[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:	Chapter 11
	Case No. 20-10343 (LSS)
BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA AND	(Jointly Administered)
DELAWARE BSA, LLC,	
	REQUEST FOR COURT'S OWN MOTION
Debtors.	IN THE MATTER OF 14TH AMENDMENT
	VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTION
	FINANCIAL FRAUD CLASS ACTION

SNAPSIS

IN RE: CLAIMANT [redacted] PRO PER, SST-redact and all similar bankruptcy creditors (Est. 20,000 from 20 states out of 50 states) in this Class Action, under the direct supervision of this Court that is administered by the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST, Honorable Barbara J. Houser (Ret.), in her capacity as Trustee of the BSA Settlement Trust, requesting that this Honorable United States

Bankruptcy Judge Laurie Selber Silverstein make its own motion as is required to correct the clear violations of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, 14th AMENDMENT.(sample provided)

After the SETTLEMENT TRUST reviews and evaluates the claim offered by the Sexually Abused victim and upon agreement using established procedures determining the amount of the Settlement claim, and as a matter of final evaluations for various deductions required to be withheld as may include various items specific to any state, the amount of the Settlement is mitigated and identified and finally stated.

In this process of mitigation of the Settlement Award which may be reduced by this process, the remainder of the settlement is now known and is eligible for payment therefrom.

Unfortunately, this is against the law! Equal protection failed!

BACKGROUND

Reporting on the actions of the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST as CLAIMANT [redacted] PRO PER, SST-redact was processed and awarded the Settlement Amount only to find that the state of Kansas restricts payment to about 2%, a high-level of rage fell upon me. Having already suffered the trauma of Sexual Abuse and now for a second time being

abused is overwhelming.

DISCOVERY

Having no knowledge of the disparity between several states in the form of Sexual Abuse Settlement payment restrictions, I discovered that this was the case for abut 20 states and 20,000 victims and began analytical evaluation of the situation. I commenced by contacting the 5 local Law Schools. Knowledgeable persons overwhelmingly asserted the 14th Amendment violation and Financial Fraud collecting 100% but paying out 2% thats a good deal for some and a bad deal for others.

I was further advised that to be sure to include all the facts in detail, so if the requested action is not delivered, the brief is ready to be heard by the Appellate Court as a fully briefed item.

INTRODUCTION

The process of allowing each state's inferior laws to interfere with the superior federal court proceedings brings to bear the principal of EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW as written in the 14th Amendment of the
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

The class of Sexually Abused victims MUST be treated exactly the same
as to any variation from the 50 States of the Union. With

some estimates, of about 20,000 abuse victims coming from PAYMENT RESTRICTIVE STATES, we have a perfect storm violating the 14th Amendment.

Do not abandon the 20,000 abuse victims again!

FINANCIAL FRAUD - When checking with the NEW BSA and the local Kansas insurance agents, we find that their insurance companies paid 100% of the contracted insurance amounts to the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST, NOT JUST 1% or so, but the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST is distributing only 1 to 2% to Kansas Sexual Victims, which is financial fraud as well as violation of 14th Amendment.

In those cases of real estate and art work as well as bank accounts, again title was transferred to SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST to sell and when sold producing cash to pay debtors, all of these funds were taken by the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST, not a refund in sight, no 98% refund, so they again got 100%, but are distributing only 1 to 2%, this is FINANCIAL FRAUD.

Recognition that it was the BSA that was overrun with thousands of cases and was forced to seek PROTECTION under the FEDERAL BANKRUPTCY LAW THAT FURTHER ALLOWED THE INSURANCE AND PROPERTY AND OTHER WELTH TO BE CONFISCATED BY THE BANKRUPTCY COURT TRUST WITH ABSOLUTELY NO RESTRICTIONS ON THE COURTS PROCESS TO DISPERSE THE COMPENSATING FUNDS TO

THE VICTIMS IN the form of SETTLEMENT AMOUNTS WITH NO RESTRICTIONS BY THE SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST.

THIS IS AN INTERNAL ACTION INVOLVING THE COURT CONTROLLED TRUST:

STATE

Suffers no damage

Looses no money

Is still whole with regards to all OTHER CASES.

Providers, insurance, loan, ownership have under contract submitted 100% percent of the contract in play; which they did prior to this action.

ABUSED

There is no down side to this Order.

The Abused tied to states that did not limit are not affected.

The Abused tied to states that did limit are are no longer limited.

PROFFESSION

Advancement is triggered by carful consideration of facts and doing the right thing; your insight is being observed!

CONSTITUTION

14th Amendment PROVIDES

Federal Preemption: A Legal Primer - Congress.gov May 18, 2023 —

The Constitution's Supremacy Clause provides that federal law is "the supreme Law of the Land" notwithstanding any state law to the contrary.

The Fourteenth Amendment - U.S. Constitution
Interpretation: The Supremacy Clause | Constitution Center

The 14th Amendment and the Evolution of Title IX

The 14th Amendment provides, in part, that no state can "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Title IX specifically ...Supreme Court of the United States (.gov)
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, 14th Amendment

The 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution is composed of five sections. Here is the full text:

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of

life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have

engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article [5].

CITATIONS

When searching for law cases involving bankruptcy court conflicts with state law, it's essential to understand that bankruptcy law is primarily governed by federal law. However, state laws can come into play, particularly when it comes to exemptions that determine what property a debtor can protect during bankruptcy.

Key Points to Consider:

- Federal Bankruptcy Court Jurisdiction: Bankruptcy courts have jurisdiction over bankruptcy cases and related proceedings under Title 11 of the United States Code.

- Conflict with State Law: Conflicts between federal bankruptcy law and state law can arise, particularly when it comes to issues like exemptions, and creditor rights. In such cases, the federal bankruptcy court may need to determine whether to apply federal or state law.

- Core and Non-Core Proceedings: Bankruptcy courts have broad authority over core proceedings, which include matters like plan confirmation, dischargeability of debts, and the automatic stay.

Notable Cases:

- Stern v. Marshall (2011): The Supreme Court limited bankruptcy court authority over certain state-law claims, ruling that Article III prevents bankruptcy courts from entering final judgments on claims that are not core to the bankruptcy proceeding.

- Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co. (1982): The Supreme Court held that Article III

hindered Congress' ability to vest bankruptcy courts with jurisdiction to decide certain state-law claims against a party who was not otherwise a party to the bankruptcy proceedings [2] [1].

Resources for Searching Law Cases:

- Federal Court Rules: The Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure govern procedure in cases under title 11 of the United States Code.

Potential Equal Protection Issues:

Trust Distribution Procedure. In the context provided, it refers to a process or plan for distributing payments or settlements, likely in a legal or financial context, such as a trust or a mass tort settlement.

The varying payout structure based on state laws may raise concerns about:

Disparate Treatment: Unequal treatment of claimants based on their state of residence.

Lack of Uniformity: Different application of settlement payments across states.

State Law Conflicts: Conflicts between state laws and the

requirements.

These issues may lead to concerns about fairness, equality, and potential legal challenges.

- Disparate Treatment: Varying payout structure based on state laws may be seen as disparate treatment, potentially violating the equal protection clause of 14th Amendment.

- Lack of Uniformity: The absence of uniform application of settlement payments across states could raise concerns about fairness and equality.

- State Law Conflicts: Conflicts between state laws may lead to unequal treatment of claimants.

Relevant Precedents:

- Yick Wo v. Hopkins: The Supreme Court held that equal protection is denied when laws are applied and administered with an evil eye and unequal hand, resulting in unjust discriminations.

- Magoun v. Illinois Trust & S. B. Co.: The Court emphasized that equal protection requires equal security under the law for everyone in similar circumstances [1].

The BSA's interaction with state laws may raise complex

questions about equal protection. To determine the violations of equal protection principles, a detailed analysis of the specific circumstances and applicable laws would be necessary.

Yick Wo v. Hopkins is a landmark Supreme Court case decided in 1886. Here's what you need to know:

Case Background

The case involved Yick Wo, a Chinese immigrant who owned a laundry business in San Francisco. Despite meeting all requirements, Yick Wo's permit to operate his business was denied, while non-Chinese laundry owners were granted permits. This led to Yick Wo's imprisonment for violating the ordinance [1].

Supreme Court Ruling

The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the law, although neutral on its face, was administered in a prejudicial manner, infringing upon Yick Wo's right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. The court emphasized that equal protection applies to all persons within a state's jurisdiction, regardless of race, color, or nationality [2].

Key Principles

- Equal Protection Clause: The ruling established that laws administered with an "evil eye or an unequal hand" violate a person's right to equal protection.

- Purposeful Discrimination: The case highlighted the importance of purposeful discrimination in determining equal protection violations [3].

Legacy and Impact

Yick Wo v. Hopkins has been cited in over 150 Supreme Court cases and remains a significant precedent in equal protection cases. The case has influenced decisions related to racial discrimination, immigration, and civil rights [4].

Important References

- Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)

    Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution
    Equal Protection Clause [5]

Magoun v. Illinois Trust & Savings Bank is a landmark US Supreme Court case decided in 1898. Here's what you need to know:

Case Background

The case involved Jessie Norton Torrence Magoun, a resident of New York, who filed a bill in equity against the Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, executor of Joseph T. Torrence's estate, and the County Treasurer of Cook County, Illinois. Magoun sought to remove a cloud from the real estate devised by Torrence's will and to enjoin the trust company from paying and the county treasurer from collecting an inheritance tax [1].

Supreme Court Ruling

The Supreme Court ruled that the Illinois inheritance tax law did not conflict with the US Constitution. The court held that:

- Classification for Taxation: The legislature had the power to make classifications for taxation, and the Illinois law's classification was reasonable.

- Power of States over Successions: States have plenary power over successions, and the tax imposed was on the succession, not the property itself [2] [1].

Key Principles

- Equal Protection Clause: The court emphasized that equal protection under the law requires equal security for

everyone in similar circumstances.

- Reasonable Classification: The court established that classifications for taxation must be based on some reasonable ground or difference that bears a just and proper relation to the attempted classification [1].

Impact

Magoun v. Illinois Trust & Savings Bank has been cited in numerous cases and remains an important precedent in tax law and equal protection cases [3].

The RIGHTS of some 50,000 SEXUALLY ABUSED BOY SCOUTS was DENIED by the Bankruptcy Court because it FAILED to require that EVERY STATE'S LAW SUITS MUST provide that their state will not limit in any way the settlements reached by the Trust.

"Equal protection under the law" is a fundamental principle that ensures individuals are treated fairly and without discrimination by the government and legal system. Here are three examples:

1. Anti-discrimination laws in employment: Laws that prohibit employers from discriminating against employees or job applicants based on characteristics such as race, gender, age, religion, disability, or sexual orientation.

This ensures that everyone has an equal opportunity to work and be treated fairly in the workplace.

2. Same-sex marriage rights: The legal recognition of same-sex marriages ensures that couples of the same gender have the same legal rights and protections as heterosexual couples, including benefits like tax benefits, inheritance rights, and hospital visitation rights.

3. Disability rights in public accommodations: Laws that require public places, such as restaurants, stores, and public transportation, to be accessible to people with disabilities. This includes features like wheelchair ramps, accessible restrooms, and accommodations for people with sensory impairments.

These examples illustrate how equal protection under the law works to ensure that all individuals, regardless of their background or characteristics, are treated fairly and have access to the same rights and opportunities [9].

All boy scout sexual abused victim were grouped into a single class under the federal bankruptcy laws and proceedings further allowed all lawsuits in all 50 states against the boy scouts to be consolidated in the single bankruptcy. however some 15 states limit the settlement amounts to 1 % meaning the insurance funds collected in the bankruptcy 98% of these funds are not being paid to those

living in the specific states.

The Boy Scouts of America (BSA) bankruptcy case involved consolidating over 82,000 sexual abuse claims into a single class under federal bankruptcy laws. This allowed for a global settlement to compensate survivors, with a plan approved in September 2022. The settlement established a $2.46 billion trust fund, contributed by the BSA, local councils, insurers, and chartered organizations like churches [1].

Key Aspects of the Settlement:

- Claim Process: Survivors submitted claims, which were evaluated based on severity, location, and other factors using a trust distribution procedure (TDP) matrix.

- Payout Structure: Payments ranged from $3,500 to $2.7 million, depending on the abuse's severity and circumstances.

- Distribution: As of May 2025, over 50% of 58,126 matrix claims were determined, with $164 million paid to approximately 22,605 survivors.

State-Specific Limitations:

Your claim about 15 states limiting settlement amounts to

1% appears inaccurate. While some states have statutes of limitations that may impact claim eligibility, the settlement's payout structure is based on individual claim circumstances rather than state-specific percentage limitations [1] [2].

Statute of Limitations Extensions:

Some states, like Alabama, Ohio, and Iowa, have extended statutes of limitations for child sexual abuse claims, potentially allowing more survivors to file claims [3].

Insurance Contributions:

Insurers like Chubb and Hartford have contributed significantly to the settlement fund, with Chubb agreeing to pay $800 million and Hartford contributing $787 million [1] [4].

Why did the bankruptcy judge fail to require all participants must be eligible to receive the same benefits as determined by the TRUST

The bankruptcy judge's decision to allow varying benefits for participants in the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) bankruptcy case stems from the complexities of bankruptcy law and the specific circumstances of the case.

Key Factors:

- Bankruptcy Code: The BSA's bankruptcy filing under Chapter 11 allows for reorganization and establishment of a trust to compensate creditors, including sexual abuse survivors.

- Trust Distribution Procedure (TDP): The trust's distribution procedure outlines how claims are evaluated and paid out, considering factors like claim severity and jurisdiction-specific laws.

- State-Specific Laws: Some states have laws limiting damages or altering statutes of limitations, which can impact claim payouts.

Potential Reasons for Unequal Benefits:

- Jurisdictional Differences: State laws governing claims can lead to varying payout amounts, as some states may cap damages or have different statutes of limitations.

- Claim Evaluation: The TDP matrix assesses claims based on severity, location and other factors, resulting in differing payout amounts.

- Bankruptcy Court Discretion: Judges have flexibility in approving plans and trusts, balancing competing interests

and ensuring fairness within the bounds of the law [1].

DOES Equal protection under the law apply to the following two irregularities:

1. On the collection side we see that the TRUST is collecting all 100 per cent of the insured and other financial sources without regard to the fact that some 15 states will not allow full payment only allowing about 1 %.

2. On the payout side the TRUET will pay out the amounts determined to be correct but will withhold those amounts some 98% from victims from states that restrict the settlement payments.

Equal protection under the law, as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the US Constitution, requires that states provide equal security under the law to every person within their jurisdiction. This principle prohibits states from denying anyone equal protection of the laws, which includes protection against unjust discrimination.

In the context of the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) bankruptcy case, the trust distribution procedure (TDP) has raised concerns about equal protection. The TDP collects 100% of insured and financial sources, but some states limit settlement payments to around 1%. Meanwhile, the trust withholds approximately 98% of settlement amounts

from victims in states with payment restrictions.

Potential Equal Protection Issues:

- Disparate Treatment: The TDP's varying payout structure based on state laws may be seen as disparate treatment, potentially violating the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

- Lack of Uniformity: The absence of uniform application of settlement payments across states could raise concerns about fairness and equality.

- State Law Conflicts: Conflicts between state laws and the TDP's requirements may lead to unequal treatment of claimants.

Relevant Precedents:

- Yick Wo v. Hopkins: The Supreme Court held that equal protection is denied when laws are applied and administered with an evil eye and unequal hand, resulting in unjust discriminations.

- Magoun v. Illinois Trust & S. B. Co.: The Court emphasized that equal protection requires equal security under the law for everyone in similar circumstances [1].

The BSA's TDP and its interaction with state laws may raise complex questions about equal protection. To determine whether the TDP violates equal protection principles, a detailed analysis of the specific circumstances and applicable laws would be necessary.

Yick Wo v. Hopkins is a landmark Supreme Court case decided in 1886. Here's what you need to know:

Case Background

The case involved Yick Wo, a Chinese immigrant who owned a laundry business in San Francisco. Despite meeting all requirements, Yick Wo's permit to operate his business was denied, while non-Chinese laundry owners were granted permits. This led to Yick Wo's imprisonment for violating the ordinance [1].

Supreme Court Ruling

The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the law, although neutral on its face, was administered in a prejudicial manner, infringing upon Yick Wo's right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. The court emphasized that equal protection applies to all persons within a state's jurisdiction, regardless of race, color, or nationality [2].

Key Principles

- Equal Protection Clause: The ruling established that laws administered with an "evil eye or an unequal hand" violate a person's right to equal protection.

- Purposeful Discrimination: The case highlighted the importance of purposeful discrimination in determining equal protection violations [3].

Legacy and Impact

Yick Wo v. Hopkins has been cited in over 150 Supreme Court cases and remains a significant precedent in equal protection cases. The case has influenced decisions related to racial discrimination, immigration, and civil rights [4].

Important References

- Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)

Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution
Equal Protection Clause [5]

Magoun v. Illinois Trust & Savings Bank is a landmark US Supreme Court case decided in 1898. Here's what you need to know:

Case Background

The case involved Jessie Norton Torrence Magoun, a resident of New York, who filed a bill in equity against the Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, executor of Joseph T. Torrence's estate, and the County Treasurer of Cook County, Illinois. Magoun sought to remove a cloud from the real estate devised by Torrence's will and to enjoin the trust company from paying and the county treasurer from collecting an inheritance tax [1].

Supreme Court Ruling

The Supreme Court ruled that the Illinois inheritance tax law did not conflict with the US Constitution. The court held that:

- Classification for Taxation: The legislature had the power to make classifications for taxation, and the Illinois law's classification was reasonable.

- Power of States over Successions: States have plenary power over successions, and the tax imposed was on the succession, not the property itself [2] [1].

Key Principles

- Equal Protection Clause: The court emphasized that equal protection under the law requires equal security for

everyone in similar circumstances.

- Reasonable Classification: The court established that classifications for taxation must be based on some reasonable ground or difference that bears a just and proper relation to the attempted classification [1].

Impact

Magoun v. Illinois Trust & Savings Bank has been cited in numerous cases and remains an important precedent in tax law and equal protection cases [3].

The RIGHTS of some 50,000 SEXUALLY ABUSED BOY SCOUTS was DENIED by the Bankruptcy Court because it FAILED to require that EVERY STATE'S LAW SUITS MUST provide that their state will not limit in any way the settlements reached by the Trust.

The Boy Scouts of America (BSA) bankruptcy case involved a $2.46 billion settlement to compensate survivors of childhood sexual abuse within its programs. The settlement, approved in September 2022, aimed to equitably distribute funds to survivors while allowing the BSA to reorganize and continue operations.

Key Points:

- Settlement Amount: $2.46 billion settlement fund, with potential additional contributions worth up to $4 billion

- Claimants: Over 82,000 men filed claims, with payments ranging from $3,500 to $2.7 million based on abuse severity and other factors
- Distribution: As of May 2025, over 50% of 58,126 matrix claims were determined, with $164 million paid to approximately 22,605 survivors

State Lawsuits and Settlement Limitations:

The settlement's payout structure considers state-specific laws and statutes of limitations. Some states have "look-back window" laws, allowing survivors to file claims decades after the abuse occurred. However, others have stricter limitations, potentially reducing survivor participation and impacting payout amounts [1].

Do not abandon the 20,000 abuse victims again!

Equal Protection Concerns:

Some argue that the settlement's varying payout structure based on state laws may raise equal protection concerns. The BSA's settlement plan was upheld by various courts, despite opposition from some survivors and insurers [2].

Current Status:

The BSA has emerged from bankruptcy, and the settlement trust continues to process claims. Further appeals are possible, including potential Supreme Court involvement.

Summary: Knowing that it would be an advantage to consolidate the BSA federal bankruptcy into one all 50 state proceeding, but to do so, each state must provide that any settlement determined by the Trust must be paid in full with no state imposed limitation otherwise the state may not enter under this bankruptcy umbrella.

Do not abandon the 20,000 abuse victims again!

To consolidate the BSA federal bankruptcy into one all-state proceeding, each state would need to agree to allow settlements determined by the Trust to be paid in full, without any state-imposed limitations. If a state has laws limiting settlement payments, it would need to waive or adjust those limitations to participate in the consolidated proceeding. This would ensure equal treatment for all claimants across states.

IN CLOSING:

A miscarriage of justice that I can not allow to exist.

This is not an arbitrary or capricious act, rather it is precise and required. To level the field Arbitrary and capricious are terms often used in legal, administrative, and decision-making contexts to describe actions or decisions that are unreasonable, unjustified, or lacking a rational basis.

This is a CLASS ACTION PROCEEDING, thus <u>ALL MEMBERS</u> MUST BE TREATED EQUALLY.

Do not abandon the 20,000 abuse victims again!

What about JOHN who owes alimony will this deduction violate 14th Amendment. NO it is a debt due to be collected by another agency.

CLARIFICATIONS OF SITUATIONS WITH DIFFERING CONDITIONS:
How does Bill in Kansas differ from Jack in Iowa?

Iowa had the intelligence to remove all laws interfering with any restricted Settlement payments to members of this class.

Kansas has not, BUT this will not have any affect on this Order, because:

1. Kansas BSA had insurance that paid 100% of contacted amount to the Trust, so the Trust got 100% of it.

2. BSA had real estate and property that was used to meet liability claims, so the trust got title to all these properties and sold them to convert to cash snd was paid 100% and deposited that 100% in the general payment Trust fund account.

Notifications

Their are no required notifications because:

1. This ORDER is an internal document within the Bankrupt proceedings, essentially the Court can and will correct this error avoiding the 14th Amendment by ORDERING the Trust to modify its payment record.

2. Since none of the states are a participant, no notice is required.

Crime against the abused to allow these inferior what reason legislation at the state level.

GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF BANKRUPTCY

Since the Boy Scouts exist in every state and several foreign countries, it is no surprise to find that with some 85,000 boys coming forward as victims that this would indeed be the case in every state.

Most states, about 35, have no restriction on Settlement Payments, but a few, some 15, have from a little to more to essentially full denial of Settlement Payments. States may do what they want about how to interpret this issue snd whatever they may do has no prevailing affect, since when in the control of the BANKRUPTCY COURT, YOU PLAY WITH THEIR RULES which do include the awesome power of the 14th amendment of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

LEGAL SCOPE OF BANKRUPTCY

When the participants in a case becomes under the control of the bankruptcy court, it now assumes full control as the price paid for its benefits. The BSA is protected by the laws providing for bankruptcy allowing continued operations and recovery after the fact.
The rules of each state now has little to no influence on how and why the bankruptcy court acts. And each state may do different things with different affects that do NOT TRIGGER THE 14TH AMENDMENT.

BUT WHEN INVOLVED IN THIS FEDERAL CASE OF BANKRUPTCY THE 14TH AMENDMENT PREVAILS AND MUST BE HONORED.

The abused boys from Kansas BSA must be treated exactly the same as the boys from Iowa BSA, failure to do so is a clear violation of the 14th Amendment.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS

Make no mistake:
Let us not be so naive as to fail to acknowledge that what you do here will not stay here, but will go to the attention of the Appellate Court when new appointments are being considered.

Abuse victims from one state must be treated the same as abuse victims from another state, else the concept of the 14th amendment of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION is triggered and imposed.

It does not matter that one state may have laws that impose differences as this is of no importance in Federal court and will be disregarded.

The 14th Amendment is locked and loaded when the bankruptcy court is dispensing funds to settle the case. No excuse will defend the various states that have different laws the Bankruptcy court is absolutely superior in this case.

MOTIVATIONS OF INFERIOR RESTRICTIONS

STATE LEGISLATORS are very close to their constituents due to donations and relations including stock ownership, so actions that can be taken to benefit those so close to home are not uncommon.

This sets the stage for favoritism and will in fact do harm to others.

We see in most cases, where a state has put limits on the Settlement Payments, suspicious relationships and blatant favoring in response to demands from their local businesses and constituents who have made contributions to the campaign. Donations were made and favors are expected.

Fortunately, bankruptcy is a federal court action and no state provisors need be considered in this activity. These are state inferior regulations that must be ignored at all federal level activities.

The basic concept of bankruptcy is to protect the bankrupt entity by moving all activities to federal jurisdiction, stopping all court actions, and collecting all financial items: cash, stocks, properties, insurance, and the like into one fund that is then distributed to the creditors of the bankrupt on an equal basis. This equality is based upon the 14th Amendment requiring equal treatment for all without regard for state inferior legislated laws.

This specifically prohibits treating an abused victim from one state differently than any other state victim. Since this BSA case includes victims from every state and only about 15 have state restrictions on the amount of a

settlement, which must be ignored in the federal process as the 14th Amendment provides.

The bankruptcy court created a Trust to actually deal with the collected assets and proceed to distribute to the victims the settlements based upon the amount and kind of abuse suffered, but they additionally included the state laws prohibiting or limiting that states victims from receiving full settlements, which is a violation of the 14th amendment.

The court's obligation is to the creditors, which is the sexually abused victims, not the states from which they came; there is no reason for honoring any of the state allegations.

The job of the bankruptcy court is to distribute the collected funds fairly to the abused victims creditors.

Reporting on those elected officials contacted reveals that in every case the question reverted to why is the bankruptcy judge allowing the travesty? This is very destructive to the future of this judge. It is this kind of thing we look at when seeking potential advancement to higher court appointments.

The Oath of Office is an Oath of Allegiance to the contents offered in is case it's the Constitution of the United

States, including the 14th Amendment.

Do not abandon the 20,000 abuse victims again!

SWORN TO UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

[redacted]

==========

JUDGE LAMENTS:

I have been troubled by the disparity between some 25,000 Settlements in this nationwide case. I stand resolute in my commitment to ensure fairness in my court and the cases I preside over. When I was appointed, I swore to the oath of office which is an oath of allegiance to the contents offered in this case, it's the Constitution of the United States, including the 14th Amendment.

All of these Boy Scout creditors from all states have been abused at a very young term of their lives and NOW, AGAIN SOME ARE BEING ABUSED BY THEIR STATES deplorable efforts to limit payments, no doubt a localized effort to line the

pockets of local powerful state legislators, at these Scouts expense.

To the extent that I have the power to acknowledge this travesty, I can and will chose to ignore the states dastardly deeds and impose the federal supremacy as paramount to a just and proper Settlement in this case.

I remain disillusioned by the clear cut violations of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution which stands guard over just this type of inequality. I swore to abide by this Constitution when I was appointed to the bench and it is my judgement that this is in fact a violation of the 14th Amendment and with such acknowledgment I can not let it stand.

Additionally it comes to my attention that the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST has, as is its duty in the bankruptcy process, managed to collect any and all things of value to provide for the distribution of these settlement amounts. Furthermore, this collection process has been at 100% of the contracted insurance policies not at some pittance of 2%, so the Trust has collected at 100% and will now distribute at 100% also. Insterectinly, I created the Trust, so it is really a part of the Court and therefor this is an Order that requires no notices to anyone.

Now in summary, I acknowledge these good cause pertinent

issues: namely Second Abuse, Federal Supremacy, 14th Amendment Violation, and 100% Collections, with the authority vested in me as the Presiding Judge over this Case No. 20-10343 BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, for good reasoning having been stated, I hereby Order the following procedural changes to the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST to be implemented retroactively and immediately.

A PERSONAL WORD TO OUR JUDGE: I want you to know that we all appreciate your long involvement in what is a very large case. Those 20,000 of us suffering from Restricted Settlement Amounts thank you for correcting this error, putting compliance with the 14th amendment FIRST with honor.

GENERAL ISSUES WITH SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST – We have evidence that Common Accounting Standards Are Missing:

1. Where are the Settlement Documents? Just like mortgage loan documents, these are financial rules and agreements that were signed for and agreed to at the award stage, but magically are now changed or missing from my Account

SST-377506. This is FINANCIAL FRAUD!

2. Where are the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST internal documents evaluating my case and establishing the amount of my award? This announcement notice is missing.

3. Where is the SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT STATEMENT? This will show adjustments and the balance of the account.

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

1. Fairness to all victims
2. Cures 14th Amendment issue
3. Asserts superiority of Bankruptcy Court
4. Elders will be pleased and impressed
5. Victims from all 50 states will be treated the same
6. Admiration among other Judges
7. National praise for leadership
8. Anxiety and sleepless nights end
9. About 20,000 Boy Scouts will receive their due
10. An internal matter to your Trust
11. States not involved
12. Financial fraud eliminated
13. Aserts equal protection
14. A sigh of relief for me
15. My efforts fully rewarded
16. A big thank you and a hug
17. No Appeal is required

========== COURT ORDER ==========>

Petitioner [redacted] Pro Per, Account SST-redact

Case No. 20-10343 BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

NOTE: I'm not an attorney. I am trying to exercise my rights to fairness with this Court in this Class Action matter.

I hope I have achieved a reasonable level of properness.

Competent research having been done, revealing several Court cases,

And the clear assertion that the Constitution's Supremacy Clause provides that federal law is "the supreme Law of the Land" notwithstanding any state law to the contrary shows good cause for this Court to issue this Order to the SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST which will cure the violations of the 14th and 15th Amendments.

BANKRUPTCY COURT ORDER

To SCOUTING SETTLEMENT TRUST:

Under the direct supervision of this Court, that is administered by the Honorable Barbara J. Houser (Ret.), in

her capacity as Trustee of the BSA Settlement Trust you are hereby Ordered:

1. Immediately remove all aspects of the mitigating factors that involve reducing any and all Settlement Amounts based upon any state law limiting Settlement Amounts and provide a corrected SETTLEMENT STATEMENT to each victim.

2. To immediately review all processed Sexual Abuse cases to reprocess all cases to remove all aspects of the mitigating factors that involve reducing any and all Settlement Amounts based upon any state law limiting Settlement amounts and provide corrected SETTLEMENT STATEMENT to each victim.

3. Immediately recalculate the current payment percentage and issue a payment to catchup those processed cases to the currently issued payment amount and provide corrected SETTLEMENT STATEMENT to each victim.

4. This Order is retroactive to the very first case processed and shall apply to all cases equally.

5. All aspects of this ORDER are to be implemented immediately, prior to acting on or processing any new cases.

SO ORDERED THIS _____ OF 2025 by

_____

Honorable Judge Laurie Selber Silverstein

FILE A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE ILLEGAL ACTION

[redacted]

September 6 2025

Judge Laurie Selber Silverstein
6th Floor, Courtroom #2
824 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801 302-252-2925

RE: Chapter 11 Case No. 20-10343 BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA AND DELAWARE BSA, LLC.

RF: Case: Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)

DEAR HONORABLE JUDGE Silverstein:

KINDLY ACCEPT THIS DOCUMENT FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

[redacted]

Retail

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

19801

RDC 99

U.S. PO
FCM LG
SAN DI
SEP 06,

$4.

S2324H

TO:

Judge Silverstein
6th Floor C Room 3
824 N. Market St.
Wilmington DE
Zip: 19801

U.S. MARSHALS
X-RAY