gain) loss on securities into earnings	—	54,930	54,930
Net unrealized gain (loss) on derivatives	(32,680)	—	(32,680)
Reclassification of net realized (gain) loss on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges into earnings	6,146	—	6,146
Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss), June 30, 2010	<u>\$ (178,915)</u>	<u>\$ (95,246)</u>	<u>\$ (274,161)</u>

Our GAAP equity changes as our real estate securities portfolio and derivatives are marked to market each quarter, among other factors. The primary causes of mark to market changes are changes in interest rates and credit spreads. During the six months ended June 30, 2010, a net tightening of credit spreads has caused a net decrease in unrealized losses recorded in accumulative other comprehensive income on our real estate securities. Net unrealized losses on derivatives designated as cash flow hedges increased for the six months ended June 30, 2010 primarily as a result of decreases in long-term interest rates. In addition, accumulated other comprehensive loss decreased as a result of the deconsolidation of the unrealized losses on securities and derivatives for CDO VII.

See “- Market Considerations” above for a further discussion of recent trends and events affecting our unrealized gains and losses as well as our liquidity.

Cash Flow

Operating Activities

Net cash flow provided by (used in) operating activities decreased to \$29.2 million for the six months ended June 30, 2010 from \$49.6 million for the six months ended June 30, 2009. This change primarily resulted from the acquisition and settlement of our investments as described above, and the performance thereof.

Operating Activities – Direct Method Comparison

Cash interest received for investments in securities and loans decreased approximately \$36.9 million as a result of a lower average balance of interest earning securities and loans of \$4.4 billion in the first six months of 2010 compared to \$5.8 billion in the first six months of 2009, a decrease in the weighted average interest rate from 5.05% in the first six months of 2009 to 5.04% in the first six months of 2010 and the redirection of defaulted interests in certain CDOs. The lower interest earning asset balance is primarily a result of paydowns and delinquencies. Prepayment penalty income decreased by \$6.2 million for the six months ended June 30, 2010 due to a higher volume of asset prepayment in the first half of 2009.

Cash interest paid decreased approximately \$16.5 million due to a lower average debt balance of \$3.8 billion in the first six months of 2010 compared to \$4.9 billion in the first six months of 2009 and a decrease in the weighted average funding cost, including the effect of hedges to 3.44% from 3.46% for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2009, respectively.

Table of Contents

Investing Activities

Investing activities provided (used) \$145.7 million and \$164.5 million during the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively. Investing activities consisted primarily of investments made in certain real estate securities, loans and other real estate related assets, offset by proceeds from the sale or settlement of investments.

Financing Activities

Financing activities provided (used) (\$205.5) million and (\$197.2) million during the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively. The return of restricted cash from refinancing activities and return of margin deposits served as the primary sources of cash flow from financing activities. Offsetting uses included the repayment of debt as described above, the payment of related deferred financing costs, the payment of preferred dividends, the payment related to the exchange of the junior subordinated notes, as well as the payment related to the preferred stock exchange described under “– Preferred Stock” above.

See the consolidated statements of cash flows included in our consolidated financial statements for a reconciliation of our cash position for the periods described.

INTEREST RATE, CREDIT AND SPREAD RISK

We are subject to interest rate, credit and spread risk with respect to our investments. These risks are further described in “Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk.”

OFF-BALANCE SHEET ARRANGEMENTS

As of June 30, 2010, we had the following material off-balance sheet arrangements.

- In April 2006, we securitized our Subprime Portfolio I. The loans were sold to a securitization trust, of which 80% were treated as a sale, which is an off-balance sheet financing.
- In July 2007, we securitized our Subprime Portfolio II. The loans were sold to a securitization trust, of which 90% were treated as a sale, which is an off-balance sheet financing.
- On January 1, 2010, pursuant to new accounting guidance, we deconsolidated CDO VII which is now effectively an off-balance sheet financing.

We have no obligation to repurchase any loans from either of our subprime securitizations. Therefore, it is expected that our exposure to loss is limited to the carrying amount of our retained interests in the securitization entities, as described above. A subsidiary of ours gave limited representations and warranties with respect to the second securitization; however, it has no assets and does not have recourse to the general credit of Newcastle.

We also had the following arrangements which do not meet the definition of off-balance sheet arrangements, but do have some of the characteristics of off-balance sheet arrangements.

- We have made investments in three equity method investees, two of which are dormant at June 30, 2010 and the other of which is immaterial to our financial condition, liquidity and operations.

In each case, our exposure to loss is limited to the carrying (fair) value of our investment.

CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

During the first six months of 2010, we had all of the material contractual obligations referred to in our annual report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2009, excluding the debt which was repaid or repurchased, as described in “– Liquidity and Capital Resources,” as well as the following:

<u>Contract Category</u>	<u>Change</u>
CDO bonds payable	We re-issued \$37.6 million face amount of CDO bonds payable in exchange for junior subordinated notes payable, and we also deconsolidated CDO VII, both as described in “– Liquidity and Capital Resources.”
Other bonds payable	We refinanced a portfolio of manufactured housing loans.

The terms of these contracts are described under “Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk” below.

[Table of Contents](#)

INFLATION

We believe that our risk of increases in the market interest rates on our floating rate debt as a result of inflation is largely offset by our use of match funding and hedging instruments as described above. See “Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosure About Market Risk — Interest Rate Exposure” below.

ADJUSTED FUNDS FROM OPERATIONS

We believe Adjusted Funds From Operations (“AFFO”) is one appropriate measure of the operating performance of real estate companies. We also believe that AFFO is an appropriate supplemental disclosure of operating performance for a REIT. Furthermore, AFFO is used to compute our incentive compensation to the Manager. AFFO, for our purposes, represents net income available for common stockholders (computed in accordance with GAAP), excluding extraordinary items, plus depreciation of operating real estate, and after adjustments for equity method investees, if any. We consider gains and losses on resolution of our investments to be a normal part of our recurring operations and therefore do not exclude such gains and losses when arriving at AFFO. This is the one difference between our definition of AFFO and the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts (“NAREIT”) definition of FFO, which excludes gains and losses. Adjustments for equity method investees, if any, are calculated to reflect AFFO on the same basis. AFFO does not represent cash generated from operating activities in accordance with GAAP and therefore should not be considered an alternative to net income as an indicator of our operating performance or as an alternative to cash flow as a measure of liquidity and is not necessarily indicative of cash available to fund cash needs. Our calculation of AFFO may be different from the calculation used by other companies and, therefore, comparability may be limited.

AFFO is calculated as follows (in thousands):

	For the Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2010	2009
Income (loss) applicable to common stockholders	\$298,159	\$(289,597)
Operating real estate depreciation	—	(124)
Adjusted Funds from Operations (AFFO)	<u>\$298,159</u>	<u>\$(289,721)</u>

Adjusted Funds from Operations was derived from our segments as follows (in thousands):

	Book Equity at June 30, 2010	AFFO for the Six Months Ended June 30, 2010
CDOs	\$ (640,915)	\$ (224,796)
Other nonrecourse	54,739	35,727
Recourse	—	(276)
Unlevered	40,113	15,265
Unallocated (1)	<u>(78,825)</u>	<u>22,647</u>
Total (2)	(624,888)	<u>\$ (151,433)</u>
Preferred stock	61,583	
Accumulated depreciation	—	
Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss)	<u>(274,161)</u>	
Net GAAP equity	<u>\$ (837,466)</u>	

- (1) Unallocated AFFO represents \$33,380 of preferred dividends, including the impact of the preferred stock exchange (described in “ – Liquidity and Capital Resources” above), (\$1,653) of interest expense on our junior subordinated notes payable and interest rate swaps, and (\$14,078) of corporate general and administrative expenses and management fees for the six months ended June 30, 2010.
- (2) Invested common equity is equal to GAAP equity excluding preferred stock, accumulated depreciation and accumulated other comprehensive income (loss).

As a result of the effect of the other-than-temporary impairment on our AFFO, we expect that there will be no incentive compensation payable to the Manager for an indeterminate amount of time.

NET INTEREST INCOME LESS EXPENSES (NET OF PREFERRED DIVIDENDS)

We believe that net interest income less expenses (net of preferred dividends) is an appropriate supplemental disclosure of the operating performance for a mortgage REIT. Net interest income less expenses (net of preferred dividends) does not represent cash generated from operating activities in accordance with GAAP and therefore should not be considered an alternative to net income as an indicator of our operating performance or as an alternative to cash flow as a measure of our liquidity and is not necessarily indicative of cash available to fund cash needs. For a further description of the differences

Table of Contents

between cash flow provided by operations and net income see “ – Liquidity and Capital Resource) above. Our calculation of net interest income less expenses (net of preferred dividends) may be different from the calculation used by other companies and, therefore, comparability may be limited.

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2010	2009	2010	2009
Income (loss) applicable to common stockholders	\$117,959	\$ (47,374)	\$ 298,159	\$(289,597)
Add (Deduct):				
Impairment	(42,495)	123,407	(110,527)	430,877
Other (income) loss	(53,384)	(55,285)	(109,927)	(67,602)
Loss from discontinued operations	(13)	142	27	175
Excess of carrying amount of exchanged preferred stock over fair value of consideration paid - Note 9	—	—	(43,043)	—
	<u>\$ 22,067</u>	<u>\$ 20,890</u>	<u>\$ 34,689</u>	<u>\$ 73,853</u>

ITEM 3. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

Market risk is the exposure to loss resulting from changes in interest rates, credit spreads, foreign currency exchange rates, commodity prices and equity prices. The primary market risks that we are exposed to are interest rate risk and credit spread risk. These risks are highly sensitive to many factors, including governmental monetary and tax policies, domestic and international economic and political considerations and other factors beyond our control. All of our market risk sensitive assets, liabilities and related derivative positions are for non-trading purposes only. For a further understanding of how market risk may affect our financial position or results of operations, please refer to “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations – Application of Critical Accounting Policies.”

Interest Rate Exposure

Changes in interest rates, including changes in expected interest rates or “yield curves,” affect our investments in two distinct ways, each of which is discussed below.

First, changes in interest rates affect our net interest income, which is the difference between the interest income earned on assets and the interest expense incurred in connection with our debt obligations and hedges.

Our general financing strategy focuses on the use of match funded structures, when appropriate and available. This means that we seek to match the maturities of our debt obligations with the maturities of our assets to minimize the risk that we have to refinance our liabilities prior to the maturities of our assets, and to reduce the impact of changing interest rates on our earnings. In addition, we generally match fund interest rates on our assets with like-kind debt (i.e., fixed rate assets are financed with fixed rate debt and floating rate assets are financed with floating rate debt), directly or through the use of interest rate swaps, caps or other financial instruments (see below), or through a combination of these strategies, which we believe allows us to reduce the impact of changing interest rates on our earnings.

However, increases in interest rates can nonetheless reduce our net interest income to the extent that we are not completely match funded. Furthermore, a period of rising interest rates can negatively impact our return on certain floating rate investments. Although these investments may be financed with floating rate debt, the interest rate on the debt may reset prior to, and in some cases more frequently than, the interest rate on the assets, causing a decrease in return on equity during a period of rising interest rates.

As of June 30, 2010, a 100 basis point increase in short term interest rates would increase our earnings by approximately \$2.5 million per annum, assuming a static portfolio of current investments and financings.

Second, changes in the level of interest rates also affect the yields required by the marketplace on debt. Increasing interest rates would decrease the value of the fixed rate assets we hold at the time because higher required yields result in lower prices on existing fixed rate assets in order to adjust their yield upward to meet the market.

Changes in unrealized gains or losses resulting from changes in market interest rates do not directly affect our cash flows, or our ability to pay a dividend, to the extent the related assets are expected to be held, as their fair value is not relevant to their underlying cash flows. Our assets are largely financed to maturity through long term CDO financings that are not redeemable as a result of book value changes. As long as these fixed rate assets continue to perform as expected, our cash flows from these assets would not be affected by increasing interest rates. Changes in unrealized gains or losses would impact our ability to realize gains on existing investments if they were sold. Furthermore, with respect to changes in unrealized gains or losses on investments which are carried at fair value, changes in unrealized gains or losses would impact our net book value and, in the cases of impaired assets and non-hedge derivatives, our net income (loss).

Changes in the value of our assets could affect our ability to borrow and access capital. As of June 30, 2010, a 100 basis point change in short term interest rates would impact our net book value by approximately \$10.1 million, assuming a static portfolio of current investments and financings.

Interest rate swaps are agreements in which a series of interest rate flows are exchanged with a third party (counterparty) over a prescribed period. The notional amount on which swaps are based is not exchanged. In general, our swaps are “pay fixed” swaps involving the exchange of floating rate interest payments from the counterparty for fixed interest payments from us. This can effectively convert a floating rate debt obligation into a fixed rate debt obligation. Interest rate swaps may be subject to margin calls.

While a REIT may utilize these types of derivative instruments to hedge interest rate risk on its liabilities or for other purposes, such derivative instruments could generate income that is not qualified income for purposes of maintaining REIT status. As a consequence, we may only engage in such instruments to hedge such risks within the constraints of maintaining our standing as a REIT. We do not enter into derivative contracts for speculative purposes nor as a hedge against changes in credit risk.

Table of Contents

Our hedging transactions using derivative instruments also involve certain additional risks such as counterparty credit risk, the enforceability of hedging contracts and the risk that unanticipated and significant changes in interest rates will cause a significant loss of basis in the contract. There can be no assurance that we will be able to adequately protect against the foregoing risks and will ultimately realize an economic benefit that exceeds the related amounts incurred in connection with engaging in such hedging strategies.

Credit Spread Exposure

Credit spreads measure the yield demanded on loans and securities by the market based on their credit relative to U.S. Treasuries, for fixed rate credit, or LIBOR, for floating rate credit. Our fixed rate loans and securities are valued based on a market credit spread over the rate payable on fixed rate U.S. Treasuries of like maturity. Our floating rate loans and securities are valued based on a market credit spread over LIBOR. Excessive supply of such loans and securities combined with reduced demand will generally cause the market to require a higher yield on such loans and securities, resulting in the use of a higher (or "wider") spread over the benchmark rate to value them.

Widening credit spreads would result in higher yields being required by the marketplace on loans and securities. This widening would reduce the value of the loans and securities we hold at the time because higher required yields result in lower prices on existing securities in order to adjust their yield upward to meet the market. The effects of such a decrease in values on our financial position, results of operations and liquidity are discussed above under "- Interest Rate Exposure."

As of June 30, 2010, a 25 basis point movement in credit spreads would impact our net book value by approximately \$20.2 million, assuming a static portfolio of current investments and financings, but would not directly affect our earnings or cash flow.

Our financing strategy is dependent on our ability to place the match funded debt we use to finance our investments at rates that provide a positive net spread. Currently, spreads for such liabilities have widened and demand for such liabilities has become extremely limited, therefore restricting our ability to execute future financings.

In an environment where spreads are tightening, if spreads tighten on the assets we purchase to a greater degree than they tighten the liabilities we issue, our net spread will be reduced.

Credit Risk

In addition to the above described market risks, Newcastle is subject to credit risk.

Credit risk refers to the ability of each individual borrower under our loans and securities to make required interest and principal payments on the scheduled due dates. The commercial mortgage and asset backed securities we invest in are generally junior in right of payment of interest and principal to one or more senior classes, but benefit from the support of one or more subordinate classes of securities or other form of credit support (which absorbs losses before the securities in which we invest) within a securitization transaction. The senior unsecured REIT debt securities we invest in reflect comparable credit risk. As a result of the current challenging credit and liquidity conditions, the value of the subordinated securities has generally been reduced or, in some cases, eliminated, which could leave our securities economically in a first loss position. We also invest in loans and securities which represent "first loss" pieces; in other words, they do not benefit from credit support although we believe they predominantly benefit from underlying collateral value in excess of their carrying amounts.

We seek to reduce credit risk by actively monitoring our asset portfolio and the underlying credit quality of our holdings and, where appropriate and achievable, repositioning our investments to upgrade their credit quality. In the event of a significant rising interest rate environment and/or economic downturn, loan and collateral defaults may increase and result in credit losses that would adversely affect our liquidity and operating results. As described above in "- Market Considerations" and elsewhere in this quarterly report, adverse market and credit conditions have resulted in our recording of other-than-temporary impairment in certain securities and loans.

Margin

We may, from time to time, be a party to derivatives or financing arrangements that are subject to margin calls based on the value of such instruments. We seek to maintain adequate cash reserves and other sources of available liquidity to meet any margin calls resulting from decreases in value related to a reasonably possible (in the opinion of management) change in interest rates.

Interest Rate and Credit Spread Risk Sensitive Instruments and Fair Value

Our holdings of such financial instruments, and their fair values and the estimation methodology thereof, are detailed in Note 6 to our consolidated financial statements included herein. For information regarding the impact of prepayment,

[Table of Contents](#)

reinvestment, and expected loss factors on the timing of realization of our investments, please refer to the consolidated financial statements included herein and in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2009. For information regarding the impact of changes in these factors on the value of securities valued with internal models, see Part I, Item 2, “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations – Critical Accounting Policies.”

We note that the values of our investments in real estate securities, loans and derivative instruments are sensitive to changes in market interest rates, credit spreads and other market factors. The value of these investments can vary, and has varied, materially from period to period.

Trends

See “- Market Considerations” above for a further discussion of recent trends and events affecting our liquidity, unrealized gains and losses.

ITEM 4. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

- (a) Disclosure Controls and Procedures. The Company's management, with the participation of the Company's Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, has evaluated the effectiveness of the Company's disclosure controls and procedures (as such term is defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act")) as of the end of the period covered by this report. The Company's disclosure controls and procedures are designed to provide reasonable assurance that information is recorded, processed, summarized and reported accurately and on a timely basis. Based on such evaluation, the Company's Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that, as of the end of such period, the Company's disclosure controls and procedures are effective.
- (b) Internal Control Over Financial Reporting. There have not been any changes in the Company's internal control over financial reporting (as such term is defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act) occurred during the fiscal quarter to which this report relates that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

PART II. OTHER INFORMATION

Item 1. Legal Proceedings

From time to time, we are or may be involved in various disputes and litigation matters that arise in the ordinary course of business. The Company is not party to any material legal proceedings as of the date on which this report is filed.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Risks relating to our management, business and company include, specifically:

Risks Related to the Financial Markets

We do not know what impact the Dodd-Frank Act will have on our business.

On July 21, 2010, the United States enacted the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the “Dodd-Frank Act” or “Act”). The Dodd-Frank Act affects almost every aspect of the U.S. financial services industry, including certain aspects of the markets in which we operate. The Act imposes new regulations on us and how we conduct our business. For example, the Act will impose additional disclosure requirements for public companies and generally require issuers or originators of asset-backed securities to retain at least five percent of the credit risk associated with the securitized assets. Importantly, many key aspects of the changes imposed by the Act will be established by various regulatory bodies and other groups over the next several years. As a result, we do not know how significantly the Act will affect us. It is possible that the Act could, among other things, increase our costs of operating as a public company, impose restrictions on our ability to securitize assets and reduce our investment returns on securitized assets.

We do not know what impact the U.S. government’s programs to attempt to stabilize the economy and the financial markets will have on our business. The government’s current efforts to modify terms of outstanding loans negatively affects our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Over the past two years, the U.S. government has taken a number of steps to attempt to stabilize the global financial markets and U.S. economy, including direct government investments in, and guarantees of, troubled financial institutions as well as government-sponsored programs such as the Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility program (TALF) and the Public Private Investment Partnership Program (PPIP). Members of Congress are also currently evaluating an array of other measures and programs that purport to help improve U.S. financial and market conditions. While conditions appear to have improved relative to the depths of the global financial crisis, it is not clear whether this improvement is real or will last for a significant period of time. Moreover, it is not clear what impact the government’s future plans to improve the global economy and financial markets will have on our business. To date, we have not benefited in a direct, material way from any government programs, and we may not derive any meaningful benefit from these programs in the future. Moreover, if any of our competitors are able to benefit from one or more of these initiatives, they may gain a significant competitive advantage over us.

In addition, the U.S. government has enacted legislation that enables government agencies to modify the terms of a significant number of residential and other loans to provide relief to borrowers without the applicable investor’s consent. These modifications allow for outstanding principal to be deferred, interest rates to be reduced, the length of the loan to be extended or other terms to be changed in ways that can permanently eliminate the cash flow (principal and interest) associated with a portion of the loan. These modifications are currently reducing, or in the future may reduce, the value of a number of our mortgage-backed securities and other investments. As a result, such loan modifications are negatively affecting our business, results of operations and financial condition. In addition, certain market participants propose reducing the amount of paperwork required by a borrower to modify their loan, which could increase the likelihood of fraudulent modifications and materially harm the U.S. mortgage market and investors that have exposure to this market.

Risks Relating to Our Management

We are dependent on our manager and may not find a suitable replacement if our manager terminates the management agreement.

We have no employees. Our officers and other individuals who perform services for us are employees of our manager. We are completely reliant on our manager, which has significant discretion as to the implementation of our operating policies and strategies, to conduct our business. We are subject to the risk that our manager will terminate the management agreement and that we will not be able to find a suitable replacement for our manager in a timely manner, at a reasonable cost or at all. Furthermore, we are dependent on the services of certain key employees of our manager whose compensation is partially or entirely dependent upon the amount of incentive or management compensation earned by our manager and whose continued service is not guaranteed and the loss of such services could adversely affect our operations.

Table of Contents

There are conflicts of interest in our relationship with our manager.

Our chairman serves as an officer of our manager. Our management agreement with our manager was not negotiated at arm's-length and its terms, including fees payable, may not be as favorable to us as if it had been negotiated with an unaffiliated third party.

There are conflicts of interest inherent in our relationship with our manager insofar as our manager and its affiliates — including investment funds, private investment funds, or businesses managed by our manager — invest in real estate securities, real estate related loans and operating real estate and whose investment objectives overlap with our investment objectives. Certain investments appropriate for Newcastle may also be appropriate for one or more of these other investment vehicles. Members of our board of directors and employees of our manager who are our officers may serve as officers and/or directors of these other entities. In addition, our manager or its affiliates may have investments in and/or earn fees from such other investment vehicles which are larger than their economic interests in Newcastle and which may therefore create an incentive to allocate investments to such other investment vehicles. Our manager or its affiliates may determine, in their discretion, to make a particular investment through another investment vehicle rather than through Newcastle and have no obligation to offer to Newcastle the opportunity to participate in any particular investment opportunity. Accordingly, it is possible that we may not be given the opportunity to participate at all in certain investments made by our affiliates that meet our investment objectives.

Our management agreement with our manager generally does not limit or restrict our manager or its affiliates from engaging in any business or managing other pooled investment vehicles that invest in investments that meet our investment objectives, except that under our management agreement neither our manager nor any entity controlled by or under common control with our manager is permitted to raise or sponsor any new pooled investment vehicle whose investment policies, guidelines or plan targets as its primary investment category investment in United States dollar-denominated credit sensitive real estate related securities reflecting primarily United States loans or assets. Our manager intends to engage in additional real estate related management and investment opportunities in the future which may compete with us for investments.

The ability of our manager and its officers and employees to engage in other business activities, subject to the terms of our management agreement with our manager, may reduce the time our manager, its officers or other employees spend managing Newcastle. In addition, we may engage in material transactions with our manager or another entity managed by our manager or one of its affiliates, including certain financing arrangements and co-investments which present an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest, subject to our investment guidelines. It is possible that actual, potential or perceived conflicts could give rise to investor dissatisfaction, litigation or regulatory enforcement actions. Appropriately dealing with conflicts of interest is complex and difficult, and our reputation could be damaged if we fail, or appear to fail, to deal appropriately with one or more potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest. Regulatory scrutiny of, or litigation in connection with, conflicts of interest could have a material adverse effect on our reputation which could materially adversely affect our business in a number of ways, including causing an inability to raise additional funds, a reluctance of counterparties to do business with us, a decrease in the prices of our common and preferred securities and a resulting increased risk of litigation and regulatory enforcement actions.

The management compensation structure that we have agreed to with our manager may incentivize our manager to invest in high risk investments. In addition to its management fee, our manager is entitled to receive incentive compensation based in part upon our achievement of targeted levels of funds from operations. In evaluating investments and other management strategies, the opportunity to earn incentive compensation based on funds from operations may lead our manager to place undue emphasis on the maximization of funds from operations at the expense of other criteria, such as preservation of capital, in order to achieve higher incentive compensation, particularly in light of the fact that our manager has not received any incentive compensation and likely will not receive any incentive compensation in the future unless it meaningfully increases Newcastle's investment returns. Investments with higher yield potential are generally riskier or more speculative than lower-yielding investments. Moreover, because our manager receives compensation in the form of options in connection with the completion of our common equity offerings, our manager may be incentivized to cause us to issue additional common stock, which could be dilutive to existing shareholders.

It would be difficult and costly to terminate our management agreement with our manager.

Termination of the management agreement with our manager would be difficult and costly. The management agreement may only be terminated annually upon the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of our independent directors, or by a vote of the holders of a majority of the outstanding shares of our common stock, based upon (1) unsatisfactory performance by our manager that is materially detrimental to us or (2) a determination that the management fee payable to our manager is

Table of Contents

not fair, subject to our manager's right to prevent such a compensation termination by accepting a mutually acceptable reduction of fees. Our manager will be provided 60 days' prior notice of any termination and will be paid a termination fee equal to the amount of the management fee earned by the manager during the twelve-month period preceding such termination. In addition, following any termination of the management agreement, the manager may require us to purchase its right to receive incentive compensation at a price determined as if our assets were sold for their fair market value (as determined by an appraisal, taking into account, among other things, the expected future value of the underlying investments) or otherwise we may continue to pay the incentive compensation to our manager. These provisions may increase the effective cost to us of terminating the management agreement, thereby adversely affecting our ability to terminate our manager without cause.

Our directors have approved very broad investment guidelines for our manager and do not approve each investment decision made by our manager.

Our manager is authorized to follow very broad investment guidelines. Consequently, our manager has great latitude in determining the types of assets it may decide are proper investments for us. Our directors periodically review our investment guidelines and our investment portfolio. However, our board does not review or pre-approve each proposed investment or our related financing arrangements. In addition, in conducting periodic reviews, the directors rely primarily on information provided to them by our manager. Furthermore, transactions entered into by our manager may be difficult or impossible to unwind by the time they are reviewed by the directors even if the transactions contravene the terms of the management agreement.

We may change our investment strategy without stockholder consent, which may result in our making investments that entail more risk than our current investments.

Our investment strategy may evolve, in light of existing market conditions and investment opportunities, and this evolution may involve additional risks depending upon the nature of such assets and our ability to finance such assets on a short or long term basis. Investment opportunities that present unattractive risk-return profiles relative to other available investment opportunities under particular market conditions may become relatively attractive under changed market conditions and changes in market conditions may therefore result in changes in the investments we target. Decisions to make investments in new asset categories present risks that may be difficult for us to adequately assess and could therefore reduce the stability of our dividends or have adverse effects on our financial condition. A change in our investment strategy may also increase our exposure to interest rate, foreign currency, real estate market or credit market fluctuations. Our failure to accurately assess the risks inherent in new asset categories or the financing risks associated with such assets could adversely affect our results of operations and our financial condition.

Risks Relating to Our Business

Challenging market conditions will likely continue to negatively impact our business, results of operations and financial condition.

The market in which we operate is affected by a number of factors that are largely beyond our control but can nonetheless have a potentially significant, negative impact on us. These factors include, among other things:

- Interest rates and credit spreads;
- The availability of credit, including the price, terms and conditions under which it can be obtained;
- The quality, pricing and availability of suitable investments and credit losses with respect to our investments;
- The ability to obtain accurate market-based valuations;
- Loan values relative to the value of the underlying real estate assets;
- Default rates on both commercial and residential mortgages and the amount of the related losses;
- The actual and perceived state of the real estate markets, market for dividend-paying stocks and public capital markets generally;
- Unemployment rates; and
- The attractiveness of other types of investments relative to investments in real estate or REITs generally.

Changes in these factors are difficult to predict, and a change in one factor can affect other factors. For example, during 2007, increased default rates in the subprime mortgage market played a role in causing credit spreads to widen, reducing availability of credit on favorable terms, reducing liquidity and price transparency of real estate related assets, resulting in difficulty in obtaining accurate mark-to-market valuations, and causing a negative perception of the state of the real estate markets and of REITs generally. These conditions worsened during 2008, and intensified meaningfully during the fourth quarter of 2008, as a result of the global credit and liquidity crisis, resulting in extraordinarily challenging market conditions. Despite signs of improvement, market conditions during 2010 remain challenging. We do not currently know the full extent to which this market disruption will affect us or the markets in which we operate, and we are unable to predict its length or ultimate severity. If the challenging conditions continue, we may experience additional impairment charges as well as additional challenges in raising capital and obtaining investment or other financing on attractive terms.

Table of Contents

A prolonged economic slowdown, a lengthy or severe recession, or declining real estate values could harm our operations.

We believe the risks associated with our business are more severe during periods similar to those we are currently experiencing in which an economic slowdown or recession is accompanied by declining real estate values. Declining real estate values generally reduce the level of new mortgage loan originations, since borrowers often use increases in the value of their existing properties to support the purchase of, or investment in, additional properties. Borrowers may also be less able to pay principal and interest on our loans, and the loans underlying our securities, if the real estate economy weakens. Further, declining real estate values significantly increase the likelihood that we will incur losses on our loans and securities in the event of default because the value of our collateral may be insufficient to cover our basis. Any sustained period of increased payment delinquencies, foreclosures or losses could adversely affect both our net interest income from loans and securities in our portfolio as well as our ability to originate, sell and securitize loans, which would significantly harm our revenues, results of operations, financial condition, liquidity, business prospects and our ability to make distributions to our shareholders. For more information on the impact of the continued challenging credit and liquidity conditions on our business and results of operations see Part I, Item 2, “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations – Market Considerations.”

The use of CDO financings with coverage tests may have a negative impact on our operating results and cash flows.

We have retained, and may in the future retain or repurchase, subordinate classes of bonds issued by certain of our subsidiaries in our CDO financings. Each of our CDO financings contains tests that measure the amount of over collateralization and excess interest in the transaction. Failure to satisfy these tests would result in principal and/or interest cash flow that would otherwise be distributed to more junior classes of securities (including those held by Newcastle) to be redirected to pay down the most senior class of securities outstanding until the tests are satisfied. As a result, failure to satisfy the coverage tests could adversely affect our operating results and cash flows by temporarily or permanently directing funds that would otherwise come to us to holders of the senior classes of bonds. In addition, the redirected funds would be used to pay down financing, which currently bears an attractive rate, thereby reducing our future earnings from the affected CDO. The ratings assigned to the assets in each CDO affect the results of the tests governing whether a CDO can distribute cash to the various classes of securities in the CDO. As a result, ratings downgrades of the assets in a CDO can result in a CDO failing its tests and thereby cause us not to receive cash flows from the affected CDO. We note that we have approximately \$510.2 million of assets in our consolidated CDOs as of July 31, 2010 that are under negative watch for possible downgrade by at least one of the rating agencies. One or more of the rating agencies could downgrade some or all of these assets at any time, and any such downgrade could affect – and possibly materially affect – our future cash flows. As of the June 2010 remittance date for CDO IV and as of the July 2010 remittance date for CDO VI, these CDOs were not in compliance with their applicable over collateralization tests and, consequently, we are not receiving cash flows from these CDOs (other than senior management fees). Based upon our current calculations, we expect these CDOs to remain out of compliance for the foreseeable future. Moreover, given current market conditions, it is possible that all of our CDOs could be out of compliance with their over collateralization tests as of one or more measurement dates within the next twelve months.

Our ability to rebalance will depend upon the availability of suitable securities, market prices, whether the reinvestment period of the applicable CDO has ended, and other factors that are beyond our control. For example, in prior periods, we were able to repurchase notes issued by the CDOs and subsequently cancel those notes in accordance with the terms of the relevant governing documentation. These cancellations assisted the applicable CDO in satisfying its overcollateralization test as of the next testing date and thereby enabled the cash flow from that CDO to be distributed to the junior classes of securities (including those held by Newcastle). The trustee of all of our CDOs has informed us that, if we wish to cancel CDO debt in the future, they will require us to obtain the approval of the noteholders of the applicable CDO. If we are unable to obtain the requisite noteholder consent, we will be unable to use CDO debt cancellations as a tool to help CDOs satisfy their overcollateralization tests and thereby maintain the flow of cash from that CDO to Newcastle. As a result, holders of our common shares and preferred shares should not expect that we will be able to cancel any of our CDO obligations in the future. While there are other permissible methods to rebalance or otherwise correct CDO test failures, such methods may be extremely difficult to employ given current market conditions, and we cannot assure you that we will be successful in our rebalancing efforts. If the liabilities of our CDOs are downgraded by Moody’s to certain predetermined levels, our discretion to rebalance the applicable CDO portfolios may be negatively impacted. Moreover, if we bring these coverage tests into compliance, we cannot assure you that they will not fall out of compliance in the future or that we will be able to correct any noncompliance.

Failure of the over collateralization tests can also cause a “phantom income” issue if cash that constitutes income is diverted to pay down debt instead of distributed to us. For more information regarding noncompliance with the terms of certain of our CDO financings in the near future, please see Part I, Item 2, “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations–Liquidity and Capital Resources” and “–Debt Obligations.”

Table of Contents

We may experience an event of default or the removal of us as collateral manager under one or more of our CDOs, which would negatively affect us in a number of ways.

The documentation governing our CDOs specify certain events of default, which, if they occur, would negatively affect us. Events of default include, among other things, failure to pay interest on senior classes of securities within the CDO, breaches of covenants, representations or warranties, bankruptcy, and failure to satisfy specific over collateralization and interest coverage tests. If an event of default occurs under any of our CDOs, it would negatively affect our cash flows, business, results of operations and financial condition.

In addition, we can be removed as manager of a CDO if certain events occur, including the failure to satisfy specific over collateralization and interest coverage tests, failure to satisfy certain “key man” requirements or an event of default occurring for the failure to pay interest on the related senior classes of securities of the CDO. If we are removed as collateral manager, we would no longer receive management fees from — and no longer be able to manage the assets of — the applicable CDO, which would negatively affect our cash flows, business, results of operations and financial condition. We note that on November 4, 2009, CDO VII failed additional over collateralization tests. The consequences of failing these tests are that an event of default has occurred, and we may be removed as the collateral manager under the documentation governing CDO VII. So long as the event of default continues, we will not be permitted to purchase or sell any collateral in CDO VII. If we are removed as the collateral manager of CDO VII, we would no longer receive the senior management fees from such CDO. As of August 4, 2010, we have not been removed as collateral manager. Based upon our current calculations, we estimate that if we are removed as the collateral manager of CDO VII, the loss of senior management fees would not have a material negative impact on our cash flows, business, results of operations or financial condition. However, given current market conditions, it is possible that events of default may occur in other CDOs, and we could be removed as the collateral manager of those CDOs if certain events of default occur. Moreover, our cash flows, business, results of operations and/or financial condition could be materially and negatively impacted if certain events of default occur.

Our investments have previously been — and in the future may be — subject to significant impairment charges, which adversely affect our results of operations.

We are required to periodically evaluate our investments for impairment indicators. The value of an investment is impaired when our analysis indicates that, with respect to a loan, it is probable that we will not be able to collect the full amount we intended to collect from the loan or, with respect to a security, it is probable that the value of security is other than temporarily impaired. The judgment regarding the existence of impairment indicators is based on a variety of factors depending upon the nature of the investment and the manner in which the income related to such investment calculated for purposes of our financial statements. If we determine that an impairment has occurred, we are required to make an adjustment to the net carrying value of the investment, which could adversely affect our results of operations and funds from operations in the applicable period and thereby adversely affect our ability to pay dividends to our stockholders.

As has been widely publicized, the continued challenging credit and liquidity conditions have resulted in a number of financial institutions recording an unprecedented amount of impairment charges, and we have also been affected by these conditions. These challenging conditions have reduced the market trading activity for many real estate securities, resulting in less liquid markets for those securities. These lower valuations have affected us by, among other things, decreasing our net book value and contributing to our decision to record impairment charges.

The lenders under any repurchase agreements that we may enter into from time to time may elect not to extend financing to us, which could quickly and seriously impair our liquidity.

We have historically financed a meaningful portion of our investments not held in CDOs with repurchase agreements, which are short-term financing arrangements, and we may enter into additional repurchase agreements in the future. Under the terms of these agreements, we sell a security to a counterparty for a specified price and concurrently agree to repurchase the same security from our counterparty at a later date for a higher specified price. During the term of the repurchase agreement — generally 30 days — the counterparty makes funds available to us and holds the security as collateral. Our counterparties can also require us to post additional margin as collateral at any time during the term of the agreement. When the term of a repurchase agreement ends, we are required to repurchase the security for the specified repurchase price, with the difference between the sale and repurchase prices serving as the equivalent of paying interest to the counterparty in return for extending financing to us. If we want to continue to finance the security with a repurchase agreement, we ask the counterparty to extend — or “roll” — the repurchase agreement for another term.

Table of Contents

Our counterparties are not required to roll our repurchase agreements upon the expiration of the stated terms, which subjects us to a number of risks. As we have experienced recently and may experience in the future, counterparties electing to roll our repurchase agreements may charge higher spread and impose more onerous terms upon us, including the requirement that we post additional margin as collateral. More significantly, if a repurchase agreement counterparty elects not to extend our financing, we would be required to pay the counterparty the full repurchase price on the maturity date and find an alternate source of financing. Alternate sources of financing may be more expensive, contain more onerous terms or simply may not be available. If we were unable to pay the repurchase price for any security financed with a repurchase agreement, the counterparty has the right to sell the underlying security being held as collateral and require us to compensate them for any shortfall between the value of our obligation to the counterparty and the amount for which the collateral was sold (which may be sold at a significantly discounted price).

Our determination of how much leverage to apply to our investments may adversely affect our return on our investments and may reduce cash available for distribution.

We leverage our portfolio through borrowings, generally through the use of credit facilities, warehouse facilities, repurchase agreements, mortgage loans on real estate, securitizations, including the issuance of CDOs, private or public offerings of debt by subsidiaries, loans to entities in which we hold, directly or indirectly, interests in pools of properties or loans, and other borrowings. Our investment policies do not limit the amount of leverage we may incur with respect to any specific asset or pool of assets, subject to an overall limit on our use of leverage to 90% (as defined in our governing documents) of the value of our assets on an aggregate basis. As a result of the continued challenging credit and liquidity conditions, the return we are able to earn on our investments and cash available for distribution to our stockholders has been significantly reduced due to changes in market conditions causing the cost of our financing to increase relative to the income that can be derived from our assets.

We have limited liquidity. We may become party to agreements that require cash payments at periodic intervals. Failure to make such required payments may adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We may become party to financing agreements that require us to make cash payments at periodic intervals. Events could occur or circumstances could arise, which we may not be able to foresee, that may cause us to be unable to make any such cash payments when they become due. Failure to make the payments required under our financing documents would give the lenders the right to require us to repay all amounts owed to them under the applicable financing immediately.

We are subject to counterparty default and concentration risks.

In the ordinary course of our business, we enter into various types of financing arrangements with counterparties. Currently, the majority of our financing arrangements take the form of repurchase agreements, securitization vehicles, loans, hedge contracts, swaps and other derivative and non-derivative contracts. The terms of these contracts are often customized and complex, and many of these arrangements occur in markets or relate to products that are not subject to regulatory oversight.

We are subject to the risk that the counterparty to one or more of these contracts defaults, either voluntarily or involuntarily, on its performance under the contract. Any such default may occur rapidly and without notice to us. Moreover, if a counterparty defaults, we may be unable to take action to cover our exposure, either because we lack the contractual ability or because market conditions make it difficult to take effective action. This inability could occur in times of market stress consistent with the conditions we are currently experiencing, which are precisely the times when defaults may be most likely to occur.

In addition, our risk-management processes may not accurately anticipate the impact of market stress or counterparty financial condition, and as a result, we may not take sufficient action to reduce our risks effectively. Although we monitor our credit exposures, default risk may arise from events or circumstances that are difficult to detect, foresee or evaluate. In addition, concerns about, or a default by, one large participant could lead to significant liquidity problems for other participants, which may in turn expose us to significant losses.

In the event of a counterparty default, particularly a default by a major investment bank, we could incur material losses rapidly, and the resulting market impact of a major counterparty default could seriously harm our business, results of operations and financial condition. In the event that one of our counterparties becomes insolvent or files for bankruptcy, our ability to eventually recover any losses suffered as a result of that counterparty's default may be limited by the liquidity of the counterparty or the applicable legal regime governing the bankruptcy proceeding.

In addition, with respect to our CDOs, certain of our derivative counterparties are required to maintain certain ratings to avoid having to post collateral or transfer the derivative to another counterparty. If the counterparty was downgraded below these levels they may not be able to satisfy their obligations under the derivative, which could have a material negative effect on the applicable CDO.

Table of Contents

The counterparty risks that we face have increased in complexity and magnitude as a result of the deterioration of conditions in the financial markets and weakening or insolvency of a number of major financial institutions (such as Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, Merrill Lynch, Citigroup and AIG). For example, the consolidation and elimination of counterparties has increased our concentration of counterparty risk and decreased the universe of potential counterparties. In addition, counterparties have generally reacted to the ongoing market volatility by tightening their underwriting standards and increasing their margin requirements for all categories of financing, which has negatively impacted us in several ways, including, decreasing the number of counterparties willing to provide financing to us, decreasing the overall amount of leverage available to us, and increasing the costs of borrowing.

We are not restricted from dealing with any particular counterparty or from concentrating any or all of our transactions with one counterparty. Any loss suffered by us as a result of a counterparty defaulting, refusing to conduct business with us or imposing more onerous terms on us would also negatively affect our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Although we seek to match fund our investments to limit refinance risk and lock in net spreads, we do not currently match fund our investments not held in our CDOs, which increases the risks related to refinancing these investments.

A key to our investment strategy is to finance our investments using match funded financing structures, which match assets and liabilities with respect to maturities and interest rates. This strategy limits our refinance risk, including the risk of being able to refinance an investment on favorable terms or at all. We generally use match funded financing structures, such as CDOs, to finance our investments in real estate securities and loans. However, our manager may elect for us to bear a level of refinancing risk on a short term or longer term basis, such as is the case with investments financed with repurchase agreements, when, based on its analysis, our manager determines that bearing such risk is deemed advisable or unavoidable (this is generally the case with respect to the residential mortgage loans and FNMA/FHLMC in which we invest). In addition, we may be unable, as a result of conditions in the credit markets, to match fund investments. For example, non-recourse term financing not subject to margin requirements was generally not available or economical for the past two years and is currently still challenging to obtain, which impairs our ability to match fund our investments. The decision not, or the inability, to match fund certain investments exposes us to additional refinancing risks that may not apply to our other investments.

Furthermore, we anticipate that, in most cases, for any period during which our floating rate assets are not match funded with respect to maturity, the income from such assets may respond more slowly to interest rate fluctuations than the cost of our borrowings. Because of this dynamic, interest income from such investments may rise more slowly than the related interest expense, with a consequent decrease in our net income. Interest rate fluctuations resulting in our interest expense exceeding interest income would result in operating losses for us from these investments.

Accordingly, if we do not or are unable to match fund our investments with respect to maturities and interest rates, we will be exposed to the risk that we may not be able to finance or refinance our investments on economically favorable terms or may have to liquidate assets at a loss.

We may not be able to finance our investments on a long term basis on attractive terms, including by means of securitization, which may require us to seek more costly financing for our investments or to liquidate assets.

When we acquire securities and loans that we finance on a short term basis with a view to securitization or other long term financing, we bear the risk of being unable to securitize the assets or otherwise finance them on a long term basis at attractive prices or in a timely matter, or at all. If it is not possible or economical for us to securitize or otherwise finance such assets on a long term basis, we may be unable to pay down our short term credit facilities, or be required to liquidate the assets at a loss in order to do so. For example, as a result of the continued deterioration in the credit markets beginning in 2007, financing investments with securitizations or other long-term non-recourse financing not subject to margin requirements was generally not available or economical for the past two years, and is currently still challenging to obtain. These conditions make it highly likely that we will have to use less efficient forms of financing for any new investments, which will likely require a larger portion of our cash flows to be put toward making the initial investment and thereby reduce the amount of cash available for distribution to our stockholders and funds available for operations and investments, and which will also likely require us to assume higher levels of risk when financing our investments.

The loans we invest in and the loans underlying the securities we invest in, are subject to delinquency, foreclosure and loss, which could result in losses to us.

Table of Contents

Commercial mortgage loans are secured by multifamily or commercial property and are subject to risks of delinquency and foreclosure, and risks of loss. The ability of a borrower to repay a loan secured by an income-producing property typically is dependent primarily upon the successful operation of such property rather than upon the existence of independent income or assets of the borrower. If the net operating income of the property is reduced, the borrower's ability to repay the loan may be impaired. Net operating income of an income-producing property can be affected by, among other things: tenant mix, success of tenant businesses, property management decisions, property location and condition, competition from comparable types of properties, changes in laws that increase operating expense or limit rents that may be charged, any need to address environmental contamination at the property, the occurrence of any uninsured casualty at the property, changes in national, regional or local economic conditions and/or specific industry segments, declines in regional or local real estate values, declines in regional or local rental or occupancy rates, increases in interest rates, changes in the availability of credit on favorable terms, real estate tax rates and other operating expenses, changes in governmental rules, regulations and fiscal policies, including environmental legislation, acts of God, terrorism, social unrest and civil disturbances.

Residential mortgage loans, manufactured housing loans and subprime mortgage loans are secured by single-family residential property and are also subject to risks of delinquency and foreclosure, and risks of loss. The ability of a borrower to repay a loan secured by a residential property is dependent upon the income or assets of the borrower. A number of factors may impair borrowers' abilities to repay their loans, including, among other things, changes in the borrower's employment status, changes in national, regional or local economic conditions, changes in interest rates or the availability of credit on favorable terms, changes in regional or local real estate values, changes in regional or local rental rates and changes in real estate taxes.

In the event of any default under a loan held directly by us, we will bear a risk of loss of principal to the extent of any deficiency between the value of the collateral and the outstanding principal and accrued but unpaid interest of the loan, which could adversely affect our cash flow from operations. Foreclosure of a loan, particularly a commercial loan, can be an expensive and lengthy process, which would negatively affect our anticipated return on the foreclosed loan.

Mortgage and asset backed securities are bonds or notes backed by loans and/or other financial assets and include commercial mortgage back securities (CMBS), FNMA/FHLMC securities, and real estate related asset backed securities (ABS). The ability of a borrower to repay these loans or other financial assets is dependent upon the income or assets of these borrowers. If a borrower has insufficient income or assets to repay these loans, it will default on its loan. While we intend to focus on real estate related asset backed securities, there can be no assurance that we will not invest in other types of asset backed securities.

Our investments in mortgage and asset backed securities will be adversely affected by defaults under the loans underlying such securities. To the extent losses are realized on the loans underlying the securities in which we invest, the Company may not recover the amount invested in, or, in extreme cases, any of our investment in, such securities.

We have recently experienced increased default rates on our commercial and residential mortgage loans.

Our investments in debt securities are subject to specific risks relating to the particular issuer of the securities and to the general risks of investing in subordinated real estate securities.

Our investments in debt securities involve special risks. REITs generally are required to invest substantially in real estate or real estate-related assets and are subject to the inherent risks associated with real estate-related investments discussed in this report. Our investments in debt are subject to the risks described above with respect to mortgage loans and MBS and similar risks, including:

- risks of delinquency and foreclosure, and risks of loss in the event thereof;
- the dependence upon the successful operation of and net income from real property;
- risks generally incident to interests in real property; and
- risks that may be presented by the type and use of a particular property.

Debt securities may be unsecured and may also be subordinated to other obligations of the issuer. We may also invest in debt securities that are rated below investment grade. As a result, investments in debt securities are also subject to risks of:

- limited liquidity in the secondary trading market;
- substantial market price volatility resulting from changes in prevailing interest rates or credit spreads;
- subordination to the prior claims of senior lenders to the issuer;
- the possibility that earnings of the debt security issuer may be insufficient to meet its debt service; and
- the declining creditworthiness and potential for insolvency of the issuer of such debt securities during periods of rising interest rates and economic downturn.

[Table of Contents](#)

These risks may adversely affect the value of outstanding debt securities and the ability of the issuers thereof to repay principal and interest.

We are subject to significant competition and we may not compete successfully.

We are subject to significant competition in seeking investments. We compete with other companies, including other REITs, insurance companies and other investors, including funds and companies affiliated with our manager. Some of our competitors have greater resources than we possess or have greater access to capital or various types of financing structures than are available to us, and we may not be able to compete successfully for investments or provide attractive investment returns relative to our competitors. Furthermore, competition for investments of the type to be made by us may lead to the returns available from such investments decreasing, which may further limit our ability to generate our desired returns. We cannot assure you that other companies will not be formed that compete with us for investments or otherwise pursue investment strategies similar to ours or that we will be able to compete successfully against any such companies.

Following the closing of a CDO financing when we have locked in the liability costs for a CDO during the reinvestment period, the rate at which we are able to acquire eligible investments and changes in market conditions may adversely affect our anticipated returns.

During the reinvestment period, we must invest the restricted cash available for reinvestments in our CDOs. Until we are able to acquire sufficient assets, our returns will reflect income earned on uninvested cash and, having locked in the cost of liabilities for the particular CDO, the particular CDO's returns will be at risk of declining to the extent that yields on the assets to be acquired decline. In general, our ability to acquire appropriate investments depends upon the supply in the market of investments we deem suitable, and changes in various economic factors may affect our determination of what constitutes a suitable investment.

Our returns will be adversely affected when investments held in CDOs are prepaid or sold subsequent to the reinvestment period.

Real estate securities and loans are subject to prepayment risk. In addition, we may sell, and realize gains (or losses) on, investments. To the extent such assets were held in CDOs subsequent to the end of the reinvestment period, the proceeds are fully utilized to pay down the related CDOs debt. This causes the leverage on the CDO to decrease, thereby lowering our returns on equity.

Our investments in senior unsecured REIT securities are subject to specific risks relating to the particular REIT issuer and to the general risks of investing in subordinated real estate securities, which may result in losses to us.

Our investments in REIT securities involve special risks relating to the particular REIT issuer of the securities, including the financial condition and business outlook of the issuer. REITs generally are required to substantially invest in operating real estate or real estate related assets and are subject to the inherent risks associated with real estate related investments discussed in this report.

Our investments in REIT securities are also subject to the risks described above with respect to mortgage loans and mortgage backed securities and similar risks, including (i) risks of delinquency and foreclosure, and risks of loss in the event thereof, (ii) the dependence upon the successful operation of and net income from real property, (iii) risks generally incident to interests in real property, and (iv) risks that may be presented by the type and use of a particular commercial property.

REIT securities are generally unsecured and may also be subordinated to other obligations of the issuer. We may also invest in REIT securities that are rated below investment grade. As a result, investments in REIT securities are also subject to risks of: (i) limited liquidity in the secondary trading market, (ii) substantial market price volatility resulting from changes in prevailing interest rates, (iii) subordination to the prior claims of banks and other senior lenders to the issuer, (iv) the operation of mandatory sinking fund or call/redemption provisions during periods of declining interest rates that could cause the issuer to reinvest premature redemption proceeds in lower yielding assets, (v) the possibility that earnings of the REIT issuer may be insufficient to meet its debt service and dividend obligations and (vi) the declining creditworthiness and potential for insolvency of the issuer of such REIT securities during periods of rising interest rates and economic downturn. These risks may adversely affect the value of outstanding REIT securities and the ability of the issuers thereof to repay principal and interest or make dividend payments.

[Table of Contents](#)

The real estate related loans and other direct and indirect interests in pools of real estate properties or other loans that we invest in may be subject to additional risks relating to the structure and terms of these transactions, which may result in losses to us.

We invest in real estate related loans and other direct and indirect interests in pools of real estate properties or loans such as mezzanine loans and “B Note” mortgage loans. We invest in mezzanine loans that take the form of subordinated loans secured by second mortgages on the underlying real property or other business assets or revenue streams or loans secured by a pledge of the ownership interests of the entity owning real property or other business assets or revenue streams (or the ownership interest of the parent of such entity). These types of investments involve a higher degree of risk than long term senior lending secured by business assets or income producing real property because the investment may become unsecured as a result of foreclosure by a senior lender. In the event of a bankruptcy of the entity providing the pledge of its ownership interests as security, we may not have full recourse to the assets of such entity, or the assets of the entity may not be sufficient to repay our mezzanine loan. If a borrower defaults on our mezzanine loan or debt senior to our loan, or in the event of a borrower bankruptcy, our mezzanine loan will be satisfied only after the senior debt is repaid in full. As a result, we may not recover some or all of our investment. In addition, mezzanine loans may have higher loan to value ratios than conventional mortgage loans, resulting in less equity in the property and increasing the risk of loss of principal.

We also invest in mortgage loans (“B Notes”) that while secured by a first mortgage on a single large commercial property or group of related properties are subordinated to an “A Note” secured by the same first mortgage on the same collateral. As a result, if an issuer defaults, there may not be sufficient funds remaining for B Note holders. B Notes reflect similar credit risks to comparably rated commercial mortgage backed securities. In addition, we invest, directly or indirectly, in pools of real estate properties or loans. However, since each transaction is privately negotiated, these investments can vary in their structural characteristics and risks. For example, the rights of holders of B Notes to control the process following a borrower default may vary from transaction to transaction, while investments in pools of real estate properties or loans may be subject to varying contractual arrangements with third party co-investors in such pools. Further, B Notes typically are secured by a single property, and so reflect the risks associated with significant concentration. These investments also are less liquid than commercial mortgage backed securities.

Investment in non-investment grade loans may involve increased risk of loss.

We acquire and may continue to acquire in the future certain loans that do not conform to conventional loan criteria applied by traditional lenders and are not rated or are rated as non-investment grade (for example, for investments rated by Moody’s Investors Service, ratings lower than Baa3, and for Standard & Poor’s, BBB- or below). The non-investment grade ratings for these loans typically result from the overall leverage of the loans, the lack of a strong operating history for the properties underlying the loans, the borrowers’ credit history, the properties’ underlying cash flow or other factors. As a result, these loans have a higher risk of default and loss than conventional loans. Any loss we incur may reduce distributions to our stockholders. There are no limits on the percentage of unrated or non-investment grade assets we may hold in our portfolio.

Insurance on real estate in which we have interests (including the real estate serving as collateral for our real estate securities and loans) may not cover all losses.

There are certain types of losses, generally of a catastrophic nature, such as earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, terrorism or acts of war, that may be uninsurable or not economically insurable. Inflation, changes in building codes and ordinances, environmental considerations, and other factors, including terrorism or acts of war, also might make the insurance proceeds insufficient to repair or replace a property if it is damaged or destroyed. Under such circumstances, the insurance proceeds received might not be adequate to restore our economic position with respect to the affected real property. As a result of the events of September 11, 2001, insurance companies are limiting and/or excluding coverage for acts of terrorism in insurance policies. As a result, we may suffer losses from acts of terrorism that are not covered by insurance.

In addition, the mortgage loans that are secured by certain of the properties in which we have interests contain customary covenants, including covenants that require property insurance to be maintained in an amount equal to the replacement cost of the properties. There can be no assurance that the lenders under these mortgage loans will not take the position that exclusions from coverage for losses due to terrorist acts is a breach of a covenant which, if uncured, could allow the lenders to declare an event of default and accelerate repayment of the mortgage loans.

Many of our investments are illiquid, and this lack of liquidity could significantly impede our ability to vary our portfolio in response to changes in economic and other conditions or to realize the value at which such investments are carried if we are required to dispose of them.

Table of Contents

The real estate properties that we own and operate and our other direct and indirect investments in real estate and real estate related assets are generally illiquid. In addition, the real estate securities that we purchase in connection with privately negotiated transactions are not registered under the relevant securities laws, resulting in a prohibition against their transfer, sale, pledge or other disposition except in a transaction that is exempt from the registration requirements of, or is otherwise in accordance with, those laws. In addition, there are no established trading markets for a majority of our investments. As a result, our ability to vary our portfolio in response to changes in economic and other conditions may be limited.

Our securities have historically been valued based primarily on third party quotations, which are subject to significant variability based on the liquidity and price transparency created by market trading activity. The ongoing dislocation in the trading markets has continued to reduce the trading for many real estate securities, resulting in less transparent prices for those securities. Consequently, it is currently more difficult for us to sell many of our assets now that it has been historically because, if we were to sell such assets, we will likely not have access to readily ascertainable market prices when establishing valuations of them. Moreover, currently there is a relatively low market demand for the vast majority of the types of assets that we hold, which may make it extremely difficult to sell assets. If we are required to liquidate all or a portion of our illiquid investments quickly, we may realize significantly less than the amount at which we have previously valued these investments.

Interest rate fluctuations and shifts in the yield curve may cause losses.

Our primary interest rate exposures relate to our real estate securities, loans, floating rate debt obligations and interest rate swaps. Changes in interest rates, including changes in expected interest rates or “yield curves,” affect our business in a number of ways. Changes in the general level of interest rates can affect our net interest income, which is the difference between the interest income earned on our interest-earning assets and the interest expense incurred in connection with our interest-bearing liabilities and hedges. Changes in the level of interest rates also can affect, among other things, our ability to acquire real estate securities and loans at attractive prices, the value of our real estate securities, loans and derivatives and our ability to realize gains from the sale of such assets.

In the event of a significant rising interest rate environment and/or economic downturn, loan and collateral defaults may increase and result in credit losses that would adversely affect our liquidity and operating results. Interest rates are highly sensitive to many factors, including governmental monetary and tax policies, domestic and international economic and political conditions, and other factors beyond our control.

Our ability to execute our business strategy, particularly the growth of our investment portfolio, depends to a significant degree on our ability to obtain additional capital. Our financing strategy is dependent on our ability to place the match funded debt we use to finance our investments at rates that provide a positive net spread. If spreads for such liabilities widen or if demand for such liabilities ceases to exist, then our ability to execute future financings will be severely restricted.

Interest rate changes may also impact our net book value as our real estate securities, real estate related loans and hedge derivatives are marked to market each quarter. Debt obligations are not marked to market. Generally, as interest rates increase, the value of our fixed rate securities decreases, which will decrease the book value of our equity.

Furthermore, shifts in the U.S. Treasury yield curve reflecting an increase in interest rates would also affect the yield required on our real estate securities and therefore their value. For example, increasing interest rates would reduce the value of the fixed rate assets we hold at the time because the higher yields required by increased interest rates result in lower market prices on existing fixed rate assets in order to adjust the yield upward to meet the market, and vice versa. This would have similar effects on our real estate securities portfolio and our financial position and operations to a change in interest rates generally.

Our investments in real estate securities and loans are subject to changes in credit spreads, which could adversely affect our ability to realize gains on the sale of such investments.

Real estate securities and loans are subject to changes in credit spreads. Credit spreads measure the yield demanded on securities and loans by the market based on their credit relative to a specific benchmark.

Fixed rate securities and loans are valued based on a market credit spread over the rate payable on fixed rate U.S. Treasuries of like maturity. Floating rate securities and loans are valued based on a market credit spread over LIBOR and are affected similarly by changes in LIBOR spreads. Excessive supply of these securities combined with reduced demand will generally cause the market to require a higher yield on these securities and loans, resulting in the use of a higher, or “wider,” spread over the benchmark rate to value such securities. Under such conditions, the value of our real estate securities and loan portfolios would tend to decline. Conversely, if the spread used to value such securities were to decrease, or “tighten,” the value of our real estate securities portfolio would tend to increase. Such changes in the market

Table of Contents

value of our real estate securities and loan portfolios may affect our net equity, net income or cash flow directly through their impact on unrealized gains or losses on available for sale securities, and therefore our ability to realize gains on such securities, or indirectly through their impact on our ability to borrow and access capital. During 2008 through the first quarter of 2009, credit spreads widened substantially. This widening of credit spreads caused the net unrealized gains on our securities, loans and derivatives, recorded in accumulated other comprehensive income or retained earnings, and therefore our book value per share, to decrease and resulted in net losses.

In addition, if the value of our loans subject to financing agreements were to decline, it could affect our ability to refinance such loans upon the maturity of the related repurchase agreements. Any credit or spread related losses incurred with respect to our loans would affect us in the same way as similar losses on our real estate securities portfolio as described above.

Any hedging transactions that we enter into may limit our gains or result in losses.

We use derivatives to hedge a portion of our interest rate exposure, and this approach has certain risks, including the risk that losses on a hedge position will reduce the cash available for distribution to stockholders and that such losses may exceed the amount invested in such instruments. We have adopted a general policy with respect to the use of derivatives, which generally allows us to use derivatives where appropriate, but does not set forth specific policies and procedures or require that we hedge any specific amount of risk. From time to time, we use derivative instruments, including forwards, futures, swaps and options, in our risk management strategy to limit the effects of changes in interest rates on our operations. A hedge may not be effective in eliminating all of the risks inherent in any particular position. Our profitability may be adversely affected during any period as a result of the use of derivatives.

There are limits to the ability of hedging strategy to protect us completely against interest rate risks. When rates change, we expect the gain or loss on derivatives to be offset by a related but inverse change in the value of the items, generally our liabilities, which we hedge. We cannot assure you, however, that our use of derivatives will offset the risks related to changes in interest rates. We cannot assure you that our hedging strategy and the derivatives that we use will adequately offset the risk of interest rate volatility or that our hedging transactions will not result in losses. In addition, our hedging strategy may limit our flexibility by causing us to refrain from taking certain actions that would be potentially profitable but would cause adverse consequences under the terms of our hedging arrangements.

In managing our hedge instruments, we consider the effect of the expected hedging income on the REIT qualification tests that limit the amount of gross income that a REIT may receive from hedging. The REIT provisions of the Internal Revenue Code limit our ability to hedge. We need to carefully monitor, and may have to limit, our hedging strategy to assure that we do not realize hedging income, or hold hedges having a value, in excess of the amounts which would cause us to fail the REIT gross income and asset tests.

Accounting for derivatives under GAAP is extremely complicated. Any failure by us to account for our derivatives properly in accordance with GAAP in our financial statements could adversely affect our earnings.

Under certain conditions, increases in prepayment rates can adversely affect yields on certain investments, including our residential mortgage loans.

The value of our assets may be affected by prepayment rates on our residential mortgage loans and other floating rate assets. Prepayment rates are influenced by changes in current interest rates and a variety of economic, geographic and other factors beyond our control, and consequently, such prepayment rates cannot be predicted with certainty. In periods of declining mortgage interest rates, prepayments on loans generally increase. If general interest rates decline as well, the proceeds of such prepayments received during such periods are likely to be reinvested by us in assets yielding less than the yields on the assets that were prepaid. In addition, the market value of floating rate assets may, because of the risk of prepayment, benefit less than fixed rate assets from declining interest rates. Conversely, in periods of rising interest rates, prepayments on loans generally decrease, in which case we would not have the prepayment proceeds available to invest in assets with higher yields. Under certain interest rate and prepayment scenarios we may fail to recoup fully our cost of acquisition of certain investments.

In addition, when market conditions lead us to increase the portion of our CDO investments that are comprised of floating rate securities, the risk of assets inside our CDOs prepaying increases. Since our CDO financing costs are locked in, reinvestment of such prepayment proceeds at lower yields than the initial investments, as a result of changes in the interest rate or credit spread environment, will result in a decrease of the return on our equity and therefore our net income.

Changes in accounting rules could occur at any time and could impact us in significantly negative ways that we are unable to predict or protect against.

Table of Contents

As has been widely publicized, the SEC and other regulatory bodies that establish the accounting rules applicable to us have recently proposed or enacted a wide array of changes to current accounting rules. Moreover, these regulators may propose additional changes in the future of which we are not currently aware. Changes to accounting rules that apply to us could significantly impact our business or our reported financial performance in negative ways that we cannot predict or prepare against. We cannot predict whether any changes to current accounting rules will occur or what impact any codified changes will have on our business, results of operation or financial condition.

Environmental compliance costs and liabilities with respect to our real estate in which we have interests may adversely affect our results of operations.

Our operating costs may be affected by our obligation to pay for the cost of complying with existing environmental laws, ordinances and regulations, as well as the cost of complying with future legislation with respect to the assets, or loans secured by assets, with environmental problems that materially impair the value of the assets. Under various federal, state and local environmental laws, ordinances and regulations, a current or previous owner or operator of real property may be liable for the costs of removal or remediation of hazardous or toxic substances on, under, or in such property. Such laws often impose liability whether or not the owner or operator knew of, or was responsible for, the presence of such hazardous or toxic substances. In addition, the presence of hazardous or toxic substances, or the failure to remediate properly, may adversely affect the owner's ability to borrow by using such real property as collateral. Certain environmental laws and common law principles could be used to impose liability for releases of hazardous materials, including asbestos-containing materials, into the environment, and third parties may seek recovery from owners or operators of real properties for personal injury associated with exposure to released asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials. Environmental laws may also impose restrictions on the manner in which a property may be used or transferred or in which businesses it may be operated, and these restrictions may require expenditures. In connection with the direct or indirect ownership and operation of properties, we may be potentially liable for any such costs. The cost of defending against claims of liability or remediating contaminated property and the cost of complying with environmental laws could adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition.

Risks Relating to Our REIT Status and Other Matters

Our failure to qualify as a REIT would result in higher taxes and reduced cash available for distribution to our stockholders.

We operate in a manner intended to qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes. Our ability to satisfy the asset tests depends upon our analysis of the fair market values of our assets, some of which are not susceptible to a precise determination, and for which we will not obtain independent appraisals. Our compliance with the REIT income and quarterly asset requirements also depends upon our ability to successfully manage the composition of our income and assets on an ongoing basis. Moreover, the proper classification of an instrument as debt or equity for federal income tax purposes, and the tax treatment of participation interests that we hold in mortgage loans and mezzanine loans, may be uncertain in some circumstances, which could affect the application of the REIT qualification requirements. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that the IRS will not contend that our interests in subsidiaries or other issuers will not cause a violation of the REIT requirements.

If we were to fail to qualify as a REIT in any taxable year, we would be subject to federal income tax, including any applicable alternative minimum tax, on our taxable income at regular corporate rates, and distributions to stockholders would not be deductible by us in computing our taxable income. Any such corporate tax liability could be substantial and would reduce the amount of cash available for distribution to our stockholders, which in turn could have an adverse impact on the value of, and trading prices for, our stock. Unless entitled to relief under certain Internal Revenue Code provisions, we also would be disqualified from taxation as a REIT for the four taxable years following the year during which we ceased to qualify as a REIT.

Our failure to qualify as a REIT would constitute an event of default under a significant number of our financings and other agreements and would cause our common and preferred stock to be delisted from the NYSE.

Our failure to qualify as a REIT would constitute an event of default under a significant number of our financing and other agreements, which would, in turn, result in either the acceleration of the amounts we owe to the applicable counterparty or otherwise give our counterparty the right to terminate the applicable agreement. Either scenario would likely have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and ability to conduct our business, which would likely, in turn, require the Company to restructure or file for protection under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

In addition, the New York Stock Exchange requires, as a condition to the continued listing of our common and preferred shares, that we maintain our REIT status. Consequently, if we fail to maintain our REIT status, our common and preferred shares would promptly be delisted from the NYSE, which would decrease the trading activity of such shares. This could make it difficult to sell shares and could cause the market volume of the shares trading to decline.

Table of Contents

If Newcastle was delisted as a result of losing its REIT status and desired to relist its shares on the NYSE, the Company would have to reapply to the NYSE to be listed as a domestic corporation. As the NYSE's listing standards for REITs are less onerous than its standards for domestic corporations, it would be more difficult for the Company to become a listed company under these heightened standards. Given current conditions, Newcastle would not be able to satisfy the NYSE's listing standards for a domestic corporation. As a result, if it were delisted from the NYSE, it likely would not be able to relist as a domestic corporation, and thus the Company's common and preferred shares could not trade on the NYSE.

Dividends payable by REITs do not qualify for the reduced tax rates.

Tax law changes in 2003 reduced the maximum tax rate for dividends payable to individuals from 35% to 15% (through 2010). Dividends payable by REITs, however, are generally not eligible for the reduced rates. Although this legislation does not adversely affect the taxation of REITs or dividends paid by REITs, the more favorable rates applicable to regular corporate dividends could cause investors who are individuals, trusts and estates to perceive investments in REITs to be relatively less attractive than investments in the stocks of non-REIT corporations that pay dividends, which could adversely affect the value of the stock of REITs, including our common stock. In addition, the relative attractiveness of real estate in general may be adversely affected by the newly favorable tax treatment given to corporate dividends, which could affect the value of our real estate assets negatively.

REIT distribution requirements could adversely affect our liquidity and our ability to execute our business plan.

We generally must distribute annually at least 90% of our net taxable income, excluding any net capital gain, in order for corporate income tax not to apply to earnings that we distribute. We intend to make distributions to our stockholders to comply with the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code. However, differences in timing between the recognition of taxable income and the actual receipt of cash could require us to sell assets or borrow funds on a short-term or long-term basis to meet the 90% distribution requirement of the Internal Revenue Code. Certain of our assets may generate substantial mismatches between taxable income and available cash. As a result, the requirement to distribute a substantial portion of our net taxable income could cause us to: (i) sell assets in adverse market conditions, (ii) borrow on unfavorable terms or (iii) distribute amounts that would otherwise be invested in future acquisitions, capital expenditures or repayment of debt, in order to comply with REIT requirements. Further, amounts distributed will not be available to fund investment activities. If we fail to obtain debt or equity capital in the future, it could limit our ability to satisfy our liquidity needs, which could adversely affect the value of our common stock.

The IRS tax rules regarding recognizing capital losses and ordinary income for our non-recourse financings, coupled with current REIT distribution requirements, could result in our recognizing significant taxable net income without receiving an equivalent amount of cash proceeds from which to make required distributions. This disconnect could have a serious, negative affect on us.

We may experience issues regarding the characterization of income for tax purposes. For example, we may recognize significant ordinary income, which we would not be able to offset with capital losses, which could, in turn, increase the amount of income we would be required to distribute to shareholders in order to maintain our REIT status. This disconnect could occur in the case of one or more of our non-recourse financing structures, including off balance sheet structures such as our subprime securitizations and non-consolidated CDOs, where we incur capital losses on the related assets, and ordinary income from the cancellation of the related non-recourse financing if the ultimate proceeds from the assets are insufficient to repay such debt. Through June 30, 2010, no such cancellation of debt as a result of losses had been incurred. In the case of our subprime securitizations, we expect that such losses and cancellations may begin to be incurred in the second half of 2010 and over the next couple of years. This disconnect could also occur as a result of the repurchase of our outstanding debt at a discount as the gain recorded upon the cancellation of indebtedness is characterized as ordinary income for tax purposes. We have repurchased our debt at a discount in the past, and we intend to attempt to do so in the future. During 2009, we repurchased \$246.7 million face amount of our outstanding CDO debt at a discount, and recorded \$215.3 million of gain. During the first two quarters of 2010, we purchased \$119.9 million face amount of our outstanding CDO debt at a discount, and recorded \$95.1 million of gain. In compliance with current tax laws, we have the ability to defer the ordinary income recorded as a result of the cancellation of indebtedness to future years and intend to defer all or a portion of such gain for 2009 and 2010. While such deferral may postpone the effect of the disconnect in the ability to offset taxable income and losses, it does not eliminate it.

If we experienced any of these disconnects, we may not have sufficient cashflow to make the distributions necessary to satisfy our REIT distribution requirements, which would cause us to lose our REIT status and thereby materially negatively impact our business, financial condition and potentially impair our ability to continue operating in the future. Under current market conditions, this type of disconnect between taxable income and cash proceeds would be likely to occur at some point in the future if the current regulations that create the disconnect are not revised, but we cannot predict at this time when such a disconnect may occur.

[Table of Contents](#)

We may be unable to generate sufficient revenue from operations to pay our operating expenses and to pay distributions to our stockholders.

As a REIT, we are generally required to distribute at least 90% of our REIT taxable income (determined without regard to the dividends paid deduction and not including net capital losses) each year to our stockholders. To qualify for the tax benefits accorded to REITs, we intend to make distributions to our stockholders in amounts such that we distribute all or substantially all our net taxable income each year, subject to certain adjustments. However, our ability to make distributions may be adversely affected by the risk factors described herein, particularly in light of current market conditions. In the event of a continued downturn in our operating results and financial performance relative to previous periods or continued declines in the value of our asset portfolio, we may be unable to declare or pay quarterly distributions or make distributions to our stockholders, and we may elect to comply with our REIT distribution requirements by, after completing various procedural steps, distributing, under certain circumstances, up to 90% of the required amount in the form of common shares in lieu of cash. The timing and amount of distributions are in the sole discretion of our board of directors, which considers, among other factors, our earnings, financial condition, debt service obligations and applicable debt covenants, REIT qualification requirements and other tax considerations and capital expenditure requirements as our board may deem relevant from time to time.

The stock ownership limit imposed by the Internal Revenue Code for REITs and our charter may inhibit market activity in our stock and restrict our business combination opportunities.

In order for us to maintain our qualification as a REIT under the Internal Revenue Code, not more than 50% in value of our outstanding stock may be owned, directly or indirectly, by five or fewer individuals (as defined in the Internal Revenue Code to include certain entities) at any time during the last half of each taxable year after our first year. Our charter, with certain exceptions, authorizes our board of directors to take the actions that are necessary and desirable to preserve our qualification as a REIT. Unless exempted by our board of directors, no person may own more than 8% of the aggregate value of our outstanding capital stock, treating classes and series of our stock in the aggregate, or more than 25% of the outstanding shares of our Series B Preferred Stock, Series C Preferred Stock or our Series D Preferred Stock. Our board may grant an exemption in its sole discretion, subject to such conditions, representations and undertakings as it may determine in its sole discretion. These ownership limits could delay or prevent a transaction or a change in our control that might involve a premium price for our common stock or otherwise be in the best interest of our stockholders. Our board has granted limited exemptions to an affiliate of our manager, a third party group of funds managed by Cohen & Steers, and certain affiliates of these entities.

Even if we remain qualified as a REIT, we may face other tax liabilities that reduce our cash flow.

Even if we remain qualified for taxation as a REIT, we may be subject to certain federal, state and local taxes on our income and assets, including taxes on any undistributed income, tax on income from some activities conducted as a result of a foreclosure, and state or local income, property and transfer taxes, such as mortgage recording taxes. Moreover, if a REIT distributes less than 85% of its taxable income to its stockholders during any calendar year (including any distributions declared by the last day of the calendar year but paid in the subsequent year), then it is required to pay an excise tax on 4% of any shortfall between the required 85% and the amount that was actually distributed. Any of these taxes would decrease cash available for distribution to our stockholders. In addition, in order to meet the REIT qualification requirements, or to avert the imposition of a 100% tax that applies to certain gains derived by a REIT from dealer property or inventory, we may hold some of our assets through taxable REIT subsidiaries. Such subsidiaries will be subject to corporate level income tax at regular rates.

Complying with REIT requirements may cause us to forego otherwise attractive opportunities.

To qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes, we must continually satisfy tests concerning, among other things, the sources of our income, the nature and diversification of our assets, the amounts we distribute to our stockholders and the ownership of our stock. We also may be required to make distributions to stockholders at disadvantageous times or when we do not have funds readily available for distribution. Thus, compliance with the REIT requirements may hinder our ability to make certain attractive investments.

Complying with REIT requirements may limit our ability to hedge effectively.

The existing REIT provisions of the Internal Revenue Code may substantially limit our ability to hedge our operations because a significant amount of the income from those hedging transactions is likely to be treated as non-qualifying income for purposes of both REIT gross income tests. In addition, we must limit our aggregate income from non-qualified hedging

[Table of Contents](#)

transactions, from our provision of services and from other non-qualifying sources, to less than 5% of our annual gross income (determined without regard to gross income from qualified hedging transactions). As a result, we may have to limit our use of certain hedging techniques or implement those hedges through total return swaps. This could result in greater risks associated with changes in interest rates than we would otherwise want to incur or could increase the cost of our hedging activities. If we fail to comply with these limitations, we could lose our REIT qualification for U.S. federal income tax purposes, unless our failure was due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, and we meet certain other technical requirements. Even if our failure was due to reasonable cause, we might incur a penalty tax.

The “taxable mortgage pool” rules may increase the taxes that we or our stockholders may incur, and may limit the manner in which we effect future securitizations.

Certain of our securitizations have resulted in the creation of taxable mortgage pools for federal income tax purposes. As a REIT, so long as we own 100% of the equity interests in a taxable mortgage pool, we would generally not be adversely affected by the characterization of the securitization as a taxable mortgage pool. Certain categories of stockholders, however, such as foreign stockholders eligible for treaty or other benefits, stockholders with net operating losses, and certain tax-exempt stockholders that are subject to unrelated business income tax, could be subject to increased taxes on a portion of their dividend income from us that is attributable to the taxable mortgage pool. In addition, to the extent that our stock is owned by tax-exempt “disqualified organizations,” such as certain government-related entities and charitable remainder trusts that are not subject to tax on unrelated business income, we may incur a corporate level tax on a portion of our income from the taxable mortgage pool. In that case, we may reduce the amount of our distributions to any disqualified organization whose stock ownership gave rise to the tax.

Maintenance of our Investment Company Act exemption imposes limits on our operations.

We conduct our operations so as not to become regulated as an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended. We believe that there are a number of exemptions under the Investment Company Act that may be applicable to us. The assets that we may acquire, therefore, are limited by the provisions of the Investment Company Act and the rules and regulations promulgated under the Investment Company Act. In addition, we could, among other things, be required either (a) to change the manner in which we conduct our operations to avoid being required to register as an investment company or (b) to register as an investment company, either of which could adversely affect us and the market price for our stock.

ERISA may restrict investments by plans in our common stock.

A plan fiduciary considering an investment in our common stock should consider, among other things, whether such an investment is consistent with the fiduciary obligations under ERISA, including whether such investment might constitute or give rise to a prohibited transaction under ERISA, the Internal Revenue Code or any substantially similar federal, state or local law and, if so, whether an exemption from such prohibited transaction rules is available.

Maryland takeover statutes may prevent a change of our control. This could depress our stock price.

Under Maryland law, “business combinations” between a Maryland corporation and an interested stockholder or an affiliate of an interested stockholder are prohibited for five years after the most recent date on which the interested stockholder becomes an interested stockholder. These business combinations include certain mergers, consolidations, share exchanges, or, in circumstances specified in the statute, an asset transfer or issuance or reclassification of equity securities or a liquidation or dissolution. An interested stockholder is defined as:

- any person who beneficially owns 10% or more of the voting power of the corporation’s outstanding shares; or
- an affiliate or associate of a corporation who, at any time within the two-year period prior to the date in question, was the beneficial owner of 10% or more of the voting power of the then outstanding stock of the corporation.

A person is not an interested stockholder under the statute if the board of directors approved in advance the transaction by which he or she otherwise would have become an interested stockholder.

After the five-year prohibition, any business combination between the Maryland corporation and an interested stockholder generally must be recommended by the board of directors of the corporation and approved by the affirmative vote of at least:

- 80% of the votes entitled to be cast by holders of outstanding shares of voting stock of the corporation voting together as a single group; and

Table of Contents

- two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by holders of voting stock of the corporation other than shares held by the interested stockholder with whom or with whose affiliate the business combination is to be effected or held by an affiliate or associate of the interested stockholder voting together as a single voting group.

The business combination statute may discourage others from trying to acquire control of us and increase the difficulty of consummating any offer, including potential acquisitions that might involve a premium price for our common stock or otherwise be in the best interest of our stockholders.

Our authorized, but unissued common and preferred stock may prevent a change in our control.

Our charter authorizes us to issue additional authorized but unissued shares of our common stock or preferred stock. In addition, our board of directors may classify or reclassify any unissued shares of common stock or preferred stock and may set the preferences, rights and other terms of the classified or reclassified shares. As a result, our board may establish a series of preferred stock that could delay or prevent a transaction or a change in control that might involve a premium price for our common stock or otherwise be in the best interest of our stockholders.

Our stockholder rights plan could inhibit a change in our control.

We have adopted a stockholder rights agreement. Under the terms of the rights agreement, in general, if a person or group acquires more than 15% of the outstanding shares of our common stock, all of our other common stockholders will have the right to purchase securities from us at a discount to such securities' fair market value, thus causing substantial dilution to the acquiring person. The rights agreement may have the effect of inhibiting or impeding a change in control not approved by our board of directors and, therefore, could adversely affect our stockholders' ability to realize a premium over the then-prevailing market price for our common stock in connection with such a transaction. In addition, since our board of directors can prevent the rights agreement from operating, in the event our board approves of an acquiring person, the rights agreement gives our board of directors significant discretion over whether a potential acquirer's efforts to acquire a large interest in us will be successful. Because the rights agreement contains provisions that are designed to assure that the executive officers, our manager and its affiliates will never, alone, be considered a group that is an acquiring person, the rights agreement provides the executive officers, our manager and its affiliates with certain advantages under the rights agreement that are not available to other stockholders.

Our staggered board and other provisions of our charter and bylaws may prevent a change in our control.

Our board of directors is divided into three classes of directors. Directors of each class are chosen for three-year terms upon the expiration of their current terms, and each year one class of directors is elected by the stockholders. The staggered terms of our directors may reduce the possibility of a tender offer or an attempt at a change in control, even though a tender offer or change in control might be in the best interest of our stockholders. In addition, our charter and bylaws also contain other provisions that may delay or prevent a transaction or a change in control that might involve a premium price for our common stock or otherwise be in the best interest of our stockholders.

Risks Related to Our Common Shares

Our share price has fluctuated meaningfully, particularly on a percentage basis, and may fluctuate meaningfully in the future. Accordingly, you may not be able to resell your shares at or above the price at which you purchased them.

The trading price of our common shares has recently been volatile. Moreover, future share price fluctuations could likely be subject to similarly wide price fluctuations in the future in response to various factors, including:

- market conditions in the broader stock market in general, or in the REIT or real estate industry in particular;
- market perception of our current and projected financial condition, potential growth, future earnings and future cash dividends;
- actual or anticipated fluctuations in our quarterly financial and operating results;
- market perception or media coverage of our manager or its affiliates;
- actions by rating agencies;
- short sales of our common stock;
- issuance of new or changed securities analysts' reports or recommendations;
- media coverage of us, other REITs or the outlook of the real estate industry;
- major reductions in trading volumes on the exchanges on which we operate;
- credit deterioration within our portfolio;

Table of Contents

- legislative or regulatory developments, including changes in the status of our regulatory approvals or licenses; and
- litigation and governmental investigations.

These and other factors may cause the market price and demand for our common shares to fluctuate substantially, which may negatively affect the price or liquidity of our common shares. Moreover, the recent market conditions have negatively impacted our share price and may do so in the future. When the market price of a stock has been volatile or has decreased significantly in the past, holders of that stock have, at times, instituted securities class action litigation against the company that issued the stock. If any of our shareholders brought a lawsuit against us, we could incur substantial costs defending, settling or paying any resulting judgments related to the lawsuit. Such a lawsuit could also divert the time and attention of our management from our business and hurt our share price.

We may be unable – or elect not – to pay dividends on our common or preferred shares in the future, which would negatively impact our business in a number of ways and decrease the price of our common and preferred shares.

We have not paid dividends on our common stock since the third fiscal quarter of 2008. While we are required to make distributions in order to maintain our REIT status (as described above under “–We may be unable to generate sufficient revenue from operations to pay our operating expenses and to pay distributions to our stockholders”), we may elect not to maintain our REIT status, in which case we would no longer be required to make such distributions. Moreover, even if we do elect to maintain our REIT status, we may elect to comply with the applicable requirements by, after completing various procedural steps, distributing, under certain circumstances, up to 90% of the required amount in the form of common shares in lieu of cash. If we elect not to maintain our REIT status or to satisfy any required distributions in common shares in lieu of cash, such action could negatively affect our business and financial condition as well as the price of both our common and preferred shares. No assurance can be given that we will pay any dividends on our common shares in the future.

In addition, our board of directors have elected not to declare any of the specified dividends on our three series of preferred stock in the second quarter of 2010. Until we pay all accrued dividends on our preferred shares, we cannot pay any dividends on our common shares, pay any consideration to repurchase or otherwise acquire shares of our common stock or redeem any shares of any series of our preferred stock without redeeming all of our outstanding preferred shares in accordance with the governing documentation. Consequently, the failure to pay dividends on our preferred shares restricts the actions that we may take with respect to our common shares and preferred shares. Moreover, if we do not pay dividends on any series of preferred stock for six or more periods, then holders of each affected series obtain the right to call a special meeting and elect two members to our board of directors. We cannot predict whether the holders of our preferred stock would take such action or, if taken, how long the process would take or what impact the two new directors on our board of directors would have on our company (other than increasing our director compensation costs). However, the election of additional directors would affect the composition of our board of directors and, thus, could affect the management of our business.

Shares eligible for future sale may adversely affect our common stock price.

Sales of our common stock or other securities in the public or private market, or the perception that these sales may occur, could cause the market price of our common stock to decline. This could also impair our ability to raise additional capital through the sale of our equity securities. Under our certificate of incorporation, we are authorized to issue up to 500,000,000 shares of common stock, of which 62,024,945 shares of common stock were outstanding as of June 30, 2010. We cannot predict the size of future issuances of our common stock or other securities or the effect, if any, that future sales and issuances would have on the market price of our common stock.

An increase in market interest rates may have an adverse effect on the market price of our common stock.

One of the factors that investors may consider in deciding whether to buy or sell shares of our common stock is our distribution rate as a percentage of our share price relative to market interest rates. If the market price of our common stock is based primarily on the earnings and return that we derive from our investments and income with respect to our investments and our related distributions to stockholders, and not from the market value of the investments themselves, then interest rate fluctuations and capital market conditions will likely affect the market price of our common stock. For instance, if market interest rates rise without an increase in our distribution rate, the market price of our common stock could decrease as potential investors may require a higher distribution yield on our common stock or seek other securities paying higher distributions or interest. In addition, rising interest rates would result in increased interest expense on our variable rate debt, thereby adversely affecting cash flow and our ability to service our indebtedness and pay distributions.

[Table of Contents](#)

Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds

None.

Item 3. Defaults upon Senior Securities

None.

Item 4. Reserved

Item 5. Other Information

None.

Table of Contents

Item 6. Exhibits

- 3.1 Articles of Amendment and Restatement (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Registration Statement on Form S-11 (File No. 333-90578), Exhibit 3.1).
- 3.2 Articles Supplementary Relating to the Series B Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended March 31, 2003, Exhibit 3.3).
- 3.3 Articles Supplementary Relating to the Series C Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-K, Exhibit 3.3, filed on October 25, 2005).
- 3.4 Articles Supplementary Relating to the Series D Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-A, Exhibit 3.1, filed on March 14, 2007).
- 3.5 Amended and Restated By-laws (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 8-K, Exhibit 3.1, filed on May 5, 2006).
- 4.1 Rights Agreement between the Registrant and American Stock Transfer and Trust Company, as Rights Agent, dated October 16, 2002 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended September 30, 2002, Exhibit 4.1).
- 4.2 Junior Subordinated Indenture between Newcastle Investment Corp. and The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association, dated April 30, 2009 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-K, Exhibit 4.1, filed on May 4, 2009).
- 4.3 Pledge and Security Agreement between Newcastle Investment Corp. and The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association, as trustee, dated April 30, 2009 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-K, Exhibit 4.2, filed on May 4, 2009).
- 4.4 Pledge, Security Agreement and Account Control Agreement among Newcastle Investment Corp., NIC TP LLC, as pledgor, and The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association, as bank and trustee, dated April 30, 2009 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-K, Exhibit 4.3, filed on May 4, 2009).
- 10.1 Amended and Restated Management and Advisory Agreement by and among the Registrant and Fortress Investment Group LLC, dated June 23, 2003 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Registration Statement on Form S-11 (File No. 333-106135), Exhibit 10.1).
- 10.2 Newcastle Investment Corp. Nonqualified Stock Option and Incentive Award Plan Amended and Restated Effective as of February 11, 2004 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005, Exhibit 10.2).
- 10.3 Exchange Agreement between Newcastle Investment Corp. and Taberna Preferred Funding IV, Ltd., Taberna Preferred Funding V, Ltd., Taberna Preferred Funding VI, Ltd. and Taberna Preferred Funding VII, Ltd., dated April 30, 2009 (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-K, Exhibit 10.1, filed on May 4, 2009).
- 10.4 Exchange Agreement, dated as of January 29, 2010, by and among Newcastle Investment Corp., Taberna Capital Management, LLC, Taberna Preferred Funding IV, Ltd., Taberna Preferred Funding V, Ltd., Taberna Preferred Funding VI, Ltd. and Taberna Preferred Funding VII, Ltd. (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Report on Form 8-K, Exhibit 10.1, filed on February 2, 2010).
- 21.1 Subsidiaries of the Registrant (incorporated by reference to the Registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2009, Exhibit 21.1)
- 31.1 Certification of Chief Executive Officer as adopted pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 31.2 Certification of Chief Financial Officer as adopted pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 32.1 Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 32.2 Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized:

NEWCASTLE INVESTMENT CORP.

August 6, 2010

By: /s/ Kenneth M. Riis
Kenneth M. Riis
Chief Executive Officer and President

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

By: /s/ Brian C. Sigman
Brian C. Sigman
Chief Financial Officer

August 6, 2010

EXHIBIT 31.1

CERTIFICATION OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

I, Kenneth M. Riis, certify that:

1. I have reviewed this quarterly report on Form 10-Q of Newcastle Investment Corp.;
2. Based on my knowledge, this report does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which such statements were made, not misleading with respect to the period covered by this report;
3. Based on my knowledge, the financial statements, and other financial information included in this report, fairly present in all material respects the financial condition, results of operations and cash flows of the registrant as of, and for, the periods presented in this report;
4. The registrant's other certifying officers and I are responsible for establishing and maintaining disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e)) and internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f)) for the registrant and have:
 - a) Designed such disclosure controls and procedures, or caused such disclosure controls and procedures to be designed under our supervision, to ensure that material information relating to the registrant, including its consolidated subsidiaries, is made known to us by others within those entities, particularly during the period in which this report is being prepared;
 - b) Designed such internal control over financial reporting, or caused such internal control over financial reporting to be designed under our supervision, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;
 - c) Evaluated the effectiveness of the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures and presented in this report our conclusions about the effectiveness of the disclosure controls and procedures, as of the end of the period covered by this report based on such evaluation; and
 - d) Disclosed in this report any change in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the registrant's most recent fiscal quarter (the registrant's fourth fiscal quarter in the case of an annual report) that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the registrant's internal control over financial reporting; and
5. The registrant's other certifying officers and I have disclosed, based on our most recent evaluation of internal control over financial reporting, to the registrant's auditors and the audit committee of registrant's board of directors (or persons performing the equivalent functions):
 - a) All significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in the design or operation of internal control over financial reporting which are reasonably likely to adversely affect the registrant's ability to record, process, summarize and report financial information; and
 - b) Any fraud, whether or not material, that involves management or other employees who have a significant role in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting.

August 6, 2010
(Date)

/s/ Kenneth M. Riis
Kenneth M. Riis
Chief Executive Officer

EXHIBIT 31.2

CERTIFICATION OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

I, Brian C. Sigman, certify that:

1. I have reviewed this quarterly report on Form 10-Q of Newcastle Investment Corp.;
2. Based on my knowledge, this report does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which such statements were made, not misleading with respect to the period covered by this report;
3. Based on my knowledge, the financial statements, and other financial information included in this report, fairly present in all material respects the financial condition, results of operations and cash flows of the registrant as of, and for, the periods presented in this report;
4. The registrant's other certifying officers and I are responsible for establishing and maintaining disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e)) and internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f)) for the registrant and have:
 - a) Designed such disclosure controls and procedures, or caused such disclosure controls and procedures to be designed under our supervision, to ensure that material information relating to the registrant, including its consolidated subsidiaries, is made known to us by others within those entities, particularly during the period in which this report is being prepared;
 - b) Designed such internal control over financial reporting, or caused such internal control over financial reporting to be designed under our supervision, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;
 - c) Evaluated the effectiveness of the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures and presented in this report our conclusions about the effectiveness of the disclosure controls and procedures, as of the end of the period covered by this report based on such evaluation; and
 - d) Disclosed in this report any change in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the registrant's most recent fiscal quarter (the registrant's fourth fiscal quarter in the case of an annual report) that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the registrant's internal control over financial reporting; and
5. The registrant's other certifying officers and I have disclosed, based on our most recent evaluation of internal control over financial reporting, to the registrant's auditors and the audit committee of registrant's board of directors (or persons performing the equivalent functions):
 - a) All significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in the design or operation of internal control over financial reporting which are reasonably likely to adversely affect the registrant's ability to record, process, summarize and report financial information; and
 - b) Any fraud, whether or not material, that involves management or other employees who have a significant role in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting.

August 6, 2010
(Date)

/s/ Brian C. Sigman
Brian C. Sigman
Chief Financial Officer

EXHIBIT 32.1

**CERTIFICATION OF CEO PURSUANT TO
18 U.S.C. SECTION 1350,
AS ADOPTED PURSUANT TO
SECTION 906 OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**

In connection with the Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q of Newcastle Investment Corp. (the "Company") for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2010 as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on the date hereof (the "Report"), Kenneth M. Riis, as Chief Executive Officer of the Company, hereby certifies, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, that, to the best of his knowledge:

- (1) The Report fully complies with the requirements of Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and
- (2) The information contained in the Report fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations of the Company.

/s/ Kenneth M. Riis

Kenneth M. Riis
Chief Executive Officer
August 6, 2010

This certification accompanies the Report pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and shall not, except to the extent required by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, be deemed filed by the Company for purposes of Section 18 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

A signed original of this written statement required by Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 has been provided to the Company and will be retained by the Company and furnished to the Securities and Exchange Commission or its staff upon request.

EXHIBIT 32.2

**CERTIFICATION OF CFO PURSUANT TO
18 U.S.C. SECTION 1350,
AS ADOPTED PURSUANT TO
SECTION 906 OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**

In connection with the Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q of Newcastle Investment Corp. (the "Company") for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2010 as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on the date hereof (the "Report"), Brian C. Sigman, as Chief Financial Officer of the Company, hereby certifies, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, that, to the best of his knowledge:

- (1) The Report fully complies with the requirements of Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and
- (2) The information contained in the Report fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations of the Company.

/s/ Brian C. Sigman

Brian C. Sigman
Chief Financial Officer
August 6, 2010

This certification accompanies the Report pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and shall not, except to the extent required by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, be deemed filed by the Company for purposes of Section 18 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

A signed original of this written statement required by Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 has been provided to the Company and will be retained by the Company and furnished to the Securities and Exchange Commission or its staff upon request.

End of Filing