

EXHIBIT A

**ORDER AS TO MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT IS
BEING GRANTED IN PART**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT A

-----X	
In re	:
	:
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
Reorganized Debtors.	:
-----X	

Chapter 11
Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
Jointly Administered

ORDER PARTIALLY GRANTING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The individual listed on **Exhibit A1** attached to this Order (the “Movant”) has moved for reconsideration of the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and order (ECF No. 9506) denying the movant’s request for relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date (the “Bar Date”). For the reasons stated in Exhibit A1 and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022, the Court grants reconsideration; denies the motion to the extent it seeks relief for claims based on conditions first diagnosed before the Bar Date; and grants the motion to the extent that the movant seeks relief based on conditions that were first diagnosed after the Bar Date. The merits of any claim based on conditions first diagnosed after the Bar Date will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT A1

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT IS BEING
GRANTED IN PART**

Washington, Jamisha

Exhibit A1

Jamisha Washington
50005 N. Frank Rd.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4558
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9654
Claim: TRO904203FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

Diagnosis dates unclear. Says unaware that company would pay for medical treatments. Does not allege lack of knowledge of bar date, contains no showing to support relief based on excusable neglect or due process.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Filed by claimant's mother. Says Jamisha Washington passed away in 2019 due to a rare cancer. Unclear when cancer was diagnosed.

Ruling:

The original motion did not allege grounds for relief. The motion for reconsideration is not clear as to the dates of diagnose but suggests that cancer may not have been diagnosed until after the bar date. The motion for relief from the bar date was denied and the Court does not see grounds for reconsideration of that ruling as to conditions and injuries that were diagnosed before the August 12, 2009 bar date. However, as indicated in the March 2021 Decision, claims that are based on injuries or conditions that were first diagnosed after August 12, 2009 are entitled to be treated as "future tort claims," though recoveries may be low. The Court will modify its prior ruling accordingly.

Disposition:

The Court's prior ruling will be modified to make clear that (1) the motion for relief from the bar date is denied to the extent it relates to conditions or injuries that were diagnosed before August 12, 2009, but (2) any claim based on conditions first diagnosed after August 12, 2009 is referred to the Trust for resolution under the Trust's normal dispute resolution procedures.

EXHIBIT A2

**NOTICE TO MOVANT WHOSE MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION IS GRANTED IN PART**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT A2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOTICE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO YOUR
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT’S PRIOR RULING AS TO
YOUR REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 3, 2022 the Court issued a Decision regarding your motion for reconsideration of the Court’s prior rulings regarding your motion for permission to file a tort claim notwithstanding the expiration of the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases. Full copies of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision, and the tables attached to it, are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxorttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at 800-753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that your motion for reconsideration has been **DENIED** to the extent it is based on conditions first diagnosed before the bar date, but that the Court has **GRANTED** your motion to the extent you contend that you suffer from conditions that were not diagnosed until after the bar date. Your motion will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. We have also enclosed a statement that sets forth the Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion.

PLEASE BE FURTHER ADVISED THAT IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU TIME TO RECEIVE THIS NOTICE AND TO CONSIDER YOUR RIGHTS THE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YOUR MOTION WILL NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022. THE DEADLINE FOR THE FILING OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WILL BE APRIL 14, 2022.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc., Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT B

**ORDER AS TO MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT
ARE BEING DENIED**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT B

-----X	
In re	:
	:
	:
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
	:
Reorganized Debtors.	:
-----X	

ORDER DENYING CERTAIN MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

The individuals listed on **Exhibit B1** attached to this Order (the “Movants”) have moved for reconsideration of the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and orders (ECF Nos. 9506 and 9507) denying the movants’ requests for relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date (the “Bar Date”). For the reasons stated in the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498), and in Exhibit B1 and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022, the motions listed in Exhibit B1 are denied. The motions listed in Exhibit B1 fail to identify legal errors or any facts that the Court overlooked and do not warrant any change to the Court’s prior decisions. It is therefore

ORDERED, that the motions for reconsideration identified on Exhibit B1 are denied.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT B1

MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT ARE DENIED

Baldwin, Willie Jr.

Willie Baldwin, Jr.
1505 27th St. North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket nos.: 3329, duplicate at docket 3999.
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9532
Claim: TRO884931FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

Duplicate motion at docket # 3999. First diagnosed 1979, "never received paperwork." No challenge to sufficiency of publication notice, no showing of excusable neglect. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and reasons why filed so long after the bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Says he did not know of the original bar date, believes he has been injured, would like what he feels is rightly due to him. Two separate claims were filed by Willie Baldwin, Jr. and it is not clear whether the motion for reconsideration applies to one claim or both.

Ruling:

The Court sympathizes with Mr. Baldwin and with other persons who may have been injured. However, as indicated in the Court's prior ruling Mr. Baldwin's claim was time-barred under the applicable Mississippi statute of limitations long before the Tronox bankruptcy filing, so that relief from the bar date would not grant him any relief. Mr. Baldwin's lack of knowledge alone also is not sufficient to establish excusable neglect for bar date relief, for the reasons set forth in the Court's prior Decision. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Bridges Family (Billy Wayne Bridges, Detra Devoune Bridges, Mildred Bridges, Terry Bridges, Evaleen Bridges, Kendrick Bridges)

Billie Wayne Bridges
Detra Devoune Bridges
Mildred Bridges
Terry Bridges
Evaleen Bridges (addressed in prior rulings as “Evaleem Bridges”)
Kendrick Bridges
10100 LeFevre Drive
Cheltenham, MD 20623

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion Docket Nos.: 3786, 3790, 7341, 8019, 8068, 8391, 8528, 8530, 9408 and 9432
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9520
Claim Nos: TRO998696FTC (Evaleen), TRO998695FTC (Kendrick), others not known

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

The Court noted in March 2021 that the Bridges family sought to be included in Tronox tort claim Class D, which only covered people who actually filed timely proofs of claim before the bar date, and that such relief could not be granted because the category definitions had become final long ago and because the funds for Tort Group D had been distributed. The Bridges family also alleged that they were represented by the Creosote Litigation Group of Mississippi beginning in 2002, starting with attorney Bambach; that the firm had lost records; and that representation was turned over to Tollison firm after 2009. The Court noted that the Bridges family appeared to confuse the bankruptcy case with the prior class actions and appeared to think that the prior class action counsel was representing them in the 2009 bankruptcy case. However, attorneys for the Creosote Litigation Group had direct notice of the bar date, so if they actually represented this group then proofs of claim should have been filed. Unexcused failures of counsel are not grounds for relief based on excusable neglect.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Again alleges that family members were part of a 2002 class action; says it is “unethical” to treat the 2009 bankruptcy case as separate from the 2002 class action; asserts again that the attorneys lost files and that the family members were part of the original class action and therefore should participate in the bankruptcy. Finally, complains that it is a denial of due process to say that claimants have no rights following misconduct of counsel.

Ruling:

The 2002 class action against Tronox was separate from the 2009 Tronox bankruptcy. Tort claimants were only permitted to participate in the 2009 bankruptcy if they filed proofs of claim in the bankruptcy case. The members of the Bridges family did not do so. It is well-settled that if counsel represented the Bridges family at that time and if counsel erred in not filing claims, that may have given rise to a cause of action against the attorneys, but it does not provide grounds for relief from the bar date based on excusable neglect unless the attorneys’ own failures can be excused, and no such excuses have been offered here. In fact, counsel to the so-called Creosote Litigation Group received direct notice, by mail, of the bar date. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Colebrooke, Minola

Minola Colebrooke
14860 Tyler Street
Miami, FL 33176

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket nos.: 3542, 8170
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9648
Claim: TRO893552FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

Diagnosed 2003, filed initial claim in December 2004 with an attorney and corresponded with "Creosote Litigation Group" in 2005. Contends she should be entitled to an additional settlement for asthma condition, prior litigation submission was for sarcoidosis. Prior litigation proceeding shows awareness of rights and of connection to creosote exposure. A supplement filed at docket #8170, says unaware of lawsuit because lives in Florida. Also says Trust has been sending her responses under two different claim numbers even though she says that claim number TRO888080FTC was superseded by claim # TRO893552FTC. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. In addition, claim either was already resolved in prior litigation or it was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Encloses medical records, says that "if denied, I feel that you did not receive attached medical records to consider as part of your decision."

Ruling:

Medical records do not change the facts alleged in connection with the original motion. As noted in the prior decision, this claim either was resolved in a prior litigation or, if not, it was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dancy, Anjerlina

Anjerlina Dancy
50005 N Frank Rd.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4374
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9650
Claim: TRO904213FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1988 and 1989 diagnoses. Says unaware of settlement or bankruptcy. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Claimant has submitted a "Supplemental Declaration" form that was designed for use by persons who claimed infancy or incompetence at the time of the August 12, 2009 bar date. Claimant has not alleged infancy or incompetence at that time. The form states that claimant has suffered from breathing problems for many years.

Ruling:

I sympathize if claimant suffers from various conditions that might be related to creosote but I can only grant relief to claimants who establish grounds for relief under the standards described in the Court's March 2021 Decision. Unfortunately, as indicated in the Court's March 2021 Decision, this claim was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. Claimant also failed to show excusable neglect under the standards spelled out in the March 2021 Decision. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dancy, Arthur

Arthur Dancy
40017 McFarland Lane
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4526
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9647
Claim: TRO904200FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

May 1987 diagnosis. Form says was "aware" of the bankruptcy but likely means "unaware." Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Claimant has submitted a "Supplemental Declaration" form that was designed for use by persons who claimed infancy or incompetence at the time of the August 12, 2009 bar date. Claimant has not alleged infancy or incompetence at that time. The form states that claimant has suffered from problems for many years and asks the Court to reconsider his case.

Ruling:

I sympathize but I can only grant relief to claimants who establish grounds for relief under the standards described in the Court's March 2021 Decision. Unfortunately, as indicated in the Court's March 2021 Decision, this claim was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. Claimant also failed to show excusable neglect under the standards spelled out in the March 2021 Decision. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dancy, Imogene

Imogene Dancy
5005 North Frank Rd.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4556
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9652
Claim: TRO902204FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1976 diagnosis. Worked for Kerr-McGee but unaware of bankruptcy settlement because on leave; says she will accept the payment for Tronox (not certain of the reference) but wants to be considered for damages from Kerr-McGee. Court has no jurisdiction over Kerr-McGee or Tronox at this point, the claims process relates only to the Tort Claims Trust that was set up under the 2010 Tronox plan of reorganization. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for reconsideration:

Claimant has submitted a “Supplemental Declaration” form that was designed for use by persons who claimed infancy or incompetence at the time of the August 12, 2009 bar date. Claimant has not alleged infancy or incompetence at that time. The form states that claimant disagrees with the Court’s March 2021 Decision, that claimant once turned down a \$5,000 offer to settle, that claimant has continuing health problems and asks for reconsideration.

Ruling:

I sympathize but I can only grant relief to claimants who establish grounds for relief under the standards described in the Court’s March 2021 Decision. Unfortunately, as indicated in the Court’s March 2021 Decision, this claim was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. Claimant also failed to show excusable neglect under the standards spelled out in the March 2021 Decision. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dancy, Keletha

Keletha Dancy
40017 McFarland Lane
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4564
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9656
Claim: TRO904198FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

Diagnoses before 1987. Rep says was a child at time of bar date but is filing for parent, and parent's claim was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations long before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for reconsideration:

Asserts that claimant is suffering due to her own exposures to creosote.

Ruling:

Prior motion related to a claim filed on behalf of claimant's parent. The Court does not have a record of a claim filed on behalf of Keletha Dancy due to her own injuries. If Ms. Dancy believes that she suffers from a disease or condition that was first manifested or diagnosed after the bar date on August 12, 2009, then she must file a claim with the Tort Claims Trust on that basis. The motion does not assert any grounds for reconsideration of the Court's ruling as to the previously asserted claim.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dancy, Melvin

Melvin Dancy
40017 McFarland Lane
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4367
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9657
Claim: TRO904199FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

Diagnoses between 1979-1990. Unaware of settlement in law suit. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for reconsideration:

Says he wishes to dispute any saying that he was not affected by creosote exposure.

Ruling:

The Court's prior ruling on Mr. Dancy's motion was not based on any dispute as to whether he was exposed to creosote or as to whether he suffers from any particular conditions. As noted in the prior decision, Mr. Dancy's claim was barred by the applicable Mississippi statute of limitations prior to the Tronox bankruptcy filing. Mr. Dancy also did not establish grounds for relief based on excusable neglect. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Johnikin, TaWanda Dismuke

TaWanda Dismuke Johnikin
109 Aileen Dr.
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket nos: 5765, 8394, 9474, 9475
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9515
Claim: TRO890016FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

Claim filed for Richard Dismuke. Symptoms began before 1990; diagnosis date uncertain; the injured party died in 2008; rep says living out of town; did not know and no reason to know of exposure to Tronox product. A supplement filed at docket #8394, rep says she moved out of town and publication notice was not available to her; not aware and had no reason to understand that the condition was caused by exposure to Tronox product. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief as to pre-bar date diagnoses. Claims based on conditions diagnosed before 2006 also were time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for reconsideration:

Claimant “[t]he person that summarized by father’s appeal was not clear nor accurate in their summary. I refuse to accept the denied motion filed. Therefore, resubmitting the Rejected Notice.” Asserts that claimant’s father was exposed to a Kerr-McGee product and qualifies as a Future Tort Claimant.

Ruling:

The Court wishes to emphasize that the denial of this motion (and the denials of other motions) were *not* based on doubts as to whether claimants had been exposed to creosote or whether they had suffered injuries. However, this particular claim was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing, so relief from the Tronox bar date would serve no purpose. Also, relief from the bar date could only be provided based on “excusable neglect.” The fact that injuries are alleged is not enough to warrant relief based on excusable neglect. The Court understands the claimant’s disappointment, but no errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Richardson, April

April Richardson
1706 7th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket nos.: 5919, 6083
Motion for reconsideration: docket 9528
Claim: TRO889909FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1981 symptoms onset, diagnosis "yes"; says that at the time of the bar date she was rendered homeless and in an institution in Mississippi and had no way of knowing about the deadline, but no dates provided for this situation and does not include medical records. A duplicate of this motion was filed at docket #6083. No explanation as to lengthy delay before claim actually filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for reconsideration:

Asserts that claimant was "in a homeless state" from 2005 until 2019 and unable to do anything. Also asserts that claimant was incarcerated in 2008-09.

Ruling:

No records have been provided showing any incompetency, though the prior rulings and notices made clear that records needed to be provided if claimants sought relief based on incompetency. The Court is sorry that claimant suffered for so many years but unfortunately, as indicated in the prior decision, this claim was time-barred as a matter of Mississippi law before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Winston, Howard

Howard Winston
2307 4th Avenue South
Columbus, MS 39701-6228

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: 4119
Motion for reconsideration: 9600
Claim: TRO891379FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1987 diagnosis. Alleges notice of bar date was not reasonable but does not contend that Tronox knew of the claimant or of the movant's claim. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in pursuit of claims and reasons why filed so long after the bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Says claimant did not have adequate information pertaining to the lawsuit and its deadline.

Ruling:

As indicated in the prior decision, this claimant's claim unfortunately was time-barred under applicable Mississippi law before the Tronox bankruptcy case was filed. I understand the claimant's disappointment, but no errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Cunningham, Tysjman

Ternisha Walker
185 Nargrove Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket nos.: 5432, 8294
Motion for reconsideration: 9662
Claim: TRO892122FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1999 diagnosis; unaware of Tronox claim or of Tronox company; knew Kerr McGee as Moss Tire; could not afford internet. A supplement filed at docket #8294. Claim filed on behalf of a minor so statute of limitations not applicable. However, the risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Parent alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Motion by Tyjsman Cunningham says he is the brother of Demorius Walker and the son of Ternisha Walker and that notice of the Court's prior ruling was delayed in reaching them.

Ruling:

No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

Walker, Ternisha

Ternisha Walker
185 Nargrove Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket nos.: 5427, 8295
Motions for reconsideration: 9663
Claim: TRO892123FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1994 diagnosis; unaware of Tronox claim; no knowledge of Tronox company; did not have access to internet. A supplement filed at docket # 8295. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing.

Motion for Reconsideration:

Motion by Ternisha Walker says she has provided her proof of injury and reasons for missing the bar date in prior submissions and has no more information to submit. Also asserts she filed a claim with Wilbur Colom (a private attorney who handled a prior litigation) in 2005 and that Mr. Colom allegedly committed wrongdoing with regard to her 2005 claim.

Ruling:

Any claim filed with Wilbur Colom in 2005 would have related to a different litigation and did not relate to the 2009 bankruptcy, which was a separate proceeding with a separate claims process. If counsel committed wrongdoing in 2005 then movant may have a claim against counsel, but that is not grounds for relief from the 2009 bar date in the 2009 bankruptcy case. In addition, as noted the claim was time-barred under MS law prior to the Tronox bankruptcy case. I sympathize with movant's plight but there is no relief that I can provide to her under these circumstances. No errors of law have been identified in the motion for reconsideration, and no facts have been identified that the Court allegedly overlooked.

Disposition:

Motion for reconsideration is denied.

EXHIBIT B2

**NOTICE TO MOVANTS WHOSE MOTIONS FOR
RECONSIDERATION ARE BEING DENIED**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT B2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOITCE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO YOUR
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT’S PRIOR RULING AS TO
YOUR REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 3, 2022 the Court issued a Decision regarding your motion for reconsideration of the Court’s prior rulings regarding your motion for permission to file a tort claim notwithstanding the expiration of the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases. Full copies of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision, and the tables attached to it, are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxorttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that your motion for reconsideration has been **DENIED**. Your motion will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. We have also enclosed a statement that sets forth the Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion.

PLEASE BE FURTHER ADVISED THAT IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU TIME TO RECEIVE THIS NOTICE AND TO CONSIDER YOUR RIGHTS THE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YOUR MOTION WILL NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022. THE DEADLINE FOR THE FILING OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WILL BE APRIL 14, 2022.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc., Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT C

**ORDER AS TO MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT IS
BEING DENIED AS PREMATURE**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT C

-----X	
In re	:
	:
	:
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
	:
Reorganized Debtors.	:
-----X	

Chapter 11
Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
Jointly Administered

ORDER DENYING PREMATURE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The individual listed on **Exhibit C1** attached to this Order (the “Movant”) has moved for reconsideration of the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and orders (ECF Nos. 9506 and 9507) denying various the movants’ requests for relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date. However, as indicated and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022, the motion for reconsideration is premature, as it seeks “reconsideration” as to a matter for which the Court has not yet made an underlying ruling. It is therefore

ORDERED, that the motion for reconsideration identified on Exhibit C1 is denied.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT C1

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT
IS DENIED AS PREMATURE**

Dancy, Kebede

Kebede Dancy
5005 N Frank Rd.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original motion docket no.: None located

Motion for reconsideration: docket 9655

Claim: Used a form that refers to claim TRO904210FTC, but that is a claim filed for Jakayla Dancy.

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

The Court has no record of a prior motion by Kebede Dancy.

Ruling:

If Kebede Dancy has filed a claim and/or a motion it may not yet have been processed by the Tort Claims Trust and/or may not yet have been presented to the Court for disposition. There are no grounds for a motion to reconsider because the Court has no record that the Tort Claims Trust has acted on a claim for Kebede Dancy or that a motion has yet been ruled upon by the Court.

Disposition:

The motion is denied as premature. No decision has been made as to Kebede Dancy or as to any motion on behalf of Kebede Dancy.

EXHIBIT C2

**NOTICE TO MOVANT WHOSE MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATON IS BEING DENIED AS PREMATURE**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT C2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOITCE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO YOUR
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT’S PRIOR RULING AS TO
YOUR REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 3, 2022 the Court issued a Decision regarding your motion for reconsideration of the Court’s prior rulings regarding your motion for permission to file a tort claim notwithstanding the expiration of the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases. Full copies of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision, and the tables attached to it, are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxorttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that your motion for reconsideration has been **DENIED** on the ground that it is premature. The Court has not yet reviewed or ruled upon an underlying motion on your behalf and so “reconsideration” is not appropriate. A copy of the Order that will be entered by the Court is enclosed, and a statement that sets forth the Court’s ruling as to your motion for reconsideration is also enclosed.

No action by you is required at this time. If the Court rules upon a motion by you seeking relief from the bar date, you will be so notified.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc. Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT D

**ORDER DENYING, IN THEIR ENTIRETY, CERTAIN
MOTIONS AS TO WHICH SUPPLEMENTS WERE PERMITTED
BUT NOT FILED**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT D

-----X	
In re	:
	:
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
Reorganized Debtors.	:
-----X	

Chapter 11
Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
Jointly Administered

**ORDER DENYING CERTAIN MOTIONS FOR RELIEF FROM THE
AUGUST 12, 2009 BAR DATE FOR WHICH SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSIONS
WERE PERMITTED BUT FOR WHICH NO SUPPLEMENTS WERE FILED**

In a prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and Order (ECF No. 9504) the Court ruled that certain movants who had asked for permission to file tort claims notwithstanding their failure to do so before the August 12, 2009 bar date (the “Bar Date”) would be permitted to make supplemental submissions to address matters the Court identified. The individuals listed on **Exhibit D1** attached to this Order were permitted to make supplemental submissions but did not do so, and their prior submissions do not establish grounds for the relief sought. For the reasons stated in the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and the attachments thereto, and in the rulings attached as Exhibit D1 and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022, it is hereby

ORDERED, that the motions for relief from the Bar Date filed by the individuals listed in Exhibit D1 are DENIED.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT D1

**MOTIONS FOR WHICH SUPPLEMENTS WERE PERMITTED
BUT NOT FILED AND THAT ARE BEING DENIED IN THEIR
ENTIRETY**

Abrams, Jasmine

Jasmine Abrams
1427 Lake Calais Court
Baton Rouge, LA 70808

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 4953
Claim: TRO885867FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis when two years old in 1990s; did not directly or indirectly receive notice of claims process; did not know or have reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Alleges publication notice was not reasonable but no showing that Tronox had reason to know of claimant, no specific challenge to the publication notices that were approved in 2009. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Allan, Joshua

Joshua Allen
2057 Schooley Rd.
Harding, PA 18643

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7289
Claim: TRO894162FTC

Ruling:

1993 and 2000 diagnoses; minor; does not say why guardian did not file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Barry, Justin

Justin Barry
2076 Shamrock Dr.
Decatur, Ga 30032

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4540
Claim: TRO887945FTC

Ruling:

Not included in the Trust's summary. Minor, apparently 11 years old at the 2009 bar date; says parent did not "put me in at the time" but does not explain why she did not do so. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Brandon, Ambrosha

Ambrosha Brandon
72 Landrum Rd.
Macon, MS 39341

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 8409
Claim: TRO897209FTC

Ruling:

1992 diagnosis (at birth); had no knowledge "until EPA came to Maranatha Faith Center;" says that when she was at the meeting at the faith center, she did the paperwork but does not mention date. Learned a year ago that "the case has been reopen." Movant apparently was a minor as of the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Brewer, Devario

Courtney Smith
Sims & Sims
PO Box 648
809 3rd Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7124
Claim: TRO894315FTC

Ruling:

Minor at the time notices were sent for the Tronox tort claims trust and did not receive notice or know that could file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Bridges, Tyler

Angela Bridges
2415 23rd Ave. North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4876
Claim: TRO902367FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis at birth in 2003; rep says unaware of deadline. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Brooks, Antavrio

Tracey Dooley
1406 4th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5121
Claim: TRO891644FTC

Ruling:

Minor; rep says child had diagnosis of schizophrenia but does not say why rep did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Brooks, Isiah

Isiah Brooks
1406 4th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5120
Claim: TRO891646FTC

Ruling:

Minor; says exposure began in 1999. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Brooks, Kashaeyla

Kashaeyla Brooks
1406 4th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5119
Claim: TRO891643FTC

Ruling:

Minor; says exposure began in 1999. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Brown, Johnathan

Johnathan Brown
869 Ranson Road
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5416
Claim: TRO892049FTC

Ruling:

1992 diagnosis; minor; unaware of the claim; standard language. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Brownlee, Shenqualia

Shenqualia Brownlee
406 Forest Blvd.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4944
Claim: TRO896757FTC

Ruling:

2002 diagnosis; says was a minor at bar date; did not see any publication regarding bankruptcy case or bar date; notice not reasonably calculated to provide notice. Notice was appropriate for the reasons set forth in the Court's March 2021 Decision. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at the time of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Buck, Deandra

Deandra Buck
2420 23rd Ave. North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5283
Claim: TRO890492FTC

Ruling:

1995 diagnosis; previously filed with attorney Bambach 2007; paperwork lost; minor at time of bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at the time of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Burgin, Eric

Eric Burgin
5248 Dresden Rd.
Irondale, AL 35210

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5954
Claim: TRO895204FTC

Ruling:

1987 diagnosis; left Columbus in 1987 to join military; does not provide dates of military service. If military service ended before 2006 then the claim would have been time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. Military service would not have tolled the application of the bar date in 2009 unless the movant continued to be in military service at that time. Permitted supplemental submission to verify dates of military service if movant believed that the application of the bar date was tolled due to military service or that the dates of military service justify relief based on excusable neglect, but no such submission was filed. The motion is denied, as there is an insufficient showing as to factors relevant to excusable neglect relief and the claim was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations.

Butler, Precious

Precious Butler
2003 Short Main Street
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5215
Claim: TRO892545FTC

Ruling:

2001 diagnosis; minor; did not know and no reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Callie, Payne

Payne Callie
5545 Norris Dr.
The Colony, TX 75056

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4768
Claim: TRO888797FTC

Ruling:

2005 diagnosis. Rep says that injured party was incapacitated and incompetent at the time, she resided in a nursing home and was unable to communicate. Rep does not specify date and it is unclear if this condition predated the bar date, particularly because the Trust says the claim is barred by the statute of limitations. Permitted supplemental submission to explain timing and duration of the alleged incapacity, whether the same affected the running of the statute of limitations, and reasons why guardians or reps did not file a claim until many years after the bar date, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Clayborn, Tywhun

Tywhun Clayborn
36 Hargrove
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7184
Claim: TRO887245FTC

2003 diagnosis; minor, did not know about the claim. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Cockrell, Aenderil

Aenderil Cockrell
421 Woolbright St.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6571
Claim: TRO893536FTC

Ruling:

1996 diagnosis; minor; did not know and no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Cockrell, Corey

Corey Cockrell
421 Woolbright St.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6550
Claim: TRO893534FTC

Ruling:

2003 and 2008 diagnoses; minor; did not know and had no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Coleman, Anthony

Anthony Coleman
4247 N. 1st St. Apt. 390
Lincoln, NE 68521

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 8425
Claim: TRO894307FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis "before August 2009;" former resident of Columbus, MS who still lived there in 2009; says was unaware of the bankruptcy suit; said just started college and was commuting back and forth between college and home. No explanation of long delay after bar date before filed claim, no explanation of any effort to investigate and pursue legal rights during that period. However, reference to just starting college suggests that movant may have been a minor in 2009. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Coleman, Cyntaria

Cyntaria Coleman
PO Box 37
Crawford, MS 39743

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6322
Claim: TRO887862FTC

Ruling:

1994-95 diagnosis; says was minor, incompetent. No explanation of alleged incompetence other than status as a minor. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Cooks, Kemion

Kemion Cooks
9500 W Sahara Ave., Apt. 1003
Las Vegas, NV 89117

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3826
Claim: TRO895599FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis date listed as "2008-2010." Was 17 years old at time of bar date, living in California. Did not know of the claims process. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Cooper, Jeffrey

Jeffrey Cooper
1417 13th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701-3605

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4708
Claim: TRO896007FTC

Ruling:

2003 diagnosis. Says was a minor at bar date and that discharge violates due process; does not say why guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Cooper, Trayvon

Trayvon Cooper
5695 Surrey Ln
San Bernardino, CA 92401

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4712
Claim: TRO896359FTC

Ruling:

2003 diagnosis. Was a minor at the time of the bar date, says violation of due process. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Dale, Michael, Jr.

Michael Dale, Jr.
415 Pittston Ave
Avoca, PA 18641

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7235
Claim: TRO886959FTC

Ruling:

1994 diagnosis; unaware of bar date; says no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product; was young at the time. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Daniels, Delanne

Dilanna Daniels
128 Temple Cove
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5372
Claim: TRO889917FTC

Ruling:

1999 diagnosis; minor (age 15) in 2009. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

DePetro, Joel

Joel DePetro
39 Washington Ave.
West Wyoming, PA 18644

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 3372, 4069
Claim: TRO887535FTC

Ruling:

Claims did not know and had no reason to know exposed to Tronox product; says was a minor. The same claim was filed again at docket #4069. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Dickerson, Frankie, Jr.

Frankie Dickerson, Jr.
3310 Hwy 69 South
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6458
Claim: TRO884267FTC

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. 1995 diagnosis; publication notice was not reasonably calculated to provide notice for unknown potential clients; did not know that was exposed to a Tronox product; also says was a child at the time of the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Dismukes, Denier

Denier Dismukes
139 White Oak Dr.
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7118
Claim: TRO900926FTC

Ruling:

Minor at bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Douglas, Jakayla

James Douglas
44 Swedenburg Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5610
Claim: TRO897535FTC

Ruling:

2003/2004 symptoms, no diagnosis date; minor at time of bar date, no other excuse offered. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Elizenbenyu, Kobe

Kobe Elizenberry
109 Cardinal Lane
Clinton, MS 39056

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7815
Claim: TRO901703FTC

Ruling:

2000 diagnosis; minor. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Elizenberry, Jamaal

Jamaal Elizenberry
109 Cardinal Lane
Clinton, MS 39056

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7814
Claim: TRO901705FTC

Ruling:

2006 diagnosis; minor; not aware of lawsuit. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Erby, Kobi

Kobi Erby
138 Beech St.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7017
Claim: TRO894828FTC

Ruling:

2010 diagnosis; minor; says symptoms and diagnosis 2010 but includes a hospital admission record for an earlier date. Standard cut-and-pasted form language as to reasons why missed the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Facciponti, Adam

Adam Facciponti
2530 4th Avenue
Hartzdale, PA 16651

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4205
Claim: TRO897870FTC

Ruling:

2006 diagnosis. Says was a minor when case began but alleges exposure began in 1985 so was at least 24 years old at the time of the bar date. Also says was in U.S. Air Force and did not hear about this matter until 2014. Claim was not filed until April 9, 2016; even if the bar date was tolled by 50 U.S.C. 3936, the claim would be untimely so long as military service ended on or before January 23, 2016. The motion alleges lack of actual knowledge in 2009 but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in pursuit of claims and reasons why filed so long after the bar date and why waited so long after learning of the process in 2014), would not be sufficient to warrant an untimely claim to be permitted on grounds of excusable neglect. Previously held that If movant believes that military service continued until January 23, 2016 or later, movant could make a supplemental submission to verify the dates of military service. No such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Fleming, John Belab

John Fleming
610 22nd St N, Apt. K
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7993
Claim: TRO890647FTC

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. 1999 diagnosis; parent went to Bambach, atty deceased (but he did not die until 2013); claimant was a child at the time; claimant can't read, write or count; was afraid to let people know because he knew would be taken advantage of but he trusts the person assisting now; mind affected by chemicals, can't concentrate; unaware of cause of medical problems. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Fox, Billsha

Billsha Fox
1911 North Roberson Street
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3419
Claim: TRO886420FTC

Ruling:

Minor at the time and did not have any knowledge of the claim; does not say why guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Fulgham, Jadalyn

Jadalyn Fulgham
1411 26 St. N
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5337
Claim: TRO886540FTC

Ruling:

2002 diagnosis; says was a minor. A supplemental letter filed with others at docket #8967 complaining about the process. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at the time of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Gray, Nadia

Nadia Gray
1609 5th Ave. North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7049
Claim: TRO885623FTC

Ruling:

2008 diagnosis; minor; unaware exposed to a Tronox product; did not see any publication information related to the case; alleges the notice was not reasonably calculated to provide notice, but does not allege that Tronox knew of the movant's claim and does not specify any problems with the notice that the Court approved. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Grays, LaQuana

LaQuana Grays
31 Shirley Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7181
Claim: TRO885089FTC

Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; minor; unaware of exposure; parent was rep but died in 2011. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Grays, Taquana

Taquana Grays
31 Shirley Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7183
Claim: TRO885090FTC

Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; minor; unaware of exposure; parent was rep but died in 2011. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Hargrove, Tiffani

Tiffani Hargrove
5582 Savannah River Rd.
Atlanta, GA 30344

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5783
Claim: TRO902688FTC

Ruling:

1993 diagnosis; minor; no excuse or information provided. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Harris, April

April Harris
608 Forrest Blvd
Columbus, MS 39702-5347

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5590
Claim: TRO0894629FTC

Ruling:

2004 diagnosis; minor in 2009; no reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Harris, Devontess

Devontess Harris
499 Emerald Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4801
Claim: TRO893501FTC

Ruling:

Minor at time of bar date; does not say why guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to verify age as of the bar date, to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Harris, Kristy

Kristy Harris
169 Applewood Dr., Apt. 18
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5903
Claim: TRO899293FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis "2002-2010 maybe"; minor; previously filed with Colom law firm. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Harrison, Marco

Marco Harrison
188 Betty Dr.
Columbus, MS 39705-0322

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4978
Claim: TRO894249FTC

Ruling:

1996 diagnosis; minor; did not know and no reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Hendrix, Tyler

Carissa Hendrix
2125 Bell Avenue
Post Office Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7872

Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

2007 diagnosis; minor (age 7) at time of bar date; unaware condition was related to Tronox chemicals. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Henley, Lucious

Lucious Henley
812 20th St. N.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6207
Claim: TRO889691FTC

Ruling:

2007 diagnosis; minor at time of bar date (21 years old at time of motion in 2017); did not know about the deadline; did not understand all of the issues and still does not. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Henry, Cherish

Lakoya Henry
168 Sunny Lane
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3534
Claim: TRO903576FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 2005, "child - under the age of 18." No allegation as to conduct of parent or guardian, no allegation of lack of awareness. Appears related to claimants in claims 3530, 3531, 3532 and 3533. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Hicks, Amanda

Hicks, Amanda
6562 Kempton St.
Navarre, FL 32566

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5727
Claim: TRO905774FTC

Ruling:

1993 diagnosis; lived in Columbus, MS at time of the bar date but moved away with parents who were serving in active military - Air Force - provides dates of parents' service. Unclear if movant was a minor as of the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Hill, Kerrigan

Kerrigan Hill
78 Ben Morgan Drive
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7748
Claim: TRO893796FTC

Ruling:

1999 diagnosis (apparently at birth); minor. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Hill, Terry

Terry Hill
1212 Avignon Drive
Conyers, GA 30094

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5722
Claim: TRO900945FTC

Ruling:

1997 and 2005 diagnoses; minor, and as a child did not know about Tronox product claim filing, does not say why parent or guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Hogan, Mikayla

Shelly Hogan
70 Pickens Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5415
Claim: TRO892986FTC

Ruling:

Minor; rep says publication notice not reasonably calculated to provide notice; did not know and no reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jackson, Tajshmon

Tajshmon Jackson
417 Burgundy Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6696
Claim: TRO885018FTC

Ruling:

November 1999 diagnosis; child at time of filing deadline. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

James, Tiffany

Tiffany James
247 William Roberts Rd., Apt 59
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3504
Claim: TRO897851FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 2004. No knowledge of exposure prior to deadline. Was minor living with grandmother as guardian and relied on her. No explanation as to grandmother's knowledge or as to reasons why she did not file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

James, Yonesha

Yonesha James
1016 Bennett Ave.
Columbus, MS

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5433
Claim: TRO902955FTC

Ruling:

Minor (12 at bar date); 1999 diagnosis. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jennings, Dontaquius

Renata Jennings
424 East Gaywood St.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4353
Claim: TRO889268FTC

Ruling:

Alleges diagnoses in 2006, 2010 and 2012. Minor, unaware exposed to Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jennings, Toney

Toney Jennings
229 John Kidd Rd.
Caledonia, MS 39740

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3486
Claim: TRO895080FTC

Ruling:

March 2009 diagnosis. Says was a child and incompetent and a slow learner and can't read and has to have someone else do it for her; does not say why a guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jones, India

India Jones
103 Mill St.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6625
Claim: TRO884254FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis "1994-2005;" underage at time of filing deadline. Born 11/28/90, apparently (that is date exposure began). Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jones, Jacqualan

Erika Jones
103 Mill St.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4305
Claim: TRO886037FTC

Ruling:

Minor, rep uncertain of process to file a claim. Alleges some diagnoses before bar date but other conditions diagnosed after bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jones, Jamarcus

Jamarcus Jones
1007 11th Avenue South
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4440
Claim: TRO887034FTC

Ruling:

1993 and 2006 diagnoses. Minor, says not aware exposed to Tronox product, but no explanation of parents' or guardian's knowledge or actions or their diligence in pursuing rights and claims. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to verify age as of the bar date and to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jones, Jenerrio

Jenerrio Jones
2006 Cherry St.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6670
Claim: TRO892137FTC

Ruling:

Exposed at birth in 1990; diagnosed in 1992; minor at deadline. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Jordan, Corrye

Corrye Jordan
1201 Wheat Street
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7842
Claim: TRO895950FTC

Ruling:

2000 diagnosis; says was a minor at the time of the bar date. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Karriem, Naml

Naml F. Karriem
1516 15th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6449
Claim: TRO880231FTC

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. 2003 diagnosis; minor; says publication notice of filing deadline was not reasonably calculated to provide notice to potential clients unknown at the time of notice; did not know and had no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product. Alleges publication notice was not reasonable but does not allege that Tronox knew of claimant's claim, no specific challenge to the publication notices that were approved and used. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Karriem, Yusuf

Yusuf Karriem
1516 15th Ave. N.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3687
Claim: TRO880232FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 2003, recites reasons for not filing by quoting verbatim from the determination notice without elaborating on underlying reasons. Alleges was a child at time of bar date, no explanation as to awareness by parents or guardian or why they did not file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

King, Travonte

Travonte King
66 Hargrove Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5522
Claim: TRO894979FTC

Ruling:

Symptoms 2006-2009; minor at time of bar date, mother had no knowledge of bankruptcy case, mother was single with 4 kids and had her own health issues; does not provide medical records. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Kye, Lynnita

Lynnita Kye
5551 Shaw Road, Apt. 132
Jackson, MS 39209

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6910
Claim: TRO901547FTC

Ruling:

1993 diagnosis; minor, with no reason to be knowledgeable of the case or deadline. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Lang, Kameryn

Josie Moore
188 Betty Dr.
Columbus, MS 39705-0322

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4990
Claim: TRO894607FTC

Ruling:

Minor; rep does not give excuse for not timely filing. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Latham, Cherell

Cherell Latham
1605 5th St. South
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3704
Claim: TRO892255FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 1997, was a child at time of deadline. No allegation as to knowledge or awareness of parent or guardian or as to reasons why they did not file a timely claim. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Little, Chelsey M.

Chelsey M. Little
2203 22nd St. North
Columbus, MS 39701-2559

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6457
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. 2005 diagnosis; minor (born 2001 or earlier); says publication notice was improperly calculated to provide notice for future claimants; did not know and had no reason to know of exposure to a Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Lockett-Watkins, Veronica

Veronica Watkins
3303 Dunway St.
Norfolk, VA 23513

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6373
Claim: TRO891290FTC

2006 diagnosis; says was not aware of the claims process and did not have knowledge of the case; says is in the U.S. Navy and due to deployments did not see or hear any advertisements on TV, radio or other media. Dates of military service not clear. Permitted supplemental submission to verify dates of military service and to permit the Court to assess the possible application of 50 U.S.C. 3936 and to determine whether military service provides grounds for relief based on excusable neglect, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Martin, Jeremy

Jeremy Martin
1423 12th Ave. No.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7996
Claim: TRO885398FTC

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. Minor at bar date; parents were told could not file for kids; when found out and filed, atty deceased; docket entry has nothing attached to it. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Maxwell, Pravi

Pravi Maxwell
4778 Pineywood Rd
Macon, MS 39341-6127

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6960
Claim: TRO892914FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis in 1994 or 1996, as child; relocated to another county and was not aware of the claim. Age at time of bar date unclear. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

McCrary, Jailan

Lasunda McCrary
19925 Krameria Ave.
Riverside, CA 92508

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7063
Claim: TRO904378FTC

Ruling:

2001, 2003, 2007 diagnoses; minor; parent was not aware or informed at the time. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

McCrary, Jonathan

Jonathan McCrary
19925 Krameria Ave.
Riverside, CA 92508

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7062
Claim: TRO904379FTC

Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; minor; parent was not aware or informed at the time. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

McCrary, Marcellus

Marcellus McCrary
1816 11th Ave. North
Columbus, MS

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3725
Claim: TRO893609FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 1999, was child at time of bar date. No showing as to knowledge or awareness by parents or guardian. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

McGee, Anthony, Jr.

Anthony McGee, Jr.
610 22nd Street North, Apt. G
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3437
Claim: TRO886698FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis in 2003. Was a minor in 2009, does not say why a parent or guardian did not file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

McKnight, Kayla

Kayla McKnight
500 Greentree Drive, Apt. J-45
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6544
Claim: TRO895915FTC

Ruling:

2000/01 diagnoses; did not have any knowledge of Tronox or its bankruptcy case; did not receive any notice by telephone, email, letter or other media; part of time was away at college. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. However, although the claimant did not seek relief based on infancy it appears possible the claimant was a minor at the time of the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

McKnight, Quinton

Quinton McKnight
500 Greentree Drive, Apt. J-45
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 6512, 8367
Claim: TRO895916FTC

Ruling:

2000 diagnosis; says had no knowledge of Tronox or the case until 2013; did not get a telephone call, email, letter or any other media communication; most of time was in high school; did not know and no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product. A supplement filed by parent at docket #8367 describing his health issues. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Mitchell, Aaron

Aaron Mitchell
427 Summerhaven Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7727
Claim: TRO890650FTC

Ruling:

1994 diagnosis; says was a minor (approximately 17) at the time of the bar date in 2013. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Moore, Demarcus

Marilyn Moore
217 Conway Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6793
Claim: TRO887351FTC

Ruling:

2000 and 2003 diagnoses; mother filing on behalf of her son, who is the twin of the boy for whom motion at docket #6793 was filed; mother did not know about the case; also says was incompetent at time of deadline in 2009 because was in and out of hospital fighting for her life. Claim filed on behalf of minor. Mother's hospitalization in 2009 may explain lack of filing then but does not explain delay of many years before claim filed. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why movant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Moore, Jamal

Jamal Moore
205 Lawrence Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4868
Claim: TRO885654FTC

Ruling:

2002 birth and diagnosis; minor; rep says unaware of bankruptcy case. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Moore, Jemarcus

Marilyn Moore
217 Conway Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6792
Claim: TRO887349FTC

Ruling:

2000 and 2003 diagnoses; mother filing on behalf of son; mother did not know about the case; says she was incompetent at time of deadline in 2009 because was in and out of hospital fighting for her life. Claim filed on behalf of minor. Mother's hospitalization in 2009 may explain lack of filing then but does not explain delay of many years before claim filed. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why movant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Moore, Terrance

Terrance Moore
P.O. Box 281
Millport, AL 35576

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3331
Claim: TRO884724FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 1994, "no reason to know exposed." Minor child living in another state at the time. Rejection notice filed at docket # 6772. A supplement filed at docket #8329. Says did not have access to Wall Street Journal but notice also was published in the Commercial Dispatch in Columbus, MS on June 23, 2009 and in several other newspapers in Mississippi and Alabama. Permitted a supplemental submission to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Moore, Tony

Tony Moore
1706 English Ivey Lane NW
Kennesaw, GA 30144

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3407
Claim: TRO887995FTC

Ruling:

Minor, lived in another state; does not say why guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Moore, William, Jr.

William Moore, Jr.
205 Lawrence Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4870
Claim: TRO885655FTC

Ruling:

1997 birth, 1998 diagnosis; minor at time and unaware of bankruptcy case. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Nicholson, Denai

Denai Nicholson
236 Pounds Rd.
Steens, MS 39766

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3499
Claim: TRO886774FTC

Ruling:

2006-07 diagnosis. Says at the time she was a minor and unable to file a claim; does not say why guardian did not file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Nicholson, Renel

Renel Nicholson
236 Pounds Rd.
Steens, MS 39766

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3326
Claim: TRO886773FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosed 1997-2001 (various diseases). Was 17 at time of deadline. Claims he was not able to file a claim as a minor but does not allege lack of knowledge or reason why a guardian did not act. Allowed supplemental submission to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 to file a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no supplement was filed. Motion is denied.

Petty, Damien

Courtney "Corky" Smith, Esq.
Sims & Sims
P.O. Box 648
809 Third Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7316
Claim: TRO892256FTC

Ruling:

2008 diagnosis; minor (14 years old at time of bar date); did not receive any notice; also submitted a signed rejection notice as to post-bar date diagnoses though none are identified in the motion. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Pilate, Marcy

Marcy Pilate
PO Box 8173
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3761
Claim: TRO889623FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis in 1998. Says was a child at time of bar date. Lists attorney representation (William Colom) but without date, unclear if representation preceded bar date or post-dated it. No explanation as to parents' or guardian's knowledge or reasons why they did not make a timely claim. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Porter, Nakeria

L. Nichole Clinkscales, Esq.
The Clinkscales Law Firm
2125 Bell Avenue
P.O. Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7959
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. Diagnoses 2002, 2003, 2005 2007; minor (15) at bar date; unaware condition related to Tronox chemicals; says notice insufficient to tell claimant of litigation and that condition was related to litigation. No indication that Tronox had reason to know of the injured party's condition. Due process did not require the impossible and did not require that Tronox send notice to each injured party saying that the injured party had a condition that Tronox had caused. The Court permitted a supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Powers, Christopher

Christopher Powers
201 Robinwood Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6857
Claim: TRO895974FTC

Ruling:

2000 symptoms, 2007 diagnosis; minor; says exposure began 1994; did not know that his area was involved until recently; did not know and no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Pratt, Shemeka Love Obo Ametrice

L. Nichole Clinkscales, Esq.
The Clinkscales Law Firm
2125 Bell Avenue
P.O. Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7952
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

2003 diagnosis; minor; unaware exposed to deadly chemicals and had no knowledge that the potential exposure causes deadly conditions; did not receive notice of the pending litigation and says form of notice used was insufficient to put her on legal notice of the litigation. Motion was not filed within 90 days after Determination Notice as required by the Court's prior order and as specified in the Determination Notice. Court nevertheless permitted a supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Profiet, Raymond

Raymond Profiet
432 Winterset Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 6514, 9292
Claim: TRO891458FTC

Ruling:

1991 and 1992 diagnoses; says was a minor but says exposure began in 1991, was at least 18 years old in 2009; says publication notice was not reasonably calculated to provide notice. A supplemental letter filed at docket #9292 complaining about the process. No explanation of long post-bar date delay before filed claim. Alleges publication notice was not reasonable but no showing that Tronox had reason to know of claimant. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Radle, Chelsea

Chelsea Radle
317 Mitchell Street
Duryea, PA 18642

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 4430, 8152
Claim: TRO892697FTC

Ruling:

2006 diagnosis. Was a minor (17) in 2009, unaware exposed to Tronox product at bar date. A supplement filed at docket #8152, says that a prudent course of action would have been to have followed the minors for many years after the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Richardson, Arlicia

Arlicia Richardson
777 Crowe Rd.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3381
Claim: TRO886368FTC

Ruling:

Motion not included on Trust's summary. Diagnosed 2004, but "was a child" at the time of the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Richardson, Christopher

Christopher Richardson
82 Chain Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3420
Claim: TRO885382FTC

Ruling:

Not included on the Trust's summary. Says was a child in school and not aware of being in a lawsuit, does not say why guardian did not file. Insufficient support for excusable neglect relief. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Richey, Leandrae

Leandra Richey
312 Swedenburg Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5935
Claim: TRO895414FTC

Ruling:

1999 diagnosis; says was too young to know a claim could be made but age as of the bar date is not clear, says exposure began in 1993. Unclear if claims relief on ground of being a minor. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Salter, Jarvaris

Jarvaris Salter
804 Spruce St.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3812
Claim: TRO884048FTC

Ruling:

Says was a child, did not know that had to show proof of medical condition. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Salter, Leatha

Leatha Salter
1911 6th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7022
Claim: TRO888535FTC

Ruling:

1994 and 2004 diagnoses; minor at the time of the bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Seals, Malik

Malik Seals
1412 17th Ave. North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5172
Claim: TRO889341FTC

Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; says was a minor in 2009. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Selvie, Marcus

Marcus Selvie
2125 Bell Avenue
Post Office Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7888

Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

Diagnoses 1992, 2007, 2009; minor (20) at bar date; unaware condition related to Tronox chemicals; unaware of pending litigation. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Sharp, Joshua

Joshua Sharp
1009 1/2 Shady Street
Columbus, MS 39701-2736

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7911
Claim: TRO914670FTC

Ruling:

1995 diagnosis; minor at bar date (approximately 17). Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Shelley, Culbert

Culbert Shelley
2615 17th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7789
Claim: TRO892769FTC

Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; minor (approximately 12 or 13 at the bar date); guardian did not file because she had no knowledge of Tronox bankruptcy case; standard form language as to reasons did not file. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Shelton, Brittany

Brittney Shelton
5480 SE 28th St.
Ocala, FL 34480

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5869
Claim: TRO904626FTC

Ruling:

Says was a minor; says exposed from birth until moved to Florida with parents in 1991, so was 18 or older by the bar date; did not get a diagnosis but symptoms began in 1998. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Smith, Amberlexis

Amberlexis Smith
4778 Pineywood Rd
Macon, MS 39341

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6962
Claim: TRO902241FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis in 1997 or 1998, as child; relocated to another county and was not aware of the claim. Age at time of bar date unclear. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Smith, Tenitra

Tenitra Smith
1002 2nd St. S.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 3980, 3981
Claim: TRO887514FTC

Ruling:

2007 diagnosis. Duplicate at docket 3981. Child at time of deadline but no showing as to parents' or guardian's knowledge and/or pursuit of claim and legal rights. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Spencer, Kenneth

L. Nichole Clinkscales, Esq.
The Clinkscales Law Firm
2125 Bell Avenue
P.O. Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7950
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

1996 diagnosis; minor (18) at bar date; says exposure began in 2005 but says symptoms began in 1996 and were diagnosed in 1996; unaware exposed to deadly Tronox chemicals; notice insufficient to provide notice of pending litigation or that condition was related to Tronox. No indication that Tronox had reason to know of the injured party's condition. Due process did not require the impossible and did not require that Tronox send notice to each injured party saying that the injured party had a condition that Tronox had caused. Motion was not filed within 90 days after Determination Notice as required by the Court's prior order and as specified in the Determination Notice. Court nevertheless permitted a supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file a claim by the bar date, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Stallings, Shawn

Shawn Stallings
2125 Bell Avenue
Post Office Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7880
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; minor (14) at time of bar date. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Tate, Whitney

Whitney Tate
65 Caribou Cave
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5079
Claim: TRO893626FTC

Ruling:

2002 and 2008 diagnoses but says was a minor (16) at bar date; illness and says recovering hospitalized for two weeks but the medical records do not reflect anything like that in 2009, not clear when she was hospitalized. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age at bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Taylor, Zachary

Zachary Taylor
3975 I 55 N
Jackson, MS 39216

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 8043
Claim: TR890591FTC

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. Various diagnosis dates, some before bar date and some after; minor and did not know nor was he aware of his options; did not know and had no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product; does not provide reason why a guardian did not file. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Thompson, Darius

Darius Thompson
129 Leila Ln.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6634
Claim: TRO891784FTC

Ruling:

Diagnoses 2005 and 2009; child and incompetent at time of deadline. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Thompson, Jacqueline

Jennifer Thompson
677 Yorkville Rd.
F2
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5401
Claim: TRO892682FTC

Ruling:

2007 diagnosis; minor in 2009. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Thompson, Jateria

Jateria Thompson
129 Leila Ln.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6637
Claim: TRO891783FTC

Ruling:

1998 symptoms; no diagnosis date listed; child and incompetent at time of deadline. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Walker, Josiah

April M Richards
910 Railroad Street
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5923
Claim: TRO889897FTC

Ruling:

Diagnosis at age 6 (date unclear); minor; rep says at time she was incapacitated and homeless. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age and alleged incapacity as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Walls, Octavian

Chynee Bailey
Bailey Law, PLLC
PO Box 8121
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7531
Claim: TRO900936FTC

Ruling:

2004 and 2016 diagnoses; minor at time of bar date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Washington, Tylesha

L. Nichole Clinkscales, Esq.
The Clinkscales Law Firm
2125 Bell Avenue
P.O. Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7958
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. Diagnoses 1996; minor (12) at bar date; unaware condition related to Tronox chemicals; says notice insufficient to advise claimant of litigation and to let claimant know that claimant's condition was due to Tronox. No indication that Tronox had reason to know of the injured party's condition. Due process did not require the impossible and did not require that Tronox send notice to each injured party saying that the injured party had a condition that Tronox had caused. The Court permitted a supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Webber, Taylor

Taylor Webber
2201 Hughes Ln.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7080
Claim: TRO893941FTC

Ruling:

1995 diagnosis; says is incapacitated, suffers from autism and at the time did not know of any legal proceedings regarding this case; his capacity to understand is limited; relies on family for assistance with personal care; his parent was working and going to school at time and did not know about any lawsuit or hear any news or information to file a claim. Age as of the bar date is not clear. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Williams, Anderson

L. Nichole Clinkscales, Esq.
The Clinkscales Law Firm
2125 Bell Avenue
P.O. Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7942
Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

2008 diagnosis; says was a minor (16) at the bar date; unaware condition related to Tronox chemicals; notice insufficient to inform claimant that condition was related to Tronox. No indication that Tronox had reason to know of the injured party's condition. Due process did not require the impossible and did not require that Tronox send notice to each injured party saying that the injured party had a condition that Tronox had caused. In addition, the motion was untimely as it was not dated or filed within the 90-day period required under the procedures approved by the Court and set forth in the Determination Notice. Court nevertheless permitted a supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file by the bar date, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied.

Williams, Caleb

Tameka Williams
204 Dauphine Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5618
Claim: TRO891114FTC

Ruling:

2007 diagnosis; minor, rep says unaware could file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Williams, Iesha

Iesha Williams
542 Sth Bond Street
Clewiston, FL 33440

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5532
Claim: TRO886751FTC

Ruling:

1992 diagnosis; minor at time of bar date, did not know of proceeding and did not see notices. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Williams, Kourgee

Kourgee Williams
16 Woodgate Cove
Jackson, TN 38305

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 8524
Claim: TRO887714FTC

Ruling:

1999 diagnosis (at age 9); minor (19 at bar date); military family relocated to Tennessee in 2005. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Wilson, La Sharra

La Sharra Wilson
1007 11th Avenue South
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4334
Claim: TRO887068FTC

Ruling:

1995 and 2001 diagnoses. Minor, unaware exposed to chemicals. Filed claim in 2015. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Woods, Mario

Mario James
700 10th Ave.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 3404
Claim: TRO884286FTC

Ruling:

Says was a minor and not aware of his rights. Exposures began in 1991. Permitted supplemental submission to be filed to explain why parent or guardian did not act, why claimant waited until 2015 before filing a claim, and whether that warrants relief, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Wright, Mildred

Mildred Wright
10055 Celtic Ash Dr.
Ruskin, FL 33573

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket nos.: 7172, 9431
Claim: TRO903204FTC

Ruling:

2004 diagnosis; former resident of Columbus, MS; unaware of bankruptcy case as moved away from Columbus in 1999 and joined the U.S. Air Force; does not provide dates of service, may have ended in 2004. A supplemental letter filed with others at docket #9431 complaining about the process. Permitted supplemental submission to verify dates of military service so Court may assess possible application of 50 U.S.C. 3936 and so that Court may consider dates of military service in assessing request for relief based on excusable neglect, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Young, Ke'ayr

Ke'ayr Young
413 10th Ave., South
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 6543
Claim: TRO895200FTC

Ruling:

Not included in Trust's summary. Diagnosed at birth (1994); minor, did not know could file a claim. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

EXHIBIT D2

**NOTICE TO MOVANTS WHO WERE PERMITTED TO FILE
SUPPLEMENTS BUT WHO DID NOT DO SO AND WHOSE
MOTIONS ARE BEING DENIED IN THEIR ENTIRETY**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT D2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOITCE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO
YOUR MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 10, 2021 the Court issued a Decision regarding approximately 4,676 motions seeking relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases so that the movants may pursue claims against the Tronox Incorporated Tort Claims Trust (the “Trust”). The Decision described the Court’s rulings with respect to many common issues among the motions. With respect to your motion, the Court permitted the filing of a supplemental submission to address certain points. However, the Court has not received such a supplemental submission with respect to your motion.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that your motion has been denied in its entirety pursuant to a decision by the Court dated March 3, 3022. A copy of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision and related Orders are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxorttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480. Your motion will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. We have also enclosed a statement that sets forth the Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion.

PLEASE BE FURTHER ADVISED THAT IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU TIME TO RECEIVE THIS NOTICE AND TO CONSIDER YOUR RIGHTS THE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YOUR MOTION WILL NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022. THE DEADLINE FOR THE FILING OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WILL BE APRIL 14, 2022.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc., Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT E

**ORDER AS TO MOTIONS FOR WHICH SUPPLEMENTS WERE
PERMITTED BUT NOT FILED AND AS TO WHICH MOTIONS
ARE BEING DENIED AS TO PRE-BAR DATE CONDITIONS**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT E

-----X	
In re	:
	:
	:
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
	:
Reorganized Debtors.	:
-----X	

**ORDER DENYING CERTAIN MOTIONS FOR RELIEF FROM THE
AUGUST 12, 2009 BAR DATE AS TO CLAIMS BASED ON CONDITIONS
FIRST DIAGNOSED BEFORE THE BAR DATE, BUT REFERRING CLAIMS
BASED ON CONDITIONS FIRST DIAGNOSED AFTER THE BAR DATE TO
THE TORT CLAIMS TRUST FOR RESOLUTION**

In a prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and Order (ECF No. 9504) the Court ruled that certain movants who had sought relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases (the “Bar Date”) would be permitted to make supplemental submissions. The individuals listed on **Exhibit E1** attached to this Order were permitted to make supplemental submissions but did not do so. However, these movants also contended that they had conditions that were not diagnosed until after the Bar Date. For the reasons stated in the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and in Exhibit E1, and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that the motions for relief from the Bar Date identified in Exhibit E1 are DENIED to the extent they relate to claims based on conditions first diagnosed before the Bar Date. Any claims by those individuals based on conditions first diagnosed after the Bar Date will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT E1

**MOTIONS FOR WHICH SUPPLEMENTS WERE PERMITTED
BUT WERE NOT FILED - DENIED AS TO PRE-BAR DATE
CONDITIONS, CLAIMS BASED ON POST-BAR DATE
CONDITONS TO BE REVIEWED BY TORT CLAIMS TRUST**

Moore, Johnnie

Celia Moore
1709 4th Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4744
Claim: TRO885411FTC

Ruling:

2009 diagnosis; says filed with Tollison firm in 2011; alleges was incapacitated in 2009, rep says injured party was seeking medical attention in 2009 due to illness, surgery and died Jan. 2010. Permitted supplemental submission to provide further support for injured party's alleged incapacity in 2009 and to explain reasons why guardians did not file, why rep waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted as to claims based on conditions diagnosed before the bar date, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied as to conditions that were first diagnosed before the bar date. The Court previously held that the merits of any claim alleging conditions first diagnosed after the bar date are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

Harris, Javokco

Javokco Harris
2014 Heather Drive
Ridgeland, MS 39157

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5047
Claim: TRO890291FTC

Ruling:

Says had different conditions with different diagnosis dates from 1998-2014. Says was unaware of deadline and unaware of “pending litigation” regarding this matter. Says was a minor at the time of the bar date; also says underwent a surgery that left him incapacitated at this time but does not provide date or medical records. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age and alleged incapacity and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file by bar date, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted as to conditions diagnosed before the bar date, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied as to conditions diagnosed before the bar date. Merits of any claim alleging conditions first diagnosed after the bar date are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

Melvin, Donald

Donald Melvin
1524 MLK Jr Drive
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5606
Claim: TRO880273FTC

Ruling:

Alleges 2010 diagnosis; says was in the armed forces; unaware of these proceedings until returned from tour of duty but does not provide dates of service. Also attaches the form letter that says did not receive "justifiable allowance under the guidance of Colom and Lundy" and refers to secret meeting and minimal information to community. Permitted movant to make a supplemental submission verifying dates of military service if movant contends that military service tolled the application of the bar date past September 2015 or otherwise contends that the dates of military service provide "excusable neglect" for a late-filed claim, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied as to conditions first diagnosed prior to the bar date. As previously held, the movant's claims based on any conditions first diagnosed after the bar date are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

Baker, Eryannah

Colanda Baker
259 Ruff St.
Macon, MS 39341

Motion and Docket Information:

Original motion docket no.: 6213
Claim: TRO892500FTC

Ruling:

Says diagnoses 2009-2011; says was a minor and parents had no idea there was a claim. Unclear whether 2009 diagnosis was before or after the bar date. To the extent the condition was diagnosed before the bar date the Court permitted a supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied as to conditions diagnosed before the bar date. Merits of any claim alleging conditions first diagnosed after the bar date are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

Williams, Dasha

Dasha Williams
2125 Bell Avenue
Post Office Box 1352
Columbus, MS 39703

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 7865

Claim: Unknown

Ruling:

Diagnoses 2001, 2003, 2016; minor at time of bar date; unaware condition was related to Tronox chemicals; says certain conditions did not manifest until after deadline. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted as to claims based on pre-bar date diagnoses, but no such submission was filed. Motion is denied as to conditions diagnosed before the bar date. Claims alleging conditions first diagnosed after the bar date do not require relief from this court and are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

EXHIBIT E2

**NOTICE TO MOVANTS WHO WERE PERMITTED TO FILE
SUPPLEMENTS BUT DID NOT DO SO AND WHOSE MOTIONS
ARE BEING DENIED AS TO PRE-BAR DATE CONDITIONS**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT E2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOITCE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO
YOUR MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 10, 2021 the Court issued a Decision regarding approximately 4,676 motions seeking relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases so that the movants may pursue claims against the Tronox Incorporated Tort Claims Trust (the “Trust”). The Decision described the Court’s rulings with respect to many common issues among the motions. With respect to your motion, the Court permitted the filing of a supplemental submission to address certain points. However, the Court has not received such a supplemental submission with respect to your motion.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the Court has ruled on your motion for relief from the bar date. A copy of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision and related Orders are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxorttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that your motion has been denied in its entirety to the extent that it is based on conditions that were diagnosed prior to the August 12, 2009 Bar Date, and will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. The Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion are set forth in a statement that is also enclosed. Any claim that is based on a condition that allegedly was first diagnosed after the August 12, 2009 bar date will be treated separately and is being referred to the Tort Claims Trust for resolution.

PLEASE BE FURTHER ADVISED THAT IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU TIME TO RECEIVE THIS NOTICE AND TO CONSIDER YOUR RIGHTS THE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YOUR MOTION WILL NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022. THE DEADLINE FOR THE FILING OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WILL BE APRIL 14, 2022.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc., Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT F

**ORDER AS TO SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS THAT ARE
BEING GRANTED**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT F

-----X		
In re	:	
	:	Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
	:	Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.	:	
-----X		

**ORDER GRANTING CERTAIN MOTIONS FOR RELIEF
FROM THE AUGUST 12, 2009 BAR DATE FOR WHICH
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSIONS WERE FILED**

In a prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and Order (ECF No. 9504) the Court ruled that certain movants who had asked for permission to file tort claims notwithstanding their failure to do so before the August 12, 2009 bar date (the “Bar Date”) would be permitted to make supplemental submissions. The individuals listed on **Exhibit F1** attached to this Order have made supplemental submissions that establish grounds for relief from the Bar Date based on excusable neglect. For the reasons stated in the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and the attachments thereto, and in the rulings attached as Exhibit F1 and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022, it is hereby

ORDERED, that the motions for relief from the Bar Date filed by the individuals listed in Exhibit F1 are **GRANTED**, and the claims filed by those individuals will be treated as Future Tort Claims, the merits of which are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust. For the avoidance of doubt, this Order merely holds that the claims covered by the motions listed in Exhibit F1 shall be treated as timely Future Tort Claims. The merits of the claims will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust pursuant to its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT F1

**SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS FOR WHICH RELIEF FROM THE
BAR DATE IS GRANTED**

LaPrecious Lowery

LaPrecious Lowery
113 School St.
P.O. Box 2
Crawford, MS 39743

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 6258
Supplement: docket 9524
Claim: TRO900542FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1996-97 diagnoses; minor; says was incompetent was not fully aware of anything, says everything was done for her at that age; unaware of dangers of the chemicals to cause injuries. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Mother is disabled and was at that time as well. I never knew my Father. My mom went blind and death when I was born.

Ruling:

Appears that movant was a minor and that parent/guardian was also disabled. Will grant the motion to treat this claim as a timely filed Future Tort Claim, subject to any defenses on the merits that the Tort Claims Trust may assert.

Disposition:

Motion to treat the claim as a timely filed Future Tort Claim is granted. The merits of the claim will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Parko Monta Butler

Cassandra McNeese-Butler
508 Lehmberg Rd., Lot 27
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4711
Supplement: docket 9602
Claim: TRO896810FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

December 2008 diagnosis. Says was incapacitated by injuries and mental illness, schizophrenia. Will permit supplemental submission to verify alleged mental incapacity at the time of the bar date and to explain why movant could not enlist others to help in filing a claim, why movant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement [submitted by Cassandra McNeese-Butler]:

“I, Cassandra McNeese-Butler, the wife of Parko Monta Butler, am submitting this information on behalf of the courts of the Tronox Tort Claim who are requesting reasons for Claim not being filed as of August 12, 2009. I, Cassandra McNeese-Butler (The Wife of Parko Monta Butler) will provide the Supplemental Declaration in support of Motion for Allowances of Future Tort Claim, due to Parko Monta Butler being deceased, as of April 10, 2021. Parko Butler began having mental breakdowns with episodes due to having schizo-affective bipolar disorder and not being aware of filing a claim, due to mental incapacities. Parko Butler moved in with wife (who was also not aware of Tronox claim during this time) and was in and out of the mental health institutions, due to his severe mental health conditions. As of Jan, 2011 Parko was incarcerated for 5 years with MDOC, and upon release was functioning for 7 days, until stable on medications, and due to unknown triggers there was a lapse in his mental health, causing him to be unable to mentally function. Parko returned to the Mental Health Facility and was not released until he was prescribed with medications that could assist and help him function. Parko Butler’s Wife assisted him with daily functions, as well as other needs during this time. Parko Butler became aware of Tronox Claim due to his wife browsing on line and reading information about claim. Parko Butler then realized he had been affected and claim was filed.”

Ruling:

Supplement adequately explains the movant’s own incapacity and reasons why others did not file on his behalf. Motion to treat claim as a timely-filed Future Tort Claim is granted. Merits of the claim will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures, and all defenses on the merits are reserved.

Disposition:

Motion to treat the claim as a timely-filed Future Tort Claim is granted. The merits of the claim will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Marvin Joiner

5666 Barber Cir.
Hahira, GA 31632-2499

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7558

Supplement: docket 9527

Claim: TRO880216FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1977 diagnosis; place of exposure not clear; says three previous lawyers were involved but only recalls the Sexton law firm; says was not provided with any information about the bar date; provides docs to support was in military service in 2009. No explanation offered for many years' delay after the bar date before a claim was filed. Will permit supplemental submission to verify dates of military service so that Court may assess the possible application of 50 U.S.C. 3936 as to the movant's own claim and may consider the dates of military service in evaluating the request for relief on grounds of excusable neglect.

Supplement:

Submitted verification of military service from July 12, 1995 to July 31, 2017. Appears the 2009 bar date was tolled until the date when a proof of claim was filed.

Ruling:

Motion is granted, the claim will be treated as a timely-filed Future Tort Claim, without prejudice to any defenses the Tort Claims Trust may assert, including without limitation defenses based on the applicable statute of limitations. Merits of the claim are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Disposition:

Motion to treat the claim as a timely filed Future Tort Claim is granted. The merits of the claim are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Terence Seals

212 Maderia Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4235

Supplement: docket 9592

Claim: TRO886604FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1980 diagnosis. Says was deployed out of country while in military service but dates are not clear. To the extent the motion seeks relief based on excusable neglect the motion is denied. The risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. If movant contends that the Mississippi statute of limitations was tolled due to military service and further contends that military service tolled the application of the bar date so that the claim was timely (which would require a showing that military service continued through September 21, 2015), movant may make a supplemental submission to verify the dates of military service.

Supplement:

Movant submitted records showing military service from July 12, 2002 through January 11, 2021.

Appears the 2009 bar date was tolled until the date when a proof of claim was filed.

Ruling:

Motion is granted, the claim will be treated as a timely-filed Future Tort Claim, without prejudice to any defenses the Tort Claims Trust may assert, including without limitation defenses based on the applicable statute of limitations. Merits of the claim are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Disposition:

Motion to treat the claim as a timely filed Future Tort Claim is granted. The merits of the claim are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

EXHIBIT F2

**NOTICE TO MOVANTS WHOSE SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS
ARE BEING GRANTED**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT F2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOITCE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO
YOUR MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 10, 2021 the Court issued a Decision regarding approximately 4,676 motions seeking relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases so that the movants may pursue claims against the Tronox Incorporated Tort Claims Trust (the “Trust”). With respect to your motion, the Court permitted the filing of a supplemental submission to address certain points.

On March 3, 2022 the Court issued a Decision regarding motions as to which supplements had been permitted. A copy of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision and related Orders are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxforttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the Court has reviewed your supplemental submission and that your motion for relief from the bar date has been **GRANTED**. Your motion will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. A statement that sets forth the Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion is also enclosed.

As a result of the Court’s ruling the fact that your claim was filed after the bar date will not bar the claim, and the merits of the claim will be determined by the Trust pursuant to its normal procedures. The Trust will notify you when it has made a determination as to the validity of the claim. **You need not take any other action at this time.**

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc. Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT G

**ORDER AS TO SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS THAT ARE
BEING DENIED IN THEIR ENTIRETY**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT G

-----X	
In re	:
	:
	:
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
	:
Reorganized Debtors.	:
-----X	

Chapter 11
Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
Jointly Administered

**ORDER DENYING CERTAIN MOTIONS FOR RELIEF
FROM THE AUGUST 12, 2009 BAR DATE FOR WHICH
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSIONS WERE FILED**

In a prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and Order (ECF No. 9504) the Court ruled that certain movants who had asked for permission to file tort claims notwithstanding their failure to do so before the August 12, 2009 bar date (the “Bar Date”) would be permitted to make supplemental submissions to address matters the Court identified. The individuals listed on **Exhibit G1** attached to this Order have made supplemental submissions. However, for the reasons stated in the Court’s prior decision (ECF No. 9498) and the attachments thereto, and in the rulings attached as Exhibit G1 and in the Decision entered on March 3, 2022, the Court has determined that these motions do not warrant the relief sought. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED, that the motions for relief from the Bar Date filed by the individuals listed in Exhibit G1 are DENIED.

Dated: New York, New York
March 31, 2022

Honorable Michael E. Wiles
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT G1

**SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS THAT ARE BEING DENIED IN
THEIR ENTIRETY**

Corinna Gagliardi

Corinna Gagliardi
153 Panama Street
Pittston, PA 18640

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4045
Supplement: docket 9508
Claim: TRO891827FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1997 and 2007 diagnoses. Minor at bar date (was at least 17). No explanation why parents or guardian did not file a claim. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of PA starting before 2000. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My parents were unaware that they could file on my behalf at that time.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Showing not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Kayla Jackson

Kayla Jackson
417 Burgundy Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket nos.: 6695, 9133
Supplement: docket 9509
Claim: TRO884951FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1998 diagnosis; child at time of filing deadline, exposure began January 1997. A supplemental letter filed at docket #9133 complaining about the process. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

No statement provided, only a signature page

Ruling:

Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion alleged lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Christopher D. Conner

Arthur Conner
805 Remunda Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4221, 8075
Supplement: docket 9510
Claims: TRO 889048FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Christopher D. Conner diagnosed 1992. Claims was a minor at bar date, grandfather filed this claim. Supplement at docket #8075. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Says “[m]y family was completely unaware of any types of bankruptcy deadlines for filing claims.”

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Christopher J. Conner

Arthur Conner
805 Remunda Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4338, 8137

Supplement: dockets 9510 (filed by Arthur Conner), 9523 (filed by Christopher J. Conner)

Claim: TRO884802FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

As to Christopher J. Conner: the excuse is that he was a minor (age 15) and unaware of the claims process. A supplement filed at docket #8137, says was diagnosed after the bar date in 2009. Unclear if claimant wishes to pursue any claim based on a diagnoses that preceded the bar date, but if so will permit supplemental submission to verify age at bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted. Merits of any claim based on a condition first diagnosed after the bar date should be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Supplement:

Filing by Arthur Conner asserts that “[m]y family was completely unaware of any types of bankruptcy deadlines for filing claims.” Filing by Christopher J. Conner states that “I was born Jan 20, 1994, making me 15 yrs old in 2009 and as minor my father (Arthur Conner) handled all of my family public + private affairs. He told us that he was unaware of any types of bankruptcy deadlines and he filed a claim for my entire family after finding out including his minor grandchildren. I am currently suffering from continuous chronic allergies/sinus infections.”

Ruling:

The Supplements allege lack of actual knowledge on the part of a grandparent but make no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Amir Brown

Kamilah Ballard
6073 Mtn View Terrace
Trussville, AL 35173

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 8080, 8415
Supplement: docket 9511
Claim: TRO902080FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Motion by a representative filed for a child; 2004 diagnosis (at age 1); rep says the publication notice was not reasonably calculated to provide notice, but does not allege Tronox knew of this claim or claimant. Says lived in Birmingham, Alabama at the time of the bar date, but notice of the bar date was also published in Birmingham. Says did not know and no reason to know exposed to a Tronox product. A supplement filed at docket #8080. Parent/guardian does not explain his/her own delay. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“My mom’s address in 2009 was 12641 Owen Park Ct, Lakeview, Al 35111. This is an unincorporated part of Tuscaloosa County. If this was published in the newspaper in unincorporated Tuscaloosa County, she did not have access to it. I have included a bank statement verifying the address. Also my mom, older sibling and younger sibling were approved. We all live together. We have never stayed apart.”

Ruling:

No showing as to reasons why parent did not file a claim in 2009 and why waited so many years after the bar date before doing so, except for allegation that parent did not actually know of the claims process. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Julian McKinley

Julian McKinley
10385 Magnolia Park Dr.
Tuscaloosa, AL 35405

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 6128
Supplement: docket 9512
Claim: TRO901498FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1993 diagnosis; minor in 2009 (age 17 or so) but no claim by parents, no claim by injured party until 2016. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“I, Julian McKinley was a minor at the time of this claim filing deadline. My parents were unaware of the lawsuit with Tronox/Kerr-McGee Product.”

Ruling

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Carolyn Baloga

Carolyn Baloga
65 Shulde Lane
Wyoming, PA 18644

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 3898
Supplement: docket 9514
Claim: TRO888197FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Was 9 years old at claims deadline, and had no reason to know exposed. Father says he had no idea the condition (epilepsy) might be connected to creosote exposure. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file in 2009, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“My parents were unaware that they could file a claim for their children. I was under age eighteen.”

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Courtney Jones

Courtney Jones
11121 Panther Ct.
Houston, TX 77099

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 6998, 8210
Supplement: docket 9522
Claim: TRO901085FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2002 and 2005 diagnoses; former resident of Columbus, MS who still lived there in 2009; minor at time of bar date; says a representative (not know who) previously filed claim with Colom firm; unaware exposed to a Tronox product until after the deadline. She was informed that the law firm had filed a claim on her behalf. A supplemental letter filed at docket #8210, says the lawyer failed to give the bar date. No record of any bankruptcy claim filed on her behalf. Not clear if Colom firm represented her in 2009 but the Colom firm received direct notice of the bar date by mail. Conduct of counsel is not grounds for relief based on excusable neglect unless counsel's conduct can be excused. Given allegation that was a minor, will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

"I was born March 29, 1992 Therefore on August 12, 2009 I was a minor."

Ruling:

Movant has confirmed her age at the time of the bar date but has not explained why parents did not file a claim and why there was such a long delay after the bar date before a claim was filed. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Quinesha Smith

Quinesha Smith
185 Military Chapel
Steens, MS 39766

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 6799
Supplement: docket 9525
Claim: TRO887342FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Diagnosed march 2009, was a minor at deadline (exposure began in 1993). Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“In August 2009, I was still in high school. I was only 17 years old and I lived with my Guardian Ruby Smith during that time who wasn’t aware of any deadline to file a claim on my behalf. At the time she was dealing with takin care of me as well as her parents. She was also dealing with the loss of a relative to pancreatic cancer. We were never informed about filling out a claim until after the deadline.”

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date before filing a claim). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Hailey K. Glenn-Sylvester

Kemberlyn Smith
3122 Greystone Drive
Florence, SC 29501

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4769
Supplement: docket 9593
Claim: TRO897338FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2006 diagnosis. Injured party is a minor and lived out of state in S.C.; unaware of exposure to dangerous Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“Hailey K. Glenn Sylvester was a minor (3 years old) who lived overseas with my mother Kemberlyn Smith and Step Father Brian G. Smith. My stepdad works as an overseas contractor.”

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge in 2009 but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Michael Thompson

Michael Thompson
10385 Magnolia Park Drive
Tuscaloosa, AL 35405

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 3864
Supplement: docket 9596
Claim: TRO896795FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Diagnoses in 2006 and prior years. Says was a child at the time of the deadline. No showing as to parents' or guardian's knowledge, awareness or pursuit of claim or explanation why they did not act before bar date. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I Michael Thompson was a minor at the time of this claim filing deadline. My parents were unaware of the lawsuit with Tronox/Kerr-McGee Product.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Zipporah Sherrod

Zipporah Sherrod
1103 Phillips Hill Rd.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5270, 8231
Supplement: docket 9601
Claim: TRO893112FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Diagnoses 1992 and 2001; says tried to file in 1998 but they were not accepting claims from children, but that must have been in connection with a prior lawsuit as the bankruptcy case was not filed until 2009; filed supplement at docket # 8231, says unaware health issues were due to Tronox product, but admitted having tried to file with prior class action. Was 17 in 2009. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age at the time of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“On August 12, 2009 my parents reason why they didn’t file then I was still a minor. In 2015 I filed a claim as an adult.”

Ruling:

Supplement does not allege lack of knowledge of the Tronox proceedings. Parents could have filed for a minor child. Alleges lack of actual knowledge of legal rights but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Tabias R. Profiet

Tabias R. Profiet
823 Fallwood Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4931
Supplement: docket 9603
Claim: TRO887112FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Says diagnosis at birth; says symptoms began in 1996 but also says first exposure was in 2003; minor at time of bar date; says mother filed papers in 2004 but was told they did not get any results. Appears to be referring to a failed claim in a prior class action. Filing in 2004 indicates awareness of legal rights by parent or guardian. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“I was born May 12, 1996, making me 13 years old in 2009 and as a minor my mother (Tanikka Profiet) handled all my family public and private affairs. Making it known that she was unaware of any types of bankruptcy deadlines and filed a claim on my behalf. I was told and sent records of my diagnosed at birth yet my present upper respiratory complications having very little knowledge to know what to file, alone knowing how my illness and complications became problematic, left her no choice and pursued. That’s why it seems like so many years later. I am a genuine recipient for this class action.”

Ruling:

Attempted participation in prior class action proceeding shows awareness of claim and of legal rights. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same also were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge of the Tronox bankruptcy proceedings but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Dylan Demo

Dylan Demo
5200 Montgomery Drive
Shelby Twp., MI 48316

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7513, 8089
Supplement: docket 9604
Claim: TRO889144FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Minor (11 at time of bar date); no knowledge of Tronox bankruptcy; says her mother no longer resided in MS at that time also had no knowledge; did not see any television or newspaper ads or any article relating to Tronox bankruptcy or deadline; symptoms and diagnosis 2009. A supplement filed at docket #8089, says was only 11 when started having asthma symptoms. Merely alleges lack of knowledge on parents' part but will permit supplemental submission as to why parents or guardians did not file in 2009, why claim was not filed until so many years after the bar date, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My mother no longer resided in the state of Mississippi at that time, nor did she have any knowledge, did not see any television or newspaper ads or any article relating to Tronox bankruptcy or deadline. I was a minor, no knowledge of Tronox bankruptcy; 11 years old when I started having asthma symptoms and was diagnosed in 2009.

Ruling:

Supplement again alleges parents' lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Bradley Brandon

Bradley Brandon
21 Melco Est.
Steens, MS 39766

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4552
Supplement: docket 9605
Claim: TRO 884196FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2004 diagnosis. Says 2009 was a difficult time, freshman year at college, away from home, in July grandmother passed away. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age at the time of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My mother did not know that we were included in this lawsuit until the deadline had passed. She worked nightly 12 hours a day, 6 days a week.

Ruling:

Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Chadsity Spratt

Chiquita McMillian
700 S. Thayer Ave.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4681, 8203
Supplement: docket 9606
Claim: TRO901404FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2005 diagnosis of daughter at birth, rep says unaware of claim; says also had no reason to believe injured party was exposed to a Tronox chemical. Filed supplement at docket # 8203, complains about WSJ publication rather than local MS papers, but in fact the notice also was published in the Columbus Commercial Dispatch and in newspapers located in Jackson and Hattiesburg, MS. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I did not file a claim on my behalf or my daughter Chadsity Spratt's behalf in said timely manner because I did not know of the claim. As soon as I found out, I immediately filed the claim. Chadsity was a newborn and I feel as though she should not be held liable for my actions.

Ruling:

Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Jonathan Brandon

Jonathan Brandon
21 Melco Est.
Steens, MS 39766

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4357
Supplement: docket 9607
Claim: TRO884195FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1999 diagnosis. In high school in 2009, unaware of a lawsuit or of claim that he should have filed; at time dealing with the July 2009 death of close relative. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age in 2009 and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My mother did not know about this lawsuit until the deadline had passed. She worked 12 hour a day 6 days a week nightly.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Lonzo M. Williams

Lonzo M. Williams
68 Hargrove Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7910
Supplement: docket 9608
Claim: TRO896347FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2005 diagnosis; minor at bar date (approximately 18); prior to bar date, unaware exposed to a Tronox product. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My mother is disabled and educational background lacks understanding legal documents. As I got older and the Tronox claim came around again, I decided to file my own claim.

Ruling:

No specifics as to the nature of movant's mother's alleged disability were provided, no indication she suffered from conditions that rendered her unable to file a claim. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Shakyra Minor

Shakyra Minor
823 Fallwood Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4930 [initially filed by Tanikka Profeit]
Supplement: docket 9609 [filed by Shakyra Minor]
Claim: TRO889731FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Diagnosis in 2000 at birth; representative claims 2004 claim filing of some kind in addition to filing with Trust in September 2015; says she sent the minor's papers with her own but for some reason they only discovered her papers. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why representative did not file before the bar date, why waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

"I was born Sept 27, 2000, making me 9 yrs old in 2009 and as a minor my mother (Tanikka Profiet) handled all of my family public and private affairs. She told us that she was unaware of any types of bankruptcy deadlines, having fears of what a lawyer would cost and perhaps naive to most legal matters. Continuously, I suffer from chronic Allergies/sinus infections. Along with coping everyday life with bipolar/disorder. I am genuine recipient for this class action."

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Brelana D. Coleman

Brelana D. Coleman
P. O. Box 9092
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 3839
Supplement: docket 9615
Claim: TRO905724FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Diagnosed with asthma in 2001. Child at time of deadline in 2009 but no showing as to parents' or guardian's knowledge of creosote related claims or explanation why they did not investigate and pursue possible claims. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

"I am submitting this statement in regard to my failure to file in the Tronox Incorporated Chapter 11 bankruptcy case by August 12, 2009 due to the fact that I was a minor at the time. My date of birth is March 13, 1994 and I was only 14 years old at the moment of the bar date. It has also been requested that I provide facts and reasons why my parents did not file a claim on my behalf by the bar date. My mother would have been the person that would have normally handled any type of paperwork for our family. My mother stated that she was not aware of the claims or how to actually file a claim prior to the bar date. I filed the claim in 2015 only after an aunt advised me that she would help me. She obtained the forms from me from an attorney that was representing her husband; an employee of the Kerr McGee facility in Columbus MS, and assisted me in completing and submitting the forms. My mother assisted in obtaining my medical records that had been submitted when my claim was initially filed. As a minor at the time of the bar date, I should not be held responsible for the lack of action by a parent or guardian or anyone else."

Ruling:

As explained in the Court's March 2021 Decision, parents are entitled to file claims for their minor children and the proper functioning of the bar date requires that parents do so if their children's claims are going to be considered. Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge by parent but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Vincent Jackson

Vincent Jackson
214 Teks Street [different address, was 205 Heathrow Drive, Apt. A, Florence AL 36533]
Florence, Alabama 36533

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5560
Supplement: docket 9622
Claim: TRO902348FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2000 diagnosis; minor; says did not know and had no reason to know exposed to Tronox product, guardian was unaware that condition was related to Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“I am writing on behalf of the motion for allowance of a Future Tort Claim. I am required to respond, Why my parent did not file a claim on my behalf? My parents divorced and my Mother, Siblings and myself moved from Columbus, Mississippi to reside in Tuscaloosa, Alabama when I was a child. I can only tell you what information that I have gathered from my Mother since I was a minor at the time. She stated that she had no knowledge of Mississippi residents making a Rightful claim against Tronox/Kerr McGee until she had a conversation with an old neighbor who still lives in Mississippi on the same street that we used to reside. Since we moved to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, she stated that, if the neighbor did not bring up the conversation about Tronox/Kerr McGee while they were talking, then she still would not have known today about the risk factor that we are facing as a family. My Mother contacted me and my siblings and explained what was going on and gave each of us the phone number to Garretson Resolution Group that was provided by our old neighbor who lives in Mississippi. My Mother and siblings all called the Garretson Resolution Group to get more information and ask questions about Tronox/Kerr McGee. We all were told by Garretson Resolution Group that they will be sending a package in the mail and it will have the necessary paperwork that will be needed to be looked over and filled out and sent back in order for us to be considered as part of the Future Tort Claim. I hope that this letter clarify any concerns and respectfully allow my claim to be moved forward as a Future Tort Claim.”

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge of the bar date and the bankruptcy but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Jayden Harris

Brandy Harris
266 Roanoke Cr.
Columbus, MS 39705

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5451, 8912
Supplement: docket 9623
Claim: TRO888374FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Injured party is a minor with mild retardation, diagnoses in April 2009; rep says did not file because unaware of claim; standard language. A supplemental letter filed at docket #8912 complaining about the process. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I was unaware of lawsuit until I moved back to my home town (Columbus) then I filed on behalf of myself + my son. Documentation of Jayden's autism was included previously.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Shaquille Jackson

Shaquille Jackson
15037 Jenny Lynn Drive
Fosters, AL 35463

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4222
Supplement: docket 9624
Claim: TRO902343FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Diagnosis approximately 2000. Says was minor but alleges exposure began 1991 so was at least 18 at bar date. Rep did not know exposed to Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“I am writing on behalf of the motion for allowance of a Future Tort Claim. I am required to respond, Why my parent did not file a claim on my behalf? My parents divorced and my Mother, Siblings and myself moved from Columbus, Mississippi to reside in Tuscaloosa, Alabama when I was a child. I can only tell you what information that I have gathered from my Mother since I was a minor at the time. She stated that she had no knowledge of Mississippi residents making a Rightful claim against Tronox/Kerr McGee until she had a conversation with an old neighbor who still lives in Mississippi on the same street that we used to reside. Since we moved to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, she stated that, if the neighbor did not bring up the conversation about Tronox/Kerr McGee while they were talking, then she still would not have known today about the risk factor that we are facing as a family. My Mother contacted me and my siblings and explained what was going on and gave each of us the phone number to Garretson Resolution Group that was provided by our old neighbor who lives in Mississippi. My Mother and siblings all called the Garretson Resolution Group to get more information and ask questions about Tronox/Kerr McGee. We all were told by Garretson Resolution Group that they will be sending a package in the mail and it will have the necessary paperwork that will be needed to be looked over and filled out and sent back in order for us to be considered as part of the Future Tort Claim. I hope that this letter clarify any concerns and respectfully allow my claim to be moved forward as a Future Tort Claim.”

Ruling:

Movant did not submit verification of her age. More importantly, the Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Keaira Williams

Kearia Williams
722 Belmont Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.:7836
Supplement: docket 9625
Claim: TRO896349FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2007 diagnosis; minor (approximately 17) at deadline. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

During the time of the claim deadline, my mother was battling multiple health conditions, high blood pressure, congestive heart failure, and kidney failure. She was preparing and prepping to be dialyzed while going back and forth to doctor's appointments trying to find the best situation for her, myself and my other two siblings. As a single parent, she could not manage any extra responsible deadlines outside of making sure our basic needs were met, such as home, food, and school. When I first heard about the claim I filed unaware of the deadline. I was also preparing for my entrance into my military career after high school, in which I am currently actively serving.

Ruling:

Supplement focuses on the bar date itself in 2009 but does not explain the many years of delay, after the bar date, before a proof of claim was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights.) Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Desi Givens

Desi Givens
186 McGee Rd.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 3763
Supplement: docket 9626
Claim: TRO890868FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1996 diagnosis. Says not aware of claims process, attached letter says unaware of dangers while living in area. Says was child in 1996, cannot tell age of claimant in 2009. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age in 2009 and, if was a minor at that time, to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

August 12, 2009, I was only 13 years old. My father was deceased. My mother was a single mother to my brother and I. She had gone back to college to further her education to provide a better life for us. She was also consumed with working two full time jobs. She was completely unaware of any bankruptcy case. My birthday is March 27, 1996.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge on parent's part but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Jaqualyn Smith

Jacquelyn Smith
973 Dr. MLK Jr. Drive
Macon, MS 39341

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5365
Supplement: docket 9628
Claim: TRO901655FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Minor, moved to another county and was not aware of the claim; did not know and no reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Was not aware of the Tort Claim, and did not know about the exposer of the product.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but does not verify age as of August 12, 2009 and makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Devondra Smith

Devondra Smith
973 Dr. MLK Jr. Dr.
Macon, MS 38341

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5396
Supplement: docket 9629
Claim: TRO901657FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1999 diagnosis; minor; says relocated to another county and was unaware of claim; did not see any advertisement about it; did not know and no reason to know exposed to Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Was not aware of the Tort Claim, and did not know about the exposer of the product.

Ruling:

Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but does not verify age as of the bar date and makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Brandon Dixon

Alma Dixon
13015 Curlington Ln.
Riverview, FL 33579

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5218
Supplement: docket 9630
Claim: TRO885380FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Minor with cerebral palsy; rep parent is only caretaker and guardian and did not have time or support to adequately notice the claim. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file on time, why waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Because of the nature of my father's job, being a member of the United States Air Force, we were constantly relocating every couple years, thus not allowing us to be properly informed.

Ruling:

Motion originally asserted that parents did not have time to prepare a claim, supplement alleges that parents did not know about the process. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

De'asia Jones

De'Asia Jones
111 Lee Street
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5363
Supplement: docket 9631
Claim: TRO885922FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1998 diagnosis; minor (12 years old in 2009); guardian unaware of deadline or that condition was caused by Tronox product; did not reside directly in the vicinity of the plant. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

In August 2009, my mother had no knowledge that there was another Tronox Tort Claim since those claims filed in the early 2000s. She had been told that she had to live within proximity of Kerr McGee during that time. However, later realizing that was not the truth.

Ruling:

A prior class action (filed many years before the Tronox bankruptcy case) was filed on behalf of persons who lived near the Kerr-McGee facility. Many claimants have confused that class action with the Tronox bankruptcy that took place in 2009, but they are different proceedings and are not related to each other. Awareness of prior class action proceeding shows awareness of claim and of legal rights. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Dylan Chaney

Alton L. Chaney Sr.
2729 Topaz Road
Riverdale, GA 30296

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7478
Supplement: docket 9633
Claim: Unknown

March 2021 Ruling:

2007 diagnosis; minor with autism and his age and illness prevented him from knowing of the deadline or the bankruptcy case, also he lives in Georgia. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Dylan Chaney in 2009 was a minor and autistic. We live in Georgia and wasn't aware of it yet. So yes he was incompetent on date. We moved to Georgia and wasn't aware of Tronox lawsuit until later. All information I had to learn either by internet or hearsay. I'm including medical record as proof of Dylan Chaney conditions.

Ruling:

Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "excusable neglect" standard. Here, the parent alleges a lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date before filing a claim). Lack of actual knowledge is not enough. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Jaitra Abrams

Jaitra Abrams
77 Marblehead Lane
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5474
Supplement: docket 9634
Claim: TRO885875FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Minor at the time of the bar date; says did not know and had no reason to know she was sick; did not know and no reason to know about the claim against Tronox; she did not see or get the newspaper. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I have been exposed to the TRONOX/Kerr-McGee products in Columbus, Mississippi from June 28, 1993 to this present date. Therefore, I was exposed to TRONOX/Kerr-McGee product before August 12, 2009 but I have acquired multiple illness; including depression, anxiety, sinusitis/ allergies, abnormal/painful menstrual requiring morphine for pain, high insulin, iron deficiency, and asthma, etc. I was a minor and incompetent to file as an adult. The hardship has been more than minimal considering all the circumstances which includes sickness and conditions at the time of being a minor plus the financial adversity of ongoing medical bills. After struggling to graduate from high school because of ADHD, I had no more Medicaid, I had to suffer the best way I could physically and mentally. Based on the few medical records I was able to obtain, due to COVID-19 some places have moved/ records in archives/ an fee plus/ or short staff will take time and I do not have transportation or the resources right now with the economy. In 2012 I had to have a physical in order to enter college to play volleyball and I suffered from shortness of breath. I was hooked up to a heart monitor for 24 hours. Later I was placed on albuterol inhaler for asthma. I know it's wrong to take other people medication, but I don't have insurance. My sister is on the same prescription and when she gets hers filled she gives me one of her inhalers. Please accept this appeal to the court and I am looking forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Ruling:

Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "excusable neglect" standard. The motion and the supplement allege a lack of actual knowledge but make no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why claim was not filed until so long after the bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Terrence Payne

Terrence Payne
2217-23rd Ave No.
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7929
Supplement: docket 9646
Claim: TRO894397FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1996 diagnosis; minor at bar date (about 15); did not receive notice. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I have attached as Exhibit "A" a copy of my birth certificate which verifies my age of fifteen (15) at the bar date. The fact listed on the reasons that may justify a determination by the Court that my claim should be treated as a Future Tort Claim is: (iv) if you were a child or incompetent at the time of this Claim Filing Deadline. In addition, I believe my claim should be accepted based on the fact of my minor age, my mother's lack of knowledge prior to filing and information regarding the claims process. Further, in the spirit and the letter of the law to deny my claim would deprive me a victim of the environment injustice and therefore produce for me economic injustice. As previously stated to the Trust in a letter heretofore submitted and attached herein as Exhibit "B", I was born onto the site which is now a federally declared Superfund Cleanup Site. As I am sure you are aware, the location which I was born in, Zone (1), is the most concentrated source of contamination. I was born with childhood asthma and continue to suffer from multiple respiratory conditions inclusive of asthma, sinus, allergies, and bronchitis. I also have been diagnosed with chronic eczema which flares up frequently and requires continuous medical treatment. I am prayerful that I will receive some "Justice" for the lifetime of suffering I am enduring as a direct result of the creosote contamination. While no amount of money will make me whole in as much as asthma and the many respiratory illnesses are each chronic diseases with no cure. Movant also submitted a letter saying he did not receive written notice in 2009, that he has been injured by creosote contamination and would like to participate in the claims process.

Ruling:

Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "due process" or "excusable neglect" standards. Movant alleges lack of written notice but makes no showing that Tronox had reason to know of claimant, no specific challenge to the publication notices that were approved in 2009. Movant also alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Almonzo Hill

Barbara Roland
411 17th Street South
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5440
Supplement: docket 9637
Claim: TRO884313FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Minor; rep says unaware of claim being filed; did not get information by mail or from anyone about bar date; the injured party has mental problems that are attributable to chemicals, breathing problem, asthma; the injured party was in a behavior center in 2015. Will permit supplemental submission to verify injured party's age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Parent says had no knowledge about a tort claims process and that is why did not file.

Ruling:

Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "due process" or "excusable neglect" standards. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Ja'Maya Summerville

Ja'Maya Summerville
77 Marblehead Lane
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5473
Supplement: docket 9638
Claim: TRO893958FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Minor at the time of the bar date, apparently born in 1999; did not know and no reason to know exposed to Tronox product; discharge of claim is a violation of due process. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I have been exposed to the TRONOX/Kerr-McGee products in Columbus, Mississippi from April 7, 1999 to this present date. Therefore, I was exposed to TRONOX/Kerr-McGee product before August 12, 2009 and have acquired multiple illnesses including: asthma, sinusitis/allergies, anxiety, and eczema, etc. I was a minor and incompetent to file as an adult so I did not know about the claim against TRONOX. The hardship has been more than minimal considering all the circumstances which includes sickness and conditions at the time of being a minor plus the financial adversity of ongoing medical bills. Based on my medical records and my physical validating these conditions, please accept this appeal to the court with the medical records attached. Thank you in advance for consideration of this matter. I look forward to hearing from you soon!

Ruling:

For the reasons explained in the Court's March 2021 Decision the proper functioning of the bar date requires that parents file claims for their minor children. The Court permitted a supplement submission to explain why the movant's parents did not do so and so that the Court could consider whether relief should be granted on grounds of excusable neglect, but the supplement only alleges that the parents were not actually aware of the process and makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of "due process" and "excusable neglect" standards. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Carlius Bankhead

Carlius Bankhead
812 Fallwood Drive
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7743
Supplement: docket 9639
Claim: TRO889827FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; says was a minor at the time of the bar date. Trustee contends the motion was untimely but it will be accepted based on the postmark date. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I don't know why my parents didn't file a claim on me.

Ruling:

For the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "due process" or "excusable neglect" standards. Motion and supplement do not adequately explain a failure to file by the bar date, and do not explain the many years of delay after the bar date before a claim was filed.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Jamika Washington

Jamika Washington
50005 North Frank Rd.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4404
Supplement: docket 9640
Claim: TRO904202FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2002-2003 diagnoses. Says was minor; unaware could file claim. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age at time of bar date in 2009 and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My name is Jamika Washington. My mother have been taken me to the doctor since I was a child for my breathing and skin breaking out. The doctor told her I had repertory infection Something in the air. Keep me inside when I could. Until today I use an inhaler to help with my breathing. I was exposed to the dust and chemicals my momma work for Kerr McGee.

Ruling:

Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "due process" or "excusable neglect" standards. In addition, the proper functioning of the bar date requires that parents act for their children if their children have injury claims. The Court permitted a supplemental submission to explain why movant's parents did not file claims and to consider whether the parents' delays could be excused, but the supplement does not explain their actions. The motion and the supplement are not sufficient to warrant relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Kierra Erby

Kierra Erby
138 Beech Street
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7016
Supplement: docket 9641
Claim: TRO892657FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Alleges December 2009 diagnosis but also says previously filed with Colom law firm in 2002 class action, outcome unknown; says was a minor at the time of the bar date. Standard cut-and-pasted form language as to reasons why missed the bar date. If claim was resolved in a prior proceeding it could no longer be asserted in the Tronox bankruptcy. Alleges was a minor, so will permit supplemental submission (a) to verify age as of the bar date, (b) to explain whether claim was resolved in prior class action, and (c) if claim was not resolved, to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I totally disagree and ask that the claim be allowed to proceed in the court and a settlement shall be granted. You are stating that it's time barred but it was file accordingly to as soon as I knew about it. As others have noted that there was never a public announcement of it being a deadline. How is that remotely even possible when they are still accepting claims as of this date. I ask the court if they are going to disallow this claim that it be revisit along with the future tort claims that are being still accepted. I know that there are no deadlines for those. Once again I ask the court to allow the motion that I previous mailed in. I thank you in advance.

Ruling:

Notices of the bar date were mailed to litigants in 2009 and to the local attorneys who had represented injured parties in prior lawsuits, and additional notices were published in many local newspapers in 2009, as described in the Court's March 2021 Decision. Movant alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Roy E. Collins

Roy E. Collins
375 Butler Road
Pittston Twp., PA 18640

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 3777
Supplement: docket 9642
Claim: TRO881005FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Filed in 2015, says was a child at the time of the bar date. However, he was born in 1989, so was 20 at bar date. Alleges father's and brother's claims were allowed but unclear when they filed or as to when they were first diagnosed with symptoms. Does not allege that he or his parents were unaware of the claims process or of their claims and legal rights at the time of the bar date. Will permit supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

Was due diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights. We filed, or my parents filed for me, in 2015 Category D for creosote exposure in or near Avoca, PA. As a result, I have severe anxiety, high bp + chronic asthma. This filing was in good faith. Filed same as my brother, who was approved for his exposure. Please review my filed claim and advise if you can approve. Thank you. Failure to file by bar date was due to due diligence in investigation process and pursuit of claims + legal rights. My claim should be allowed as a Future tort claim. Thank you.

Ruling:

Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of PA starting in 2001. Supplement alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date before filing claim). Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Diamond B. Walker

Diamond Walker
1812 6th Ave. North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5064
Supplement: docket 9643
Claim: TRO902634FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Conditions at childhood; says was 18 at bar date and did not have any legal counsel to advise. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age at the time of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

My legal guardian was incarcerated at the time the claim was going on. My grandparents were raising me and did not know about the claim all together.

Ruling:

Supplement does not explain why grandparents did not file a claim. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Jakayla J. Dancy

Jakayla J. Dancy
50005 North Frank Rd.
Aberdeen, MS 39730

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 4528
Supplement: docket 9653
Claim: TRO904210FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

2005 and 2005 diagnoses. Says was too young to know about it and mother did not know about it. Age at time of bar date is unclear. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of 2009 bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I was a minor. My mother was a caregiver. She has been taken me to the doctors and allergy doctor to see what was wrong with my breathing and breaking out on my skin. Until today I still have breathing and breaking out of due to the chemical I was exposed too when my mom work at Kerr McGee. We went to take the kids to work and picnic and was expose to the spills they had and the chemical my mother had on her every day she came home from work. She work there for 26 yrs.

Ruling:

Supplement does not adequately explain why mother did not file a timely claim or why so much delay occurred after the bar date before a claim was filed. Unfortunately, for the reasons stated in the Court's prior March 2021 decision, the mere fact that someone was exposed and is injured is not enough to permit the Court to allow a late-filed claim. Instead, a showing needs to be made that the lateness should be excused under the case law that governs the application of the "due process" or "excusable neglect" standards. Here the movant alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date). Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Khamaya Brooks

Khamaya Brooks
1800 Links Blvd. # 3805
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35405

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5847
Supplement: docket 9660
Claim: TRO893720FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

January 2001 diagnosis; minor; did not know and had no reason to know exposed to a dangerous Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I am not responsible for what my parents did and did not do on my behalf. I was a minor at the time and was not aware of the bar date. I also was not able to get my letter mailed off by August 25, 2021 Due to my family having COVID and I was not aware that I had this letter in my parents possession due to the fact I live in another state.

Ruling:

The Supplement was not received until after the deadline set by the Court. In addition, as explained in the Court's March 2021 Decision, the proper functioning of the bar date requires that parents or guardians file claims on behalf of minors or incompetent persons. The Court permitted a supplemental filing to determine whether a parent's delay could be excused under the standards that govern the "excusable neglect" determination, but the supplement does not explain the parent's action. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Walker, Demorius

Demorius Walker
185 Hargrove Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 5426
Claim: TRO892121FTC
Supplement: docket 9664

Ruling:

1995/2003 diagnoses; minor; very poor, no access to internet, cable tv or radio; says did not understand anything about Tronox company; unaware of lawsuit against Kerr McGee because people were calling it Tronox. A supplement filed at docket # 8293. Permitted supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Supplement:

Says his mother filed a claim with Wilbur Colom and that his mother still suffers from disease. Says gave medical documents to Colom in 2004 and to this Court in connection with the prior motion. Says Colom never provided any compensation. Alleges that family filed in Tronox bankruptcy once learned that Tronox was Kerr-McGee.

Ruling:

I sympathize with every claimant who believes they have been injured but as explained in the March 2021 decision an allegation that a claimant did not actually know of the bankruptcy or of the bar date is not enough by itself to provide grounds for relief based on excusable neglect. Instead, under the applicable case law a claimant must show that he or she acted diligently to investigate and to assert his or her claims and that the entire delay in doing so is due to circumstances that should be excused and not due to failures to pursue rights. In this case, the publication notice identified the connection between Tronox and Kerr-McGee, and the risks of creosote and the existence of the bankruptcy were well-publicized and well-known in the community. Many local attorneys who had handled creosote claims (including Mr. Colom) received direct written notice of the bankruptcy case and of the bar date. This claim was not filed until many years after the bar date and the reasons for the long delays have not been explained in a way that would permit relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Douglas, Jayden

James Douglas
44 Swedenburg Circle
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and Docket Information

Original motion docket no.: 4936
Claim: TRO897536FTC
Supplement: docket 9718

Ruling:

Minor; 2006-07 diagnoses; representative does not give reason for lack of timely filing. Permitted supplemental submission to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file earlier, why so many years passed after the bar date before a claim was filed, and whether relief is warranted, but no such submission was filed. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect. Motion is denied.

Supplement:

Says mother died September 12, 2008 and could not file on his behalf. Says he was underage and had no knowledge as to what the claim was.

Ruling:

The Supplement was not received until after the deadline set by the Court. More importantly, the Supplement explains why the claimant's mother did not file, but movant had to have been in someone's care and custody as of the August 12, 2009 bar date and there is no explanation as to why that guardian or other person with custody did not file a claim on movant's behalf.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

Tommy Jackson
417 Burgundy Dr.
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 6703, 8266
Supplement: docket 9513
Claim: TRO886908FTC

Reason for March 2021 Denial:

1963 and 2003 diagnoses; says publication notice not reasonably calculated to reach claimants; also mentions that he was in the army, does not provide dates. Says exposure began in 1963 and that joined the army after high school, so military service may have ended long before the bar date. Supplement at docket # 8266. Will permit supplemental submission to verify dates of military service so that Court may assess the application of 50 U.S.C. 3936 on the running of the MS statute of limitations with respect to the state-law claim, the possible tolling of the bar date, and whether military service affects the determination of whether relief should be granted on grounds of excusable neglect.

Supplement:

Movant confirms he was discharged from the Army in 1983.

Ruling:

Military service did not toll the operation of the statute of limitations or the operation of the 2009 bar date. Claim also was time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations before the Tronox bankruptcy filing. There also would not be grounds for relief even if the claim were not barred. Movant alleges publication notice was not reasonable but no showing that Tronox had reason to know of claimant, no specific challenge to the publication notices that were approved in 2009. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied.

EXHIBIT G2

**NOTICE TO MOVANTS WHOSE SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS
ARE BEING DENIED IN THEIR ENTIRETY**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT G2

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOTICE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO
YOUR MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 10, 2021 the Court issued a Decision regarding approximately 4,676 motions seeking relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases so that the movants may pursue claims against the Tronox Incorporated Tort Claims Trust (the “Trust”). With respect to your motion, the Court permitted the filing of a supplemental submission to address certain points.

On March 3, 2022 the Court issued a Decision regarding motions as to which supplements had been permitted. A copy of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision and related Orders are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxforttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the Court has considered your supplement and that your motion has been **DENIED** in its entirety and will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. The Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion are set forth in a statement that is also enclosed.

PLEASE BE FURTHER ADVISED THAT IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU TIME TO RECEIVE THIS NOTICE AND TO CONSIDER YOUR RIGHTS THE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YOUR MOTION WILL NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022. THE DEADLINE FOR THE FILING OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WILL BE APRIL 14, 2022.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc., Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202

EXHIBIT H

**ORDER DENYING CERTAIN SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS AS
TO PRE-BAR DATE CONDITIONS**

EXHIBIT H1

**SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS - MOTIONS DENIED AS TO PRE-
BAR DATE CONDITIONS, CLAIMS BASED ON CONDITIONS
FIRST DIAGNOSED AFTER THE BAR DATE TO BE
REVIEWED BY THE TORT CLAIMS TRUST**

Monica Sykes

Monica Sykes
1715 Short 3rd Avenue North
Columbus, MS 39701

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 7154
Supplement: docket 9627
Claim: TRO893421FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

Date condition first diagnosed listed as “2003-2017;” minor; unaware exposed to a Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

“I totally disagree and ask that the claim be allowed to proceed in the court and a settlement shall be granted. You are stating that it’s time barred but it was file accordingly to as soon as I knew about it. As others have noted that there was never a public announcement of it being a deadline. How is that remotely even possible when they are still accepting claims as of this date. I ask the court if they are going to disallow this claim that it be revisit along with the future tort claims that are being still accepted. I know that there are no deadlines for those. Once again I ask the court to allow the motion that I previous mailed in. I thank you in advance.”

Ruling:

The time bar is based on the original bar date, which was August 12, 2009. Exceptions are made for claims that are based on conditions that were not diagnosed until after August 12, 2009. However, as to pre-bar date diagnoses the claim is barred unless the late filing can be excused under the standards set forth in the Court’s March 2021 decision. Risks of creosote exposure and filings of claims based on the same were the subjects of widespread publicity in the relevant areas of MS starting before 2000. Movant alleges lack of actual knowledge but makes no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect.

Disposition:

Motion is denied to the extent that the claim seeks recovery for conditions that were first diagnosed before the bar date. Any claim based on conditions first diagnosed after the bar date will be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust pursuant to its normal dispute resolution procedures.

Kenya Jones

Kenya Jones
453 Ginger Lane
Columbus, MS 39702

Motion and docket information:

Original Motion docket no.: 5361
Supplement: docket 9632
Claim: TRO885921FTC

March 2021 Ruling:

1997 diagnosis; unaware of bankruptcy case; still in high school and unaware what was going on; was misinformed and told she had to live in direct vicinity of the plant; unaware condition was because of exposure to Tronox product. Will permit supplemental submission to verify age as of the bar date and to explain reasons why parents or guardians did not file, why claimant waited so many years after the bar date before filing a claim, and whether relief is warranted.

Supplement:

I was not even aware that in 2009 that was another Future Tort Claim. I was only aware of the Tronox claim that was filed in 2000 or 2001. After recently speaking with my mother about this, she said that even back then she put me down on the claim and they did nothing. I had the diagnosis in 1997 and since then have suffered an unknown autoimmune disorder that has caused severe hair loss (totalis alopecia) and unexplained inflammation in the body. This all began February 2017.

Ruling:

A prior class action (filed many years before the Tronox bankruptcy case) was filed on behalf of persons who lived near the Kerr-McGee facility. Many claimants have confused that class action with the Tronox bankruptcy that took place in 2009, but they are different proceedings and are not related to each other. Awareness of prior class action proceeding shows awareness of claim and of legal rights. Alleges lack of actual knowledge but no showing as to other relevant factors (including diligence in investigation and pursuit of claims and legal rights, reason why filed so long after bar date), motion and supplement are not sufficient for relief based on excusable neglect as to conditions first diagnosed before the bar date. Supplement suggests that movant may be pursuing a claim based on conditions diagnosed *after* the bar date. Merits of any claim alleging conditions first diagnosed after the bar date are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

Disposition:

Motion is denied as to claims based on conditions that were first diagnosed prior to the bar date. Merits of any claim alleging conditions first diagnosed after the bar date are to be resolved by the Tort Claims Trust under its dispute resolution procedures.

EXHIBIT H2

**NOTICE TO MOVANTS WHOSE SUPPLEMENTED MOTIONS
ARE BEING DENIED AS TO PRE-BAR DATE CONDITIONS**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re)
) Chapter 11
TRONOX INCORPORATED, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 09-10156 (MEW)
) Jointly Administered
Reorganized Debtors.)

**NOITCE OF DECISION AND IMPENDING ORDER WITH REGARD TO
YOUR MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A TORT CLAIM
NOTWITHSTANDING THE EXPIRATION OF THE 2009 BAR DATE**

On March 10, 2021 the Court issued a Decision regarding approximately 4,676 motions seeking relief from the August 12, 2009 bar date in these cases so that the movants may pursue claims against the Tronox Incorporated Tort Claims Trust (the “Trust”). With respect to your motion, the Court permitted the filing of a supplemental submission to address certain points.

On March 3, 2022 the Court issued a Decision regarding motions as to which supplements had been permitted. A copy of the Court’s March 3, 2022 Decision and related Orders are available on the Trust’s website at www.tronoxforttrust.com. You may also obtain copies by calling the Trust’s toll-free number at (800) 753-2480.

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the Court has considered your supplemental filing and that your motion has been **DENIED** to the extent that it is based on conditions that were diagnosed prior to the August 12, 2009 Bar Date. Your motion will be the subject of an Order that will be entered in the form that is enclosed. The Court’s rulings with respect to your individual motion are set forth in the statement that is also enclosed. Any claim that is based on a condition that allegedly was first diagnosed after the August 12, 2009 bar date will be treated separately and is being referred to the Tort Claims Trust for resolution.

PLEASE BE FURTHER ADVISED THAT IN ORDER TO GIVE YOU TIME TO RECEIVE THIS NOTICE AND TO CONSIDER YOUR RIGHTS THE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YOUR MOTION WILL NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022. THE DEADLINE FOR THE FILING OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WILL BE APRIL 14, 2022.

Dated: March 15, 2022

Tronox, Inc. Tort Claims Trust
600 Vine Street
Suite 2006
Cincinnati, OH 45202