

CRYPTOME

5 January 2019

The Dark Overlord Hacked Confidential Documents of WTC 9/11 Litigation:

Source of this file by anonymous via email:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1RVGAMSPAk4pOfXYOu9Xx5k_ILo63PLnq

Which links to download of this file:

911_Archive-20190104T123956Z-001.zip

Cryptome mirror of the Zip:

https://cryptome.org/2019/01/911_Archive-20190104T123956Z-001.zip

Extracted from this Zip:

Document number: 00031659.DOC (converted to PDF by Cryptome)

Previous 19 hacked documents:

<https://cryptome.org/2019/01/wtc-911-001-018.pdf>

<https://cryptome.org/2019/01/wtc-911-019.pdf>

Mirrors of previous hacks:

TDO 911 Litigation Documents Leak Announcement

<https://cryptome.org/2019/01/tdo-911-leak.txt>

Files

https://cryptome.org/2019/01/911_Archive.zip.torrent

https://cryptome.org/2019/01/911_docs.zip

https://cryptome.org/2019/01/release_01.zip

<https://cryptome.org/2019/01/images.zip>

<https://cryptome.org/2019/01/Advantage-Life.zip>

<https://cryptome.org/2019/01/Documents.zip>

WARDEN TRIPLETT GRIER

Tower 42, Level 7
25 Old Broad Street
London EC2N 1HN
Phone: 0207-872-5779
Fax: 0207-419-1360
Mobile: 07713-642-431
mkuckelman@wtglaw.com

MEMORANDUM

TO: WTC File
FROM: Mike Kuckelman
RE: WTC Plaintiffs' Steering Committee on 24 September 2002
DATE: 24 September 2002

**Attendance Note of Michael J. Kuckelman and
WTC Plaintiffs Steering Committee**

On 24 September 2002, I participated in the plaintiffs' steering committee meeting as ordered by the Court. The committee is to report to the court on 7 October 2002.

The committee discussed five topics. The five topics were:

1. Plaintiffs' Committee/Subcommittees
2. Funding of litigation
3. Preparation of master complaint
4. Security clearance
5. Executive committee website.

The following individuals participated at the conference:

Mike Kuckelman
Michael Baum
Paul Hanley/Motley
Ken Nolan/Frank Granito III
John Greaves
Paul Hedlund
Marc Moller
Mary Schiavo

The discussions were as follows:

I. Plaintiffs' Executive Committee -- The Steering Committee will use the following subcommittees.

1. American Airlines
 - a. Flight 11
 - b. Flight 77
2. United Airlines
 - a. Flight 93
 - b. Flight 175
3. Tower -- WTC Towers/Buildings
 - a. North Tower
 - b. South Tower

The tower group will explore liability of PONY, engineers and designers, evacuation procedures, building codes, etc.

4. General Committee regarding suits against the United States which would include the FBI, CIA, FAA, etc.

On behalf of Underwriters, we will only participate in the first two subcommittees, American Airlines and United Airlines. Obviously, Underwriters have no interest in the remaining groups.

There was an additional discussion regarding the perceived conflict between property insurers, i.e., Underwriters, and the victims. People such as Michael Baum and Mitch Baumeister are opposed to Underwriters being included in this group. They again indicated they will file a motion as soon as possible with the court to exclude property losses, i.e., Underwriters. I think they will irritate the judge if they file a motion without anymore information. The judge was adamant in his rulings last Friday in New York that property and victims have no conflict of interest on the issue of liability. The judge was not persuaded on the argument that there is a conflict of interest in regard to damages because there is a conflict between every plaintiff on the issue of damages due to inadequate resources to satisfy all of the claims and demands.

Marc Moller stopped the conversation fairly quickly. I think he did this because it was an absolute waste of time given the court's ruling. They did indicate they want to attempt to prioritize damages as follows:

1. People on the plane
2. People in the buildings
3. Property damage

Of course, this drew criticism from many lawyers in the room because many of the lawyers represent people who were in the buildings. They obviously had to take the side of property in arguing that there is no distinction in the law between any of these groups and all stand to recover equally. However, as we have discussed in the past, if money becomes available, Underwriters will obviously be in a position of negotiating from a commercial standpoint to allow the victims somewhat better recovery in terms of a pro rata share. We have discussed this in the past and we will need to continue to discuss it in order to determine exactly where Underwriters stand on the issue. However, if any of you object to the notion that Underwriters will not take in complete parity with victims, you need to notify me. Otherwise, I have left this as a negotiable item once the money becomes available. I do believe that the plaintiffs' lawyers representing victims will at some point become a bit wiser and approach us with a negotiation upon allocation in advance of any settlement funds becoming available in order to make it easier to work alongside each other.

There is also a dispute between ground victims and the passengers on United 93. As you will recall, United 93 went down in a field in Pennsylvania. The lawyers representing the United 93 passengers argued that their clients will be entitled to all of the money from United 93 because United 93 will only pay for losses of passengers. Other lawyers were arguing that the United 93 money should be thrown into a central pool and be divided. Obviously, Underwriters will never receive any of the funds from United 93. I also agree with the plaintiffs' lawyers representing the victims on 93 that the airline and its insurers will only pay victims who were actually on the aircraft that crashed into the field. There is no direct nexus between the deaths in WTC and the crash in Pennsylvania.

The issue of foreseeability was also discussed. Everyone seems to be coming to the conclusion that a motion will be filed very promptly by the airlines on foreseeability. I think it is good to call a question as soon as possible but obviously there will need to be discovery conducted prior to allowing the court to rule on it. We will need to gather evidence to show that the airlines knew or should have known that aircraft could be used as weapons and crashed intentionally into buildings.

II. Funding

The group is currently looking for committee fees for committee participants. The group does agree that we need financing for the website and to conduct liability discovery. The liability preparation will be enormous. All attorneys agreed we will need to brief the

foreseeability issue early in the case. We will need to conduct discovery to figure out exactly what the airlines knew and when. The same will true of the security companies. We are all going to meet again to discuss specifically how to finance discovery. This is obviously going to be expensive but the burden falls much heavier on the individuals as opposed to Underwriters in terms of affordability.

III. Preparation of Master Complaint

The master complaint is due 15 December 2002. We will need to have an active role in preparing the master complaint as it relates to property damage.

IV. Security Clearance

We will need to obtain security clearances from the government for the lawyers involved. We will need security clearances due to SSI. However, there is some concern that the security clearance level is at such a low level that being a member of the bar should be sufficient enough security clearance combined with the court order. The government has offered that they would give everyone a security clearance on the same level as an airport worker. Of course, this was laughable to the lawyers involved because we actually need to see SSI documents which clearly would not be available to the average airport worker. The government is going to be difficult on this issue. Mary Schiavo will be useful because she is very familiar with the government operations and regulations. She was previously an FAA official. Schiavo opined that she does not believe security clearance in this case. She believes that the FAA will have to comply with court orders provided that the court imposes some type of a protective order upon the involved lawyers.

V. Website --

The postage cost alone in dealing with all the lawyers in this case will be enormous. There were nearly 100 lawyers in attendance at the hearing in New York. We are likely dealing with far more lawyers and others who will need access to information. Hopefully, a website can be developed and parties, including Underwriters will notified of new postings via e-mail. If the recipient is interested in seeing the document that has been posted, they can then go to the website and download the document for their own review. This will save an enormous amount of money in photocopies and mailing.

The court demanded that one lawyer be appointed as the court's liaison contact. The court wants to speak with one lawyer and make that lawyer responsible for forwarding orders and information to all others lawyers on the steering committee and in fact all of the lawyers who have an interest in the litigation. Marc Moller of the Kreindler firm will fill this role.

cc: Steve Phillips steve.phillips@piperrudnick.com
Jim Warden
Tim Triplett
Mike Grier
Kris Kuehn

Attachment A:

Tony Wilson -- Hiscox -- tony.wilson@hiscox.com
Bob Britton -- Hiscox -- Robert.britton@hiscox.com
Philip Coldbeck -- Hiscox -- philip.coldbeck@hiscox.com
Paul Jaffe -- Catlin -- paul.jaffe@catlin.com
Kees van der Klugt -- Euclidian -- kees.vanderklugt@euclidian.co.uk
Ian Holmes -- Euclidian -- Ian.Holmes@euclidian.co.uk
Robin Stevenson -- Talbot -- robin.stevenson@talbotuw.com
Nick Coles -- Cox -- nick.coles@cox.co.uk
Ted Jagers -- Great Lakes -- ejagers@munichre.com