

January 2, 2024

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,

Debtors

Chapter 11

Case No- 19-23649

**STATEMENT BY INDIVIDUAL, PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMANT [REDACTED] TO THE COURT,
THE US TRUSTEE, THE SUPREME COURT, LAWYERS REPRESENTING THE DEBTORS AND THOSE
CLAIMING TO REPRESENT THE VICTIMS IN THIS CASE.**

WHEREAS, PRO SE CLAIMANT [REDACTED] has made several **GOODFAITH** efforts, documented on the **DOCKET**, in a genuine effort to remedy her concerns, born from lived experience surviving the effects of opiates and the resulting organizational brain issues, with the Plan so that they could be resolved without further litigation and her valid **OBJECTIONS** were timely made; she rightly claims **NO GOODFAITH** effort was made to gain **CONSENT FOR RELEASES** from her in this matter;

WHEREAS, each month the **ESTATE** has been avariciously drained and depleted in value by the **"RUNUP"** in **EXCESSIVE FEES** by agents and their governmental counterparts negotiating the case;

WHEREAS, Judge Drain stated that nothing in this case precludes the ability of individuals to mediate their claims outside the bankruptcy process, Individual **[REDACTED]** reached out to the **DEBTORS** and was **NOT** given a **GOODFAITH** opportunity to **RESOLVE** her **CONCERNS** and give **CONSENT for RELEASES**;

WHEREAS, most of the **RESPONDENTS** to the Supreme Court filing have cited the potential for **PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMANTS** with **VALID, EVIDENTIARY** claims, like hers, to make a **RUN** for the courthouse to sue the Sackler family and then use that as their reasoning that the releases must be approved **WITHOUT CONSENT**;

WHEREAS, INDIVIDUALS injured by the **DEBTORS** and the Sackler family have every right to seek their own justice; most people truly injured just want to help others and use their time left

on this earth to prevent further drug addiction and use their compensation to avoid further abuse of patients by a corrupted PharMedical Healthcare System.

THEREFORE, IT IS HER INTENTION TO POINT OUT SOME OF THE ERRORS IN THE ASSUMPTIONS MADE BY PARTIES RESPONDING TO AND NEGOTIATING THIS CASE:

Due to the written arguments and the emotionally damaging name calling of claimants who have OBJECTED to the plan and voted NO, such as herself, during the oral arguments at the Supreme Court for this case, [REDACTED] is compelled to make a few things clear to all involved.

1. The **RESPONDENTS** and parties negotiating this case wrongly assume that survivors are just like them with an intention to use the process for excessive personal gain. The US Trustee is correct in assuming that a **RESOLUTION** is possible, if only, a **GOODFAITH** effort were to be made.
2. In **GOODFAITH**, [REDACTED] shared parts of her vulnerable "lived experience" dealing with opiates both as a former worker in the pharmaceutical industry, having worked at two private psychiatric institutions and other hospitals, and as a patient trapped within the Pain Management System. She had hopes that the 'powers that be' would take that information and use it to do **GOOD**. Unfortunately, the System being implemented through the funds generated from this case and others are designed to **SIPHON** off the top in bureaucratic waste while at the same time **FILTERING** all funds through an **ANTI-NATURE, ANTI-GOD** agenda, which puts everyone in this country at greater risk.
3. It is clear now that there was **NEVER** any intention for a **GOODFAITH** effort by the parties managing this case to seriously consider **CLAIMS** that **DO NOT** fit the "approved" narrative. They have continued on, as if the points were never made, even stating in their Response to the Supreme Court case that "**the record is devoid of any evidence**" as to why anyone **OBJECTED** to the plan and voted **NO**.
 - a. For example, in the Response made by the **AD HOC Committee** to the Supreme Court, they state that "**As to personal injury victims who voted against the Plan, the record is devoid of any evidence as to why those individuals voted the way they did....**" (page 37)
4. In addition, the '**powers that be**' seem to be trapped within in a '**prison of two ideas**' while they **NEVER** made a **GOODFAITH** effort to obtain **CONSENT for RELEASES** by genuinely considering the reasons for her **OBJECTIONS**. They just used their "requisite skills" to shut her down rather than actually attempt to understand her "lived experience" and the difficulty in even bringing concerns forward in such a difficult venue. She is a **Surviving Victim** in this case and the parties in power did **NOT** take seriously her concerns, at all. They even removed her name from the list to receive

NOTICE after she requested to be placed on it and received Plan documents to her for review.

5. Firms make monthly submissions for “time” spent reading one another’s “time sheets”, expounding upon the “time and labor devoted” and the legal complexity of the case as a basis for the “skill requisite to properly perform the legal services.” As an example, in Docket# **5980**, the firm states:
 - a. “time and labor devoted is only one of the many factors to be considered in awarding compensation.”
 - b. However, the same consideration is NOT given to the very people firms like this represent, the personal injury victims. No such consideration of compensation is given for the Survivor’s “lost time” or “suffering”, or even the **EVIDENCE** they might have to prove their **CLAIM**.
 - c. In addition, firms lay out the “terms” for one another and justify their ever-rising fees based on whatever they decide is “customary”.
6. **SURVIVORS** forced to represent themselves are at an extreme disadvantage because of the “**Difficulty by Design**” nature of this case and others. It is clear that it is a mass “**paper- producing, money-making scheme**” for bureaucrats and lawyers, which is what [REDACTED] had hoped would not be the case due to the fact that this is a **NATIONAL CRISIS**, and shouldn’t become an opportunity for **AVARICE**. None of the calls she made to the groups representing victims was ever returned.
7. Furthermore, **INDIVIDUAL, PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMS** are receiving **UNFAIR AND UNEQUAL** treatment. Personal Injury Claimant’s **COMPENSATION** has been arbitrarily limited and their **EVIDENCE** is **NOT** even considered so as to spread out compensation regardless of **EVIDENCE**, disregarding the fact that the **STATES** and other governmental institutions are receiving the **BULK of the ESTATE** to treat those with little to **NO EVIDENCE** due to illegal drug use. The **CREDITORS** who participated in creating the crisis, such as: hospitals, governments, and others are given **PRIORITY STATUS**, yet they are the very ones ignoring Survivors who have “lived experience” that does not comport with the “**official narrative**” being pushed by the “Recovery System” being created. They seem interested only in hearing from those they can **MANIPULATE** and **CONTROL** to maintain the narrative instead of considering **ALL** truth. Most people who took as many prescription drugs as she did, died and are unable to share their experience.
8. The Plan was already set and the law firms managing the case are the ones who made the **RUNUP** to the “**free-for-all**” by draining the **ESTATE** of **VALUE** every time they raised their exorbitant fee schedules [REDACTED] wondered why none of the firms representing the injured objected, but then realized, they are the very firms personally profiting off of this process. Those who are charged to maximize the value of the **ESTATE**

are draining it with their refusal to act in **GOODFAITH** with **OBJECTORS** who voted **NO** to the Plan and thereby are delaying the conclusion of the process.

9. It is clear that the parties who developed this Plan did not expect someone with her "lived experience" and over 15 years of **EVIDENCE** and **RECEIPTS** to **OBJECT** and vote **NO**. But it is about much more than money to her, as it would be to anyone who was truly injured. They wrongly assume that she would be unreasonable, even though she tried to offer **REASONABLE REMEDIES** for her **OBJECTIONS**. They **DID NOT** display **GOODFAITH** and the mistreatment by those in the Recovery Community and those in power (local, state and national), was emotionally damaging to her and **ADDED** to her injuries.
10. Indeed, the "**ONE NUTCASE HOLDOUT**" comment, by Justice Kagan, was inflammatory and hurtful, especially given that the possibility of receiving **CONSENT for RELEASES** was always available if a **GOODFAITH** effort had only been explored.
11. [REDACTED] stated previously that she had hoped that this case would NOT be treated like every other mass tort case, whereby the only winners are the lawyers and victims receive scant justice; however, as stated, she was disappointed by the avaricious system being implemented and **NO ONE**, with any **real** power sought to **OBJECT** to it, but rather joined in.

It is therefore [REDACTED] plea to this **Court**, the **U. S. Trustee** and the **Supreme Court**, along with all those involved in negotiating this Plan to escape the "**Prison of Two Ideas**" and display **GOODFAITH** in a manner that does **NOT** contain the avarice, so clearly exhibited in Docket submissions for payment every month to push through a Plan that creates a Circular Funding Scheme focused on implementing the **ANTI-NATURE, ANTI-GOD**; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion agenda of the current administration.

[REDACTED] is pointing out that a **GOODFAITH** effort is necessary to receive **CONSENT for RELEASES**, and as a "**ONE NUTCASE HOLDOUT**" with ample evidence to prove her **CLAIM**, there was **NONE** given. Due to the added emotional injuries, she received by those who weaponized her exposed vulnerabilities, she requests that serious consideration be made to resolve these issues in **GOODFAITH**.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

REFERENCED DOCKET SUBMISSION LINKS:

Docket #4405 Letter to Debtors

[126022044084-rep-0203123306 \(40\).pdf](#)

Docket #4406 Letter of Apology

[126022044094-rep-0203123308 \(9\).pdf](#)

Docket #4394 Statement on 8th Monitoring Report

[126022037473-rep-2502095505 \(11\).pdf](#)

Docket #6021 Statement in Support of Supreme Court Review

[8aead996-b952-4cb3-885b-26273f626530 \(2\).pdf](#)

Supreme Court Docket Response by Ad HOC Committee

[20231020185002099 23-124 Respondents Brief.pdf \(supremecourt.gov\)](#)

Docket #5980

[67dd09f4-3924-48fd-9a43-c96e928d7762 \(1\).pdf](#)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, [REDACTED] Pro Se Claimant certify that the above-mentioned statement and associated Docket Links were presented by email on January 2, 2024, to the following:

Debtors' Counsel

- Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
<https://www.davispolk.com/>
Phone: 212.450.4000
Fax: 212.701.5800

Marshall S. Huebner
Timothy Graulich
Eli J. Vonnegut

- United States Trustee

U.S. Federal Office Building
201 Varick Street, Suite 1006
New York, NY 10014
<https://www.justice.gov/ust-regions-r02>
Phone: 212.510.0500
Fax: 212.668.2255

- United States Bankruptcy Court

Southern District of New York
300 Quarropas Street
White Plains, NY 10601-4140
<http://www.nysb.uscourts.gov>
Phone: 212.668.5637