Motion for Status Conference and Order Directing Expedited Resolution of Attorney Lien

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Case Name:	**In re: BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA and DELAWARE BSA, LLC**
Case Number:	20-10343 (LSS) (Jointly Administered)
Debtors:	**Claimant Name:** [redacted]

MOTION OF [redacted] (PRO SE CLAIMANT) FOR STATUS CONFERENCE AND ORDER DIRECTING EXPEDITED RESOLUTION OF ATTORNEY LIEN

TO THE HONORABLE LAURIE SELBER SILVERSTEIN:

[redacted] (the "Claimant" or "Movant"), a *pro se* claimant in this Chapter 11 case, respectfully moves this Court for an Order directing a Status Conference and requiring the expedited resolution of the attorney lien asserted by former counsel, Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP ("SSS"). In support thereof, the Claimant states as follows:

1. The Claimant terminated SSS **for cause** due to concerns over professional misconduct, including fee misrepresentation and deviation from the Trust Distribution Procedures (TDP). These facts are detailed in the **Declaration of** [redacted] filed concurrently herewith.
2. The Claimant has filed this Declaration to provide **sworn evidence** in support of the pending fee motion against SSS (Doc. No. 13181).
3. SSS has asserted an **Attorney Lien** against the Claimant's distribution with the Scouting Settlement Trust, formally triggering the Trust's administrative 90-day resolution process.
4. The Claimant has served a written demand upon SSS to immediately withdraw the lien, as the termination for cause should result in a forfeiture of fees, rendering the lien baseless and invalid.
5. Resolution of this lien is necessary for the Claimant to proceed with the payment process established by the confirmed Plan. Given that the asserted lien is highly contested and based on an attorney-client relationship terminated for cause, the delay caused by the 90-day negotiation period is **unduly prejudicial** to the Claimant's receipt of compensation.

6. The Claimant, proceeding *pro se*, requests the Court intervene to ensure the dispute is resolved within the spirit of the Plan, which **intends** to compensate survivors efficiently and without undue delay.
7. This matter constitutes a contested matter governed by Rule 9014 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

WHEREFORE [redacted] Pro Se Claimant, respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order:

A. Directing a Status Conference to be held on an expedited basis concerning the asserted lien.

B. Requiring SSS to demonstrate cause for maintaining the lien given the Claimant's Declaration of termination for cause.

C. Directing SSS to engage in good faith negotiation within a period shorter than the Trust's standard 90 days, or ordering the immediate withdrawal of the lien.

D. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: **November 3, 2025**

[redacted]

(Claimant, Pro Se)

DECLARATION OF [redacted] (PRO SE CLAIMANT) IN SUPPORT OF CLAIMANTS' MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEYS AND FEE REDUCTION (Doc. No. 13181)

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Case Name:	**In re: BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA and DELAWARE BSA, LLC**
Case Number:	20-10343 (LSS) (Jointly Administered)
Debtors:	**Claimant Name:** [redacted]

[redacted]

November 3, 2025

VIA U.S. MAIL AND EMAIL

The Honorable Laurie Selber Silverstein

United States Bankruptcy Judge

United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware

824 North Market Street, 6th Floor

Wilmington, DE 19801

RE: Notice of Support for Motion Against Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP

- **Claimant Name**[redacted]
- **Claim Number:** [redacted]

Statement of Facts

I, [redacted] hereby declare as follows:

I am a survivor claimant in the above-referenced Chapter 11 case, and I am currently proceeding *pro se*. I am making this Declaration to express my **strong support** for the efforts and any pending motion against the law firm Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP. I am aware that SSS has asserted an Attorney Lien against my claim and this statement addresses the dispute over that lien's validity.

I recently terminated my representation with SSS approximately two weeks ago due to concerns over their professional conduct and financial transparency related to my claim. The circumstances surrounding my termination and my current status as a *pro se* claimant are highly relevant to any review of SSS's fees and practices.

Grounds for Termination and Financial Concern

My decision to terminate SSS was based on the following issues, which I feel demonstrate a lack of honesty and clear communication regarding my financial interests:

- **Contingency Fee Misrepresentation:** I believe SSS attempted to deceive clients by announcing a confusing fee reduction. SSS had sent a mass email to all clients offering a **"10% reduction in legal fees"** due to their admitted irregularities in claim submissions and delayed Trust evaluation; however, this amounted to a minimal reduction of approximately **4%** of the total contingency fee to clients. This initial offer was confusing and inadequate. Following this, I subsequently engaged in discussions with SSS to achieve a fair fee, formally requesting a **20% reduction** in the contingency fee and later requesting a final contingency fee of **30%**, a specific reduction that SSS refused to meet. A true and correct copy of the SSS mass email offering the 10% fee reduction, **along with my reply detailing these negotiation attempts and demanding a full case file**, is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. I terminated my representation shortly thereafter when it became apparent the firm was using confusing and misleading language that led clients to believe they were receiving a significant financial reduction in their total contingency fee, rather than the nominal reduction that the math actually dictated, and refused to negotiate a fee that accurately reflected the diminished value of their services.
- **TDP Deviation and Non-Disclosure**: My concerns were compounded by the deviation in the Trust Distribution Procedures (TDP) for the First-In, First-Out (FIFO) process caused by the firm's actions and the necessity of a third-party, neutral evaluation before Trust evaluation and determination. This, combined with the firm's non-disclosure of admitted irregularities for over a year and the delayed case evaluation, was unacceptable.

- **Potential for Prejudice:** I concluded that my continued association with SSS, given their admitted irregularities and the resulting public and additional third-party scrutiny, created the potential for unfair **prejudice and financial loss** to my claim. This termination was, therefore, **for cause.**

Offer of Assistance

I am currently proceeding pro se in this bankruptcy case and wish to confirm my support for the efforts of any parties seeking accountability from SSS. I am prepared to provide any relevant, non-privileged documentation, including correspondence and my retainer agreement, to assist the Court or any parties in interest who are pursuing this motion.

Certification

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

[redacted]**, TX.**

(Claimant, Pro Se)

EXHIBIT 1 Declaration o[redacted]**No. 20-10343 (LSS)**

Gmail

Paul Buescher <paulcbuescher@gmail.com>

IMPORTANT MESSAGE FROM SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
3 messages

Slater Slater Schulman LLP <bsafaq@sssfirm.com> Tue, Sep 9, 2025 at 5:13 PM
R[redacted]n.com>
T[redacted]

SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Dear [redacted]

We are writing to share important information about the status of Boy Scout claims handled by our firm.

The Scouting Settlement Trust ("the Trust") advised in June 2024 that it believed there were irregularities in some of our firm's claim submissions to the Trust. The Trust paused the processing of all claims submitted by our law firm while an investigation of the irregularities was conducted.

What this means for you (unless you were an exigent health claimant) is that *your claim has not been reviewed by the Trust – and it may still take additional* time before it is. This is neither your fault nor the Trust's; and we take full responsibility. As a result, we have agreed to reduce our legal fee by 10% of the actual dollar amount we would have received under your original retainer agreement. For example, if you recover $100,000, you would have received $60,000 under your original retainer. However, now you would receive $64,000, an increase of $4,000. Therefore, you will receive more from any recovery than you would have received under your original retainer.

Our firm has cooperated fully in the Trust's investigation. We now agree that there are procedural and factual problems in some of our claim submissions to the Trust. We have been and will continue to work diligently to address these concerns; and we will be contacting certain clients to confirm information about their claims.

Because of the problematic claims, we have agreed that *all* of our claim submissions to the Trust be vetted by an independent third party before they are reviewed by the Trust's claims determination team. Some claim submissions may pass through the third party's review and proceed on to the Trust for its regular claims determination process. Other claim submissions may be flagged for irregularities that require us to contact our clients to investigate our clients' claims more thoroughly, obtain additional information, and/or provide new or more complete claim forms to the Trust. For clients we contact, we are asking for their speedy cooperation. The faster we obtain this additional information, the faster the Trust's claims review process can resume.

We apologize for the delay caused to date and further apologize that the remaining review process will result in additional delays in the determination of submitted claims. We are doing everything possible to quickly resolve all outstanding issues.

Finally, we have been informed by the Trust that because of the firm's role in the submission of your claim to the Trust, your claim will still have to proceed through the independent third-party review process before it can proceed to the Trust for its claims determination process (assuming no irregularities are identified in the independent review process), whether or not you choose to terminate your attorney-client relationship with the firm.

Should you have any questions, please call Slater Slater Schulman at (631) 815-5580

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Slater
Adam P. Slater
Jonathan E. Schulman

SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Gmail

Paul Buescher <paulcbuescher@gmail.com>

IMPORTANT MESSAGE FROM SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP

[redacted] Mon, Sep 15, 2025 at 10:24 AM
To: "Hunter, Esq., Cara" <chunter@sssfirm.com>, "Leder, Linc, Esq." <lleder@sssfirm.com>

Dear Ms. Hunter,

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the status of the Boy Scout claims. I appreciate you taking full responsibility for the issues and informing me of the delays.

As you noted, this situation has created significant disadvantages for my claim, including a substantial delay in review, additional third-party scrutiny, and the risk of being unfairly prejudiced due to my association with your firm. The fact that my case will still be subject to this independent review even if I terminate our relationship is of particular concern and adds undue stress, anxiety, and uncertainty.

Given these serious issues, your offer of a 10% reduction in legal fees is not a sufficient remedy. This offer does not adequately address the financial impact of the delays and the potential for a lower recovery due to the extra scrutiny my claim will now face. Therefore, I propose a counteroffer of a 20% reduction in your firm's contingency fee. This more accurately reflects the diminished value of the legal services provided and the additional burden placed on me as a result of these delays.

To make an informed decision on how to proceed, I will need to have an outside attorney review my case. Please provide me with a full copy of my case file, all documents related to my claim, and an itemized invoice of all work completed to date. I would appreciate it if you could send these documents as soon as possible.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]

--

[Quoted text hidden]

Gmail

Paul Buescher <paulcbuescher@gmail.com>

Slater Slater Schulman LLP Case# 0007167 [redacted]

[redacted]
To: "Leder, Linc, Esq." <lleder@sssfirm.com>

Tue, Sep 30, 2025 at 6:22 PM

Hello Linc,

Thank you for confirming your position regarding my initial request for a fee adjustment regarding your firms' actions and the repercussions to my case.

Following the rejection of that request, I consulted with an attorney specializing in mass tort proceedings at a neutral firm to discuss the total cost of resolution for my case. This consultation provided a valuable perspective on the complexity, associated work, and available paths moving forward.

Before we proceed with any final decision, I formally reiterate my request for the following documents:

Mandatory Documentation Request

1. A current balance sheet and itemized invoice of all work completed to date on my case.
2. A calculation breakdown of any fees incurred.
3. Any remaining signed release exhibits related to my file besides those already provided.

Two Paths Forward

Based on my objective review, I see two distinct paths moving forward, depending on how your firm wishes to handle our client-attorney relationship:

Path 1: Revised Fee and Continued Representation
I propose a revised contingency fee reduction of 10% (instead of the originally requested 20%). Your firm would retain a 30% contingency fee. This option allows us to proceed immediately with your representation, to our mutual benefit, in the most direct and efficient manner.

Path 2: Contract Termination
I will terminate our contract and seek other representation, or, as was surprisingly suggested, proceed *pro se* with minimal assistance. I understand this action would necessitate sending a formal termination letter, potentially filing complaints with the appropriate agencies, and submitting the Maroon Change of Representation Form with the Trust, which would likely result in a lien against my recovery and a significant delay in the overall process. The final resolution would then be based on entitlement to *quantum meruit*.

I strongly prefer Path 1 as the optimal resolution for all parties. However, be advised that I am prepared to pursue Path 2 if necessary, which would more than likely ultimately benefit me more, as I have structured my finances and expectations based on the full range of outcomes.

Please provide a decision from your firm regarding the acceptance of the revised 30% contingency fee as soon as possible, so that I may proceed accordingly. I'm sure that you'll make the best decision for all parties involved considering the indiscretions which occurred.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Unsubscribe paulcbuescher@gmail.com from future emails.

--

I hereby certify that on **November 3, 2025**, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Motion of [redacted] (Pro Se Claimant) for Status Conference and Order Directing Expedited Resolution of Attorney Lien**, the **Declaration of [redacted] (Pro Se Claimant) in Support of Claimants' Motion for Substitution of Attorneys and Fee Reduction (Doc. No. 13181), and Exhibit 1 attached thereto** were served upon the following parties via U.S. First-Class Mail and email (where available), as indicated below:

Counsel	Affiliation	Service Method
Counsel for the Movant Claimants (Friedman & Scheer)		
Frederick B. Rosner, Esquire 824 N. Market Street, Suite 810 Wilmington, DE 19801	The Rosner Law Group LLC	U.S. Mail & Email rosner@teamrosner.com
Timothy J. Silverman, Esquire 85 Argonaut, Suite 202 Aliso Viejo, CA 92656	Scheer Law Group, LLP	U.S. Mail & Email tsilverman@scheerlawgroup.com
Lawrence A. Friedman, Esquire PO Box 609 Grayling, Michigan 49738	Friedman Partners LLC	U.S. Mail & Email lfriedman@friedmanpartners.net
Counsel for Slater Slater Schulman LLP (SSS)		
Susan E. Kaufman, Esquire 919 N. Market Street, Suite 460 Wilmington, DE 19801	Law Office of Susan E. Kaufman, LLC	U.S. Mail & Email skaufman@skaufmanlaw.com
Clifford S. Robert, Esquire 526 RXR Plaza Uniondale, New York 11556	Robert & Robert PLLC	U.S. Mail & Email crobert@robertlaw.com
Michael Farina, Esquire 526 RXR Plaza Uniondale, New York 11556	Robert & Robert PLLC	U.S. Mail & Email mfarina@robertlaw.com
Counsel for the BSA Settlement Trust		
Mark T. Hurford, Esquire 27 Crimson King Drive [redacted]	A.M. Saccullo Legal, LLC	U.S. Mail & Email mark@saccullolegal.com

(Claimant, Pro Se)

[redacted]

The Clerk of the Court
United States Bankruptcy Court
for the District of Delaware
824 North Market Street, 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Retail

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

19801

RDC 99

U.S. POSTAGE PAII
FCM LETTER
HOUSTON, TX 770ε
NOV 03, 2025

$1.36

S2324Y502356-14

[redacted]

Date: November 10, 2025

VIA OVERNIGHT/PRIORITY MAIL
VIA EMAIL (Courtesy Copy to Counsel)

Clerk of Court
U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware
824 North Market Street, 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

RE: SUBMISSION TO CURE DEFICIENCY IN MOTION FOR STATUS CONFERENCE

Case Name: In re: Boy Scouts of America and Delaware BSA, LLC
Case No.: 20-10343 (LSS)
Claimant: [redacted] (Pro Se)

Dear Clerk of Court,

Please find enclosed the complete filing packet for my **Motion for Status Conference and Order Directing Expedited Resolution of Attorney Lien**.

This submission is intended to **cure a procedural deficiency** in the original filing which was mailed to the Court on **November 3, 2025**.

Pursuant to the Local Rules requiring a proposed form of order to accompany any motion, this packet contains the missing document.

The enclosed packet includes the following original and corrected documents:

1. **Proposed Form of Order** (Original, Unsigned)
2. **Certificate of Service** (Original, Signed, confirming service of the Proposed Order on all interested counsel)
3. **Motion for Status Conference and Order** (Copy)
4. **Declaration of** [redacted] (Copy, sworn evidence)

I respectfully request that the Clerk's Office attach the enclosed **Proposed Form of Order** to my original motion so that the entire filing is deemed **complete and timely** for purposes of consideration by the Honorable Judge Silverstein.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

[redacted]
(Claimant, Pro Se)

Case Name:	**In re: BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA and DELAWARE BSA, LLC**
Case Number:	20-10343 (LSS) (Jointly Administered)
Debtors.	**Claimant Name:** [redacted]

ORDER DIRECTING STATUS CONFERENCE AND EXPEDITED RESOLUTION OF ATTORNEY LIEN

Upon consideration of the **[MOTION] OF** [redacted] **(PRO SE CLAIMANT) FOR STATUS CONFERENCE AND ORDER DIRECTING EXPEDITED RESOLUTION OF ATTORNEY LIEN**, the accompanying Declaration of the Claimant executed on **NOVEMBER 10, 2025** in **HOUSTON, TEXAS**, and the record established in this case; and the Court finding that the Claimant is proceeding *pro se* and the Motion raises material issues of fact and law regarding the implementation of the confirmed Plan, including the validity of an attorney lien asserted by Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP; and for good cause shown:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. A **Status Conference** is scheduled before the Honorable Laurie Selber Silverstein for:
2. **Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP** and its counsel of record shall attend the Status Conference and be prepared to **demonstrate cause** for maintaining an attorney lien against the Claimant's distribution in light of the Claimant's Declaration of termination for cause.
3. The parties (**Claimant and SSS**) shall be prepared to discuss an **expedited schedule** for the mandatory negotiation, mediation, or ultimate judicial determination of the asserted fee lien, which shall be shorter than the 90-day period contemplated by the Scouting Settlement Trust's administrative process.
4. Service of the Motion, Declaration, and this Proposed Order on SSS's counsel of record shall be deemed adequate and proper.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: ______________________________________

BY THE COURT:

The Honorable Laurie Selber Silverstein

United States Bankruptcy Judge

I hereby certify that on **November 10, 2025**, a true and correct copy of the complete and corrected filing packet, including the **Motion of [redacted] (Pro Se Claimant) for Status Conference and Order Directing Expedited Resolution of Attorney Lien**, the **Declaration of [redacted]**, and the new **Proposed Form of Order**, were served upon the following parties via U.S. First-Class Mail and email (where available), as indicated below:

Counsel	Affiliation	Service Method
Counsel for the Movant Claimants (Friedman & Scheer)		
Frederick B. Rosner, Esquire 824 N. Market Street, Suite 810 Wilmington, DE 19801	The Rosner Law Group LLC	U.S. Mail & Email rosner@teamrosner.com
Timothy J. Silverman, Esquire 85 Argonaut, Suite 202 Aliso Viejo, CA 92656	Scheer Law Group, LLP	U.S. Mail & Email tsilverman@scheerlawgroup.com
Lawrence A. Friedman, Esquire PO Box 609 Grayling, Michigan 49738	Friedman Partners LLC	U.S. Mail & Email lfriedman@friedmanpartners.net
Counsel for Slater Slater Schulman LLP (SSS)		
Susan E. Kaufman, Esquire 919 N. Market Street, Suite 460 Wilmington, DE 19801	Law Office of Susan E. Kaufman, LLC	U.S. Mail & Email skaufman@skaufmanlaw.com
Clifford S. Robert, Esquire 526 RXR Plaza Uniondale, New York 11556	Robert & Robert PLLC	U.S. Mail & Email crobert@robertlaw.com
Michael Farina, Esquire 526 RXR Plaza Uniondale, New York 11556	Robert & Robert PLLC	U.S. Mail & Email mfarina@robertlaw.com
Counsel for the BSA Settlement Trust		
Mark T. Hurford, Esquire 27 Crimson King Drive Bear, DE 19701	A.M. Saccullo Legal, LLC	U.S. Mail & Email mark@saccullolegal.com

[redacted]
(Claimant, Pro Se)

Motion for Status Conference and Order Directing Expedited Resolution of Attorney Lien

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Case Name:	**In re: BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA and DELAWARE BSA, LLC**
Case Number:	20-10343 (LSS) (Jointly Administered)
Debtors:	**Claimant Name:** [redacted]

MOTION OF [redacted] (PRO SE CLAIMANT) FOR STATUS CONFERENCE AND ORDER DIRECTING EXPEDITED RESOLUTION OF ATTORNEY LIEN

TO THE HONORABLE LAURIE SELBER SILVERSTEIN:

[redacted] (the "Claimant" or "Movant"), a *pro se* claimant in this Chapter 11 case, respectfully moves this Court for an Order directing a Status Conference and requiring the expedited resolution of the attorney lien asserted by former counsel, Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP ("SSS"). In support thereof, the Claimant states as follows:

1. The Claimant terminated SSS **for cause** due to concerns over professional misconduct, including fee misrepresentation and deviation from the Trust Distribution Procedures (TDP). These facts are detailed in the **Declaration of Paul Christopher Buescher** filed concurrently herewith.
2. The Claimant has filed this Declaration to provide **sworn evidence** in support of the pending fee motion against SSS (Doc. No. 13181).
3. SSS has asserted an **Attorney Lien** against the Claimant's distribution with the Scouting Settlement Trust, formally triggering the Trust's administrative 90-day resolution process.
4. The Claimant has served a written demand upon SSS to immediately withdraw the lien, as the termination for cause should result in a forfeiture of fees, rendering the lien baseless and invalid.
5. Resolution of this lien is necessary for the Claimant to proceed with the payment process established by the confirmed Plan. Given that the asserted lien is highly contested and based on an attorney-client relationship terminated for cause, the delay caused by the 90-day negotiation period is **unduly prejudicial** to the Claimant's receipt of compensation.

6. The Claimant, proceeding *pro se*, requests the Court intervene to ensure the dispute is resolved within the spirit of the Plan, which **intends** to compensate survivors efficiently and without undue delay.
7. This matter constitutes a contested matter governed by Rule 9014 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

WHEREFORE, [redacted] Pro Se Claimant, respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order:

A. Directing a Status Conference to be held on an expedited basis concerning the asserted lien.

B. Requiring SSS to demonstrate cause for maintaining the lien given the Claimant's Declaration of termination for cause.

C. Directing SSS to engage in good faith negotiation within a period shorter than the Trust's standard 90 days, or ordering the immediate withdrawal of the lien.

D. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: **November 3, 2025**

[redacted]

(Claimant, Pro Se)

DECLARATION OF [redacted] (PRO SE CLAIMANT) IN SUPPORT OF CLAIMANTS' MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEYS AND FEE REDUCTION (Doc. No. 13181)

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Case Name:	**In re: BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA and DELAWARE BSA, LLC**
Case Number:	20-10343 (LSS) (Jointly Administered)
Debtors:	**Claimant Name:** [redacted]

[redacted]

November 10, 2025

VIA OVERNIGHT/PRIORITY MAIL
VIA EMAIL (Courtesy Copy to Counsel)

The Honorable Laurie Selber Silverstein
United States Bankruptcy Judge
United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware
824 North Market Street, 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

RE: Notice of Support for Motion Against Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP

- **Claimant Name:** Paul [redacted]
- **Claim Number:** SST [redacted]

Statement of Facts

I, [redacted], hereby declare as follows:

I am a survivor claimant in the above-referenced Chapter 11 case, and I am currently proceeding *pro se*. I am making this Declaration to express my **strong support** for the efforts and any pending motion against the law firm Slater, Slater and Schulman (SSS) LLP. I am aware that SSS has asserted an Attorney Lien against my claim and this statement addresses the dispute over that lien's validity.

I recently terminated my representation with SSS approximately two weeks ago due to concerns over their professional conduct and financial transparency related to my claim. The circumstances surrounding my termination and my current status as a *pro se* claimant are highly relevant to any review of SSS's fees and practices.

Grounds for Termination and Financial Concern

My decision to terminate SSS was based on the following issues, which I feel demonstrate a lack of honesty and clear communication regarding my financial interests:

- **Contingency Fee Misrepresentation:** I believe SSS attempted to deceive clients by announcing a confusing fee reduction. SSS had sent a mass email to all clients offering a **"10% reduction in legal fees"** due to their admitted irregularities in claim submissions and delayed Trust evaluation; however, this amounted to a minimal reduction of approximately **4%** of the total contingency fee to clients. This initial offer was confusing and inadequate. Following this, I subsequently engaged in discussions with SSS to achieve a fair fee, formally requesting a **20% reduction** in the contingency fee and later requesting a final contingency fee of **30%**, a specific reduction that SSS refused to meet. A true and correct copy of the SSS mass email offering the 10% fee reduction, **along with my reply detailing these negotiation attempts and demanding a full case file**, is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. I terminated my representation shortly thereafter when it became apparent the firm was using confusing and misleading language that led clients to believe they were receiving a significant financial reduction in their total contingency fee, rather than the nominal reduction that the math actually dictated, and refused to negotiate a fee that accurately reflected the diminished value of their services.
- **TDP Deviation and Non-Disclosure:** My concerns were compounded by the deviation in the Trust Distribution Procedures (TDP) for the First-In, First-Out (FIFO) process caused by the firm's actions and the necessity of a third-party, neutral evaluation before Trust evaluation and determination. This, combined with the firm's non-disclosure of admitted irregularities for over a year and the delayed case evaluation, was unacceptable.

- **Potential for Prejudice:** I concluded that my continued association with SSS, given their admitted irregularities and the resulting public and additional third-party scrutiny, created the potential for unfair **prejudice and financial loss** to my claim. This termination was, therefore, **for cause**.

Offer of Assistance

I am currently proceeding pro se in this bankruptcy case and wish to confirm my support for the efforts of any parties seeking accountability from SSS. I am prepared to provide any relevant, non-privileged documentation, including correspondence and my retainer agreement, to assist the Court or any parties in interest who are pursuing this motion.

Certification

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **November 3, 2025** in **Houston, TX**.

[redacted]

(Claimant, Pro Se)

EXHIBIT 1 Declaration of [redacted] Case No. 20-10343 (LSS)

Gmail [redacted]

IMPORTANT MESSAGE FROM SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
3 messages

Slater Slater Schulman LLP <bsafaq@sssfirm.com> Tue, Sep 9, 2025 at 5:13 PM
Reply-To: Slater Slater Schulman LLP <bsafaq@sssfirm.com>
To: Paul C Buescher <paulcbuescher@gmail.com>

SSS

SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Dear [redacted]

We are writing to share important information about the status of Boy Scout claims handled by our firm.

The Scouting Settlement Trust ("the Trust") advised in June 2024 that it believed there were irregularities in some of our firm's claim submissions to the Trust. The Trust paused the processing of all claims submitted by our law firm while an investigation of the irregularities was conducted.

What this means for you (unless you were an exigent health claimant) is that your claim has not been reviewed by the Trust – and it may still take additional time before it is. This is neither your fault nor the Trust's; and we take full responsibility. As a result, we have agreed to reduce our legal fee by 10% of the actual dollar amount we would have received under your original retainer agreement. For example, if you recover $100,000, you would have received $60,000 under your original retainer. However, now you would receive $64,000, an increase of $4,000. Therefore, you will receive more from any recovery than you would have received under your original retainer.

Our firm has cooperated fully in the Trust's investigation. We now agree that there are procedural and factual problems in some of our claim submissions to the Trust. We have been and will continue to work diligently to address these concerns; and we will be contacting certain clients to confirm information about their claims.

Because of the problematic claims, we have agreed that *all* of our claim submissions to the Trust be vetted by an independent third party before they are reviewed by the Trust's claims determination team. Some claim submissions may pass through the third party's review and proceed on to the Trust for its regular claims determination process. Other claim submissions may be flagged for irregularities that require us to contact our clients to investigate our clients' claims more thoroughly, obtain additional information, and/or provide new or more complete claim forms to the Trust. For clients we contact, we are asking for their speedy cooperation. The faster we obtain this additional information, the faster the Trust's claims review process can resume.

We apologize for the delay caused to date and further apologize that the remaining review process will result in additional delays in the determination of submitted claims. We are doing everything possible to quickly resolve all outstanding issues.

Finally, we have been informed by the Trust that because of the firm's role in the submission of your claim to the Trust, your claim will still have to proceed through the independent third-party review process before it can proceed to the Trust for its claims determination process (assuming no irregularities are identified in the independent review process), whether or not you choose to terminate your attorney-client relationship with the firm.

Should you have any questions, please call Slater Slater Schulman at (631) 815-5580

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Slater
Adam P. Slater
Jonathan E. Schulman

SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Gmail

Paul Buescher <paulcbuescher@gmail.com>

IMPORTANT MESSAGE FROM SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP

Paul Buescher [redacted]
To: "Hunter, Esq., Cara" <chunter@sssfirm.com>, "Leder, Linc, Esq." <lleder@sssfirm.com>

Mon, Sep 15, 2025 at 10:24 AM

Dear Ms. Hunter,

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the status of the Boy Scout claims. I appreciate you taking full responsibility for the issues and informing me of the delays.

As you noted, this situation has created significant disadvantages for my claim, including a substantial delay in review, additional third-party scrutiny, and the risk of being unfairly prejudiced due to my association with your firm. The fact that my case will still be subject to this independent review even if I terminate our relationship is of particular concern and adds undue stress, anxiety, and uncertainty.

Given these serious issues, your offer of a 10% reduction in legal fees is not a sufficient remedy. This offer does not adequately address the financial impact of the delays and the potential for a lower recovery due to the extra scrutiny my claim will now face. Therefore, I propose a counteroffer of a 20% reduction in your firm's contingency fee. This more accurately reflects the diminished value of the legal services provided and the additional burden placed on me as a result of these delays.

To make an informed decision on how to proceed, I will need to have an outside attorney review my case. Please provide me with a full copy of my case file, all documents related to my claim, and an itemized invoice of all work completed to date. I would appreciate it if you could send these documents as soon as possible.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]
--
[Quoted text hidden]

Gmail

Paul Buescher <paulcbuescher@gmail.com>

Slater Slater Schulman LLP Case# 0007167 - Paul C Buescher

[redacted]

Tue, Sep 30, 2025 at 6:22 PM

To: "Leder, Linc, Esq." <lleder@sssfirm.com>

Hello Linc,

Thank you for confirming your position regarding my initial request for a fee adjustment regarding your firms' actions and the repercussions to my case.

Following the rejection of that request, I consulted with an attorney specializing in mass tort proceedings at a neutral firm to discuss the total cost of resolution for my case. This consultation provided a valuable perspective on the complexity, associated work, and available paths moving forward.

Before we proceed with any final decision, I formally reiterate my request for the following documents:

Mandatory Documentation Request

1. A current balance sheet and itemized invoice of all work completed to date on my case.
2. A calculation breakdown of any fees incurred.
3. Any remaining signed release exhibits related to my file besides those already provided.

Two Paths Forward

Based on my objective review, I see two distinct paths moving forward, depending on how your firm wishes to handle our client-attorney relationship:

Path 1: Revised Fee and Continued Representation
I propose a revised contingency fee reduction of 10% (instead of the originally requested 20%). Your firm would retain a 30% contingency fee. This option allows us to proceed immediately with your representation, to our mutual benefit, in the most direct and efficient manner.

Path 2: Contract Termination
I will terminate our contract and seek other representation, or, as was surprisingly suggested, proceed *pro se* with minimal assistance. I understand this action would necessitate sending a formal termination letter, potentially filing complaints with the appropriate agencies, and submitting the Maroon Change of Representation Form with the Trust, which would likely result in a lien against my recovery and a significant delay in the overall process. The final resolution would then be based on entitlement to *quantum meruit*.

I strongly prefer Path 1 as the optimal resolution for all parties. However, be advised that I am prepared to pursue Path 2 if necessary, which would more than likely ultimately benefit me more, as I have structured my finances and expectations based on the full range of outcomes.

Please provide a decision from your firm regarding the acceptance of the revised 30% contingency fee as soon as possible, so that I may proceed accordingly. I'm sure that you'll make the best decision for all parties involved considering the indiscretions which occurred.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Unsubscribe paulcbuescher@gmail.com from future emails.

--