

APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

I. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM INFORMATION

Claimant Name	Last/Name of Business ██████████	First ██████	Middle
Claimant ID	██████████	Claim ID	██████
Claim Type	Individual Economic Loss		
Law Firm	██████		

II. DECISION

Denial Upheld

Denial Overturned

III. PRIMARY BASIS FOR PANELIST DECISION

Please select the primary basis for your decision. You may also write a comment describing the basis for your decision.

Claim should have been excluded.

Claim should have been denied.

Claim should not have been excluded.

Claim should not have been denied.

No error.

Comment (optional):

Claimant is a resident of ██████████ and , as with three other denied claims, appeals the Program vendors' denial of his IEL claim, said denial based upon the fact that Claimant neither lived nor worked in required Gulf Coast areas at times relevant to this Program under Section 1.1 of the Settlement Agreement. Claimant appears pro se, and his submissions are frankly hard to decipher, containing as they do many puzzling positions in the context of run-on sentences and sentence fragments. As one example, Claimant argues, "You know they are equivocality (sic) wrong and want to use this cause against you if you uphold their opposition memorandum against me and allow them to win." Claimant asserts that he is a qualified member of a recovery class he terms as "other," and appears to argue that he was allegedly contracted by BP after the Spill to perform some online work from ██████████ and developed a business plan which he was unable to carry out because of the denial of a prior BEL claim. He analogizes to BP's retention of law firms located outside the Gulf Coast area, and appears to assert that they also perform "mental work" (presumably virtual, online projects) without being excluded from participating as part of the Program. With all due respect, Claimant is confusing apples and oranges. No member of BP's law firms are allowed to make claims under the subject Program. If he has a dispute for non-payment with BP for online services he allegedly performed for them after the Spill, that claim is not something that the Settlement Agreement was designed to address. As a resident of ██████████ who admittedly neither lived



nor worked in Gulf Coast areas as defined by the Settlement Agreement, Claimant is not a qualifying member of any class defined thereunder. As such, his claim was properly denied.