



## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Court's order at the January 12, 2017 status conference, the Ignition Switch Pre-Closing Accident Plaintiffs who filed an Omnibus Motion for Authority to File Late Proofs of Claim for Personal Injuries and Wrongful Deaths (Dkt. No. 13807) ("Movants") submit these objections to the draft interrogatories proposed by New GM, the Participating Unitholders, and the GUC Trust. Movants make these objections to the specific interrogatories proposed without prejudice to: (a) Movants' contentions that (i) no discovery should be permitted because *Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assoc. L.P.*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993) ("Pioneer") does not apply in light of Old GM's violation of Movants' due process rights, and (ii) prior orders or agreements tolled the filing of such late claims and therefore limit the relevant time period for discovery; (b) Movants' general objections, including but not limited to the fact that the proposed interrogatories are premature under Local Rule 7033-1; and (c) any other objections Movants are entitled to make under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure when answering the interrogatories, if the Court ultimately permits them to be served.

Through the Court-ordered meet and confer process, the parties narrowed their disputes to one: whether Movants must answer interrogatories designed to elicit Movants' knowledge of defects other than the ignition switch defect that is the subject of Movants' Late Claims Motion. Discovery regarding non-ignition switch defects is irrelevant to whether "excusable neglect" permits Movants' late claims for damages resulting from the ignition switch defect.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Movants respectfully request the Court to rule that any discovery directed to the *Pioneer* factors must be limited to the ignition switch defect and associated claims.

---

<sup>1</sup> This objection applies to proposed Interrogatory Nos. 9-12, 15-18, 22, 27. *See* Ex. A, Proposed Interrogatories. Movants have edited these interrogatories to limit their applicability to Movants' knowledge of the ignition switch defect and associated claims. *See* Ex. B, Movants' Redline of the Proposed Interrogatories. More specifically, Movants have deleted those proposed interrogatories that relate solely to defects other than the ignition switch defect (Proposed Interrogatory Nos. 9-12) and narrowed other interrogatories to request information only about the ignition switch defect (Proposed Interrogatory Nos. 15-18, 22, 27). *See id.*

## II. ARGUMENT

In proceedings in which the *Pioneer* line of cases applies, the Court is authorized to accept late proofs of claim where the failure to file the claim before the bar date was the result of “excusable neglect.” Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9006(b)(1). “Excusable neglect” in this context means “late filings caused by inadvertence, mistake, or carelessness, as well as by intervening circumstances beyond the party’s control.” *Pioneer*, 507 U.S. at 389. In determining whether the failure to timely file the proof of claim was the result of “excusable neglect,” the Court must apply the four-part test articulated in *Pioneer*: (1) the danger of prejudice to the debtor; (2) the length of the delay and impact thereof on the proceedings; (3) the reason for the delay, including whether it was in the reasonable control of the movant; and (4) whether the movant acted in good faith. *Id.* at 395. The Second Circuit gives particular weight to the third factor – the reason for the delay. *See Midland Cogeneration Venture Ltd. P’ship v. Enron Corp.*, 419 F.3d 115, 122-23 (2d Cir. 2005) (“*Enron*”).

Interrogatories directed to Movants’ knowledge of some other potential claim—which Movants did not file and are not the subject of Movants’ Late Claims Motion—are irrelevant to this analysis.<sup>2</sup> *DPWN Holdings (USA), Inc. v. United Air Lines, Inc.*, 871 F. Supp. 2d 134 (E.D.N.Y. 2012) (“*DPWN Holdings*”) is instructive. In that case, United Air Lines (“United”) allegedly participated in an illegal price-fixing conspiracy prior to filing for bankruptcy which resulted in overcharges to its customers, including DPWN Holdings USA, Inc. (“DHL”). As a trade creditor, DHL received actual notice of United’s bankruptcy and the bar date, but did not receive notice of United’s potential antitrust violations. *DPWN Holdings* 871 F. Supp. 2d at 147,

---

<sup>2</sup> One of the proposed interrogatories asks whether Movants filed proofs of claim in the bankruptcy other than the proof of claim related to the ignition switch defect that is the subject of the Late Claims Motion. *See* Ex. A, Proposed Interrogatory No. 26. Even if any of the Movants did file a claim concerning a non-ignition switch defect, the objectionable interrogatories are still overbroad and irrelevant as they are not limited to the late-filed claim that is the subject of their motion, nor to any late-filed claim. Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1) and *Pioneer* deal only with late-filed claims.

155. Following United's emergence from bankruptcy, DHL sued United under the antitrust laws and United moved to dismiss arguing that DHL's antitrust claim had been discharged in bankruptcy. *Id.* at 149. The district court held that because DHL was not told about the existence of its price fixing claim before the bar date, that claim was not discharged in United's chapter 11 case and could be asserted against United notwithstanding the passing of the bar date. *Id.* at 156. In so holding, the district court made clear that DHL's knowledge of United's bankruptcy and of the bar date relative to its trade claims was not relevant to whether DHL had received sufficient notice of its price fixing claim. *Id.* On appeal, the Second Circuit remanded the case for further proceedings regarding what DHL knew *about the antitrust claim* prior to the bar date. *See DPWN Holdings (USA), Inc. v. United Air Lines, Inc.*, 747 F.3d 145, 153 (2d Cir. 2014).

Here, the Omnibus Motion relates only to claims concerning the ignition switch defect. As in *DPWN Holdings*, where DHL's knowledge of potential trade claims was deemed irrelevant to notice of its price-fixing claim, the possibility that Movants might have had other problems with their vehicles unrelated to the ignition switch defect is not relevant to the late-filed claims concerning the ignition switch defect. Thus, assuming *arguendo* that one or more Movants had other problems with their vehicles but chose (for whatever reason) not to file those claims, the claim Movants knew about is not relevant to the claim Movants were not told about.

Analysis of the *Pioneer* factors further demonstrates that interrogatories directed to Movants' knowledge of some other potential claim are irrelevant and should not be permitted.

The danger of prejudice to the debtor. Although *Pioneer* may have given little guidance as to what "prejudice" entails, *see Enron*, 419 F.3d at 130, the decisions make clear (and, indeed, it should be stating the obvious) that the relevant inquiry is the prejudice that results from the

late-filed claim – not some other potential claim that was never filed, and thus could not reduce the assets otherwise available for timely filed claims. *See, e.g., Pioneer*, 507 U.S. at 397 (referring to “the findings made below concerning the . . . absence of any danger of prejudice to the debtor or of disruption to efficient judicial administration *posed by the late filings*” in affirming the Court of Appeals’ ruling) (emphasis added); *Enron*, 419 F.3d at 130 (examining the considerations evaluated by courts in deciding the prejudice suffered by the debtor, including but not limited to the size of the late-filed claim, whether the debtor had knowledge of the late-filed claim, and whether allowing the late-filed claim would open the floodgates to similar claims).

The length of the delay and impact thereof on the proceedings. Courts evaluate many of the same factors when considering the length of delay as they do when considering prejudice to the debtor. *See id.* at 130-31. And it is equally apparent here that the relevant inquiry concerns the late-filed proofs of claim. One can only calculate the length of the delay and assess the impact of this delay by reference to the claim that was filed after the bar date. In other words, there is no “delay” to assess with respect to a claim that has never been filed.

The reason for the delay. This same reasoning applies to the reason for the delay. There is no delay with respect to an unfiled claim, nor is there any neglect to excuse. The issue that the Court must decide under *Pioneer* is why Movants did not timely file their late claims, *i.e.*, their ignition switch defect claims; inquiry into a Movant’s knowledge of a defect in her tires, for example, says nothing about that pertinent question. Whatever Movants may have known about their vehicles’ non-ignition switch defects, which were not the subject of their late-filed claims, cannot explain whether the “*late filings* [were] caused by inadvertence, mistake, or carelessness .

.. [or] by intervening circumstances beyond the party’s control.” *Pioneer*, 507 U.S. at 389  
(emphasis added).

Whether the movant acted in good faith. Again, the relevant inquiry is Movants’ good faith in filing the late-filed claim. Whether Movants believed that their vehicles contained some defect other than the ignition switch defect simply has no bearing on whether Movants’ late filings were the result of their good or bad faith. Nor does the fact that the *Pioneer* inquiry is “an equitable one, taking account of all relevant circumstances surrounding the omission,” *see Pioneer*, 507 U.S. at 395, permit inquiry into non-ignition switch defects. The relevant “omission” is the untimely filed claim, which Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1) might nevertheless permit if the circumstances surrounding that omission, *i.e.*, the late filing of the ignition switch defect claims, was the result of excusable neglect.

### III. CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Movants respectfully request that, if the Court requires Movants to answer *Pioneer*-related interrogatories, it limit such interrogatories to the ignition switch defect and not permit discovery regarding other defects that are not the subject of Movants’ Late Claims Motion.

Dated: February 8, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William P. Weintraub  
William P. Weintraub  
Gregory W. Fox  
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP  
The New York Times Building  
620 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10018  
Tel.: 212.813.8800  
Fax: 212.355.3333  
wweintraub@goodwinlaw.com  
gfox@goodwinlaw.com

-and-

Robert C. Hilliard  
Anne K. Fornecker  
HILLIARD MUÑOZ GONZALES LLP  
719 South Shoreline  
Suite 500  
Corpus Christi, TX 78401  
T: 361-882-1612  
E: bobh@hmglawfirm.com  
E: anne@hilliardshadowenlaw.com

*Designated Counsel for Ignition Switch  
Pre-Closing Accident Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, William P. Weintraub, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *IGNITION SWITCH  
PRE-CLOSING ACCIDENT PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT INTERROGATORIES  
PROPOSED BY NEW GM, THE PARTICIPATING UNITHOLDERS AND THE GUC TRUST*,  
filed through the CM/ECF system, will be sent electronically to the registered participants as  
identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) on February 8, 2017.

/s/ William P. Weintraub  
William P. Weintraub

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**In re:**

**MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, et  
al., f/k/a General Motors Corp., et al.,**

**Debtors.**

Chapter 11

Case No. 09-50026 (MG)

(Jointly Administered)

**FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO MOVANTS PATRICIA BARKER  
AND CERTAIN IGNITION SWITCH PRE-CLOSING ACCIDENT MOVANTS**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Judge Glenn’s order at the status conference held on January 12, 2017, Wilmington Trust Company, in its capacity as trustee for and administrator of the Motors Liquidation Company General Unsecured Creditors Trust (the “GUC Trust”), and General Motors LLC (“New GM”) hereby propounds the following written interrogatories to Movant Patricia Barker, as putative class representative for the Ignition Switch Economic Loss Movants, and Certain Ignition Switch Pre-Closing Accident Movants (as identified at Exhibit A to docket entry 13807). Each of these interrogatories is to be answered fully, accurately, separately, in writing, under oath, and within 30 days after the Bankruptcy Court rules on the Motions relating to the application of the *Pioneer* factors and tolling.

**DEFINITIONS**

1. The definitions and rules of construction set forth in Rule 33 of the Federal Rules are incorporated herein.

2. “And” and “or” mean “and/or.” The masculine gender of any word used herein includes the feminine, and the singular includes the plural. The terms “any,” “all,” and “each” mean any, all, each, and every. The present tense shall be construed to include the past tense and vice versa. References to employees, officers, directors, or agents shall include both current and

former employees, officers, directors, and agents.

3. “Bar Date” means the deadline to file Proofs of Claim against Old GM, which was set by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York as November 30, 2009.

4. “Communicate” or “communication” means any transmission or exchange of information, whether orally or in writing, electronically or in hard copy, including any conversation or discussion by means of letter, note, memorandum, text message, video, or any other medium.

5. “Concerning,” “relating to,” or “regarding” means referring to, reflecting, describing, evidencing, constituting, containing, alluding to, germane to, mentioning, analyzing, setting forth, summarizing, supporting, refuting, or characterizing, directly or indirectly, expressly or implicitly, in whole or in part, the subject matter of the Interrogatory.

6. “Date(s)” means the exact date(s), if known, or the closest approximation to the exact date(s) as can be specified including without limitation the year, month, week in a month, part of a month, or part of a year.

7. “Document” has the broadest possible meaning and shall refer to any and all documents, tangible things, and electronically stored information (“ESI”), including all non-original, non-conforming, and non-identical copies, whether by reason of subsequent modification, notation, deletion or otherwise. This includes all written, typed, or otherwise preserved communications, including any e-mail, letter, correspondence, note, book, pamphlet, article, bulletin, directive, review, publication, memorandum, diary, analysis, study, appraisal, projection, check, invoice, receipt, bill, financial statement, financial record, purchase order, shipping order, contract, lease, work paper, calendar, envelope, paper, telephone message, tape,

computer tape, computer disk, computer card, computer file, recording, videotape, film, microfilm, microfiche, drawing, account, ledger, statement, database, financial data, agreement, contract, amendments or modification to such contracts or agreements, letter of intent, term sheet, agenda, schedule, minutes, memorandum of telephone or personal conference or communications, phone log, message log, binder, periodical, publication, facsimile, report, working paper, transcription, chart, paper, survey, index, photograph, picture, drawing, appointment book, calendar entry, address or telephone record, electronic message board posting, text message, instant message conversation, weblog or blog, social media content (*e.g.*, Facebook or Twitter content), and/or all other writings or communication, no matter how stored or maintained (*e.g.*, electronic or hard copy form) in Your actual or constructive possession, custody, or control, or of which You have knowledge of the existence, and whether prepared, published, or released by You or by any other person. The term “Document(s)” includes drafts and non-identical copies. Without limiting the foregoing, the term “Document” shall include any copy that differs in any respect from the original or other versions of the Document, including, without limitation: copies found in different custodians’ files; copies containing notations, insertions, corrections, or marginal notes; or any other variations. The term “Document” includes all communications. To the extent that the parties reach agreement on an ESI production protocol, any relevant provisions of that agreement will supersede any conflicting aspects of this paragraph.

8. “GUC Trust” means the Motors Liquidation Company General Unsecured Creditors Trust.

9. “Including” means “including but not limited to” or “including without limitation.”

10. “Ignition Switch Related Event” includes, but is not limited to, an incident where Your Vehicle’s ignition switch moved from the “run” position to “accessory” position (or otherwise moved out of the “run” position) resulting in a partial loss of electrical power, the vehicle’s engine turning off, a loss of power steering, and/or a failure of the airbags to deploy.

11. “Information” means facts, circumstances, specific statements, documents, and communications.

12. “New GM” means General Motors LLC, or any agents, dealers, attorneys, representatives, assigns, individuals, or entities acting on behalf of either.

13. “Old GM” means General Motors Corporation or Motors Liquidation Company, or any agents, dealers, attorneys, representatives, assigns, individuals, or entities acting on behalf of either.

14. “Proof of Claim” means a document filed with a bankruptcy court so as to register a claim against the debtor’s bankruptcy estate. The claim sets out the amount that is owed to the creditor as of the date of the bankruptcy filing.

15. “You,” and “Your” refer to you, individually, and any agents, representatives, assigns, or individuals, or entities acting on your behalf.

16. “Your Vehicle” means any vehicles that forms the basis for your claims.

17. The use of the singular form of any word includes the plural and vice versa.

18. The use of the term “the” shall not be construed as limiting the scope of any request.

19. The use of a verb in any tense shall be construed as the use of the verb in all other tenses.

### **INSTRUCTIONS**

20. Movants are to answer each Interrogatory separately and fully, in writing and under oath, unless all portions of an Interrogatory are in good faith objected to, in which event Movants are to state in complete detail the basis of their objection and all facts upon which Movants rely to support the objection. If an objection pertains to only a portion of an Interrogatory, or to a word, phrase or clause contained in an Interrogatory, Movants are to state in complete detail the basis of their objection to that portion and all facts upon which Movants rely to support their objection, and answer the Interrogatory to the extent it is not objectionable.

21. Some questions may be duplicative of questions contained in a Plaintiff Fact Sheet that was previously submitted in connection with the multidistrict litigation captioned *In re General Motors Ignition Switch Litigation*, Case No. 14-md-2543, pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. If Movants have already responded to the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and it contains this information, then Movants may refer to where that response appears in the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and need not repeat the information in response to such questions.

22. In answering each Interrogatory, Movants are required to furnish all information known or reasonably available to them, in their possession, custody, or control, including, without limitation, all information in the possession of Movants' agents, investigators, representatives, and attorneys, and not merely such information as exists under Movants' immediate direction or control.

23. Whenever an Interrogatory may be answered by referring to a document, the

document may be attached as an exhibit to the response and referred to in the response. If the document has more than one page, refer to the page and section where the answer to the Interrogatory can be found.

24. If Movants withhold any requested information responsive to these Interrogatories under a claim of privilege, work product immunity, or some other immunity, Movants shall provide the information required by Local Rule 7033-1(e)(3).

25. Movants are to answer or respond fully to each Interrogatory as of the time their response is due. After exercising due diligence to secure the information requested by a specific Interrogatory, if Movants cannot secure information sufficient to fully respond to any of the following Interrogatories, Movants are to answer or respond to the extent possible, specifying the reason or reasons for their inability to answer or respond to the remainder.

26. These Interrogatories are to be considered continuing so as to require prompt supplemental responses as required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if and when Movants obtain further information with respect to the same between the time Movants' initial responses are served and the time of trial, and such information is to be made known by means of supplemental answers to these Interrogatories promptly upon first being discovered.

27. These instructions are submitted for the purposes of discovery and are not to be taken as waiving any objections which may be made at trial to the introduction of evidence on subjects covered by these Interrogatories or as an admission at the trial of the relevance or materiality of any of the matters covered by these Interrogatories.

28. Defendants serve these Interrogatories without prejudice to their right to serve additional interrogatories.

### **INTERROGATORIES**

1. When, how, and under what circumstances did you first become aware that Old GM had filed for bankruptcy?
2. When, how, and under what circumstances did you first become aware of the Bar Date in the Old GM bankruptcy?
3. When, how, and under what circumstances did you first become aware that Your Vehicle was subject to NHTSA Recall No. 14v047?
4. When did you first learn that Your Vehicle might have a defect that may cause an Ignition Switch Related Event?
5. Did you bring Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
6. If the answer to number 5 is yes, when was the first time that you brought Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
7. Did you communicate with Old GM or New GM about what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
8. If the answer to number 7 is yes, when did you first communicate with Old GM or New GM, and how did you so communicate (telephone contact, e-mail, letter or other), about what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
9. Did you bring Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you now believe to be or was a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch)?
10. If the answer to number 9 is yes, when was the first time that you brought Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you believed to be or was a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch)?
11. Did you communicate with Old GM or New GM about what you now allege to be a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch)?
12. If the answer to number 11 is yes, when did you first communicate with Old GM or New GM, and how did you so communicate (telephone contact, e-mail, letter or other), about what you now allege to be a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch) or any other issue with Your Vehicle's performance?
13. When did you acquire Your Vehicle and from whom did you acquire it?
14. Do you or any member of your family still own or lease Your Vehicle and, if not, when

did you transfer Your Vehicle or cease to own or lease it?

15. When did you first consider consulting with an attorney concerning Your Vehicle?
16. When was the first time that any attorney contacted you, or you contacted any attorney, concerning Your Vehicle, Old GM, or New GM?
17. When were you first represented by a lawyer in connection with Your Vehicle, Old GM, or New GM?
18. When did you first believe that you may have a claim against Old GM and what was that claim?
19. When did you first learn that the GUC Trust was making distributions to Old GM creditors?
20. When did you first see a draft of your Proof of Claim?
21. When did you sign your Proof of Claim?
22. When, if at all, were you involved in an accident involving Your Vehicle as a result of what you believe to be a defect in Your Vehicle?
23. Please explain your initial understanding of the cause of your accident.
24. Please explain how, if at all, your initial understanding of the cause of your accident has changed over time, and when and why your understanding changed.
25. If you applied to participate in the compensation fund established by New GM and administrated by Kenneth Feinberg, what was the outcome of that application?
26. Other than the Proof of Claim you seek to file in connection with the motion filed on December 22, 2016 (Dkt No. 13807), have you previously filed a Proof of Claim in the Old GM bankruptcy?
27. Have you ever filed an insurance claim with respect to Your Vehicle and, if so, when, for how much, and under what circumstances did you make your claim?
28. If the answer to number 27 is yes, what was the result of the insurance claim that you filed?

**INTERROGATORIES**

1. When, how, and under what circumstances did you first become aware that Old GM had filed for bankruptcy?
2. When, how, and under what circumstances did you first become aware of the Bar Date in the Old GM bankruptcy?
3. When, how, and under what circumstances did you first become aware that Your Vehicle was subject to NHTSA Recall No. 14v047?
4. When did you first learn that Your Vehicle might have a defect that may cause an Ignition Switch Related Event?
5. Did you bring Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
6. If the answer to number 5 is yes, when was the first time that you brought Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
7. Did you communicate with Old GM or New GM about what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
8. If the answer to number 7 is yes, when did you first communicate with Old GM or New GM, and how did you so communicate (telephone contact, e-mail, letter or other), about what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event?
- ~~9. Did you bring Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you now believe to be or was a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch)?~~
- ~~10. If the answer to number 9 is yes, when was the first time that you brought Your Vehicle to a dealer, a repair shop, or a mechanic as a result of what you believed to be or was a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch)?~~
- ~~11. Did you communicate with Old GM or New GM about what you now allege to be a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch)?~~
- ~~12. If the answer to number 11 is yes, when did you first communicate with Old GM or New GM, and how did you so communicate (telephone contact, e-mail, letter or other), about what you now allege to be a defect (other than a defect related to the ignition switch) or any other issue with Your Vehicle’s performance?~~
- 13.9. When did you acquire Your Vehicle and from whom did you acquire it?

- ~~14.~~10. Do you or any member of your family still own or lease Your Vehicle and, if not, when did you transfer Your Vehicle or cease to own or lease it?
- ~~15.~~11. When did you first consider consulting with an attorney concerning what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event~~Your Vehicle?~~
- ~~16.~~12. When was the first time that any attorney contacted you, or you contacted any attorney, concerning what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event~~Your Vehicle, Old GM, or New GM?~~
- ~~17.~~13. When were you first represented by a lawyer in connection with what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event~~Your Vehicle, Old GM, or New GM?~~
- ~~18.~~14. When did you first believe that you may have a claim against Old GM concerning what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event~~and what was that claim?~~
- ~~19.~~15. When did you first learn that the GUC Trust was making distributions to Old GM creditors?
- ~~20.~~16. When did you first see a draft of your Proof of Claim?
- ~~21.~~17. When did you sign your Proof of Claim?
- ~~22.~~18. When, if at all, were you involved in an accident involving Your Vehicle concerning what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event~~as a result of what you believe to be a defect in Your Vehicle?~~
- ~~23.~~19. Please explain your initial understanding of the cause of your accident.
- ~~24.~~20. Please explain how, if at all, your initial understanding of the cause of your accident has changed over time, and when and why your understanding changed.
- ~~25.~~21. If you applied to participate in the compensation fund established by New GM and administrated by Kenneth Feinberg, what was the outcome of that application?
- ~~26.~~22. Other than the Proof of Claim you seek to file in connection with the motion filed on December 22, 2016 (Dkt No. 13807), have you previously filed a Proof of Claim in the Old GM bankruptcy?
- ~~27.~~23. Have you ever filed an insurance claim with respect to Your Vehicle concerning what you now allege to be a defect related to the ignition switch or an Ignition Switch Related Event and, if so, when, for how much, and under what circumstances did you make your

claim?

| ~~28.24.~~ 24. If the answer to number 27 is yes, what was the result of the insurance claim that you filed?