

Claim No. [REDACTED]; [REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED];² [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED]; [REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED]; [REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED]; [REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; and [REDACTED], Claim No. [REDACTED] denying their claims for
payment from the Halliburton/Transocean Settlement Agreements.

Having reviewed these materials, the determination of the Claims Administrator is AFFIRMED essentially for the reasons provided by the Claims Administrator. This court finds no inconsistency of the type suggested by counsel in the treatment of these claims when compared to his other claimants who won appeals. With no specific proof of oiling of these properties and their location well beyond the affected zone, they are decidedly different from those whose appeals were granted. The Claims Administrator's determination is consistent with the Settlement Agreements, the Allocation and the court's orders approving the Settlement Agreements, the Distribution Model and the law supporting them, including equitable considerations. No basis requiring a different result has been provided.



JOSEPH C. WILKINSON, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² I note that this claim number applies to three (3) pieces of property owned by the claimant and listed as separate item numbers on the administrator's cases pending spreadsheet. This order is equally applicable to each appeal concerning those pieces of property.