



Cecil & Geiser<sup>LLP</sup>

FILED  
COURT OF CLAIMS  
OF OHIO

**ORIGINAL**

April 24, 2015

2015 APR 27 AM 10:40

The Honorable Judge Dale A. Crawford  
Court of Claims of Ohio  
The Ohio Judicial Center  
65 South Front Street, Third Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

**RE: Luedella Dickens, Admr. v. Ohio State University Medical Center  
Case No. 2013-00204**

Dear Judge Crawford:

Per your instruction, I am sending a written explanation of the process involving obtaining Probate Court approval of the *Dickens v. OSU Medical Center* claim.

The decedent died April 24, 2012. A Wrongful Death claim was pursued by her sister, Luedella Dickens. Ms. Dickens is a resident of the State of Maryland. Counsel was made aware of a surviving son and grandson in addition to Ms. Dickens.

Approximately October, 2014, the matter was settled, subject to the necessary approval of the Probate Court. The Court had previously closed the Estate so a motion to reopen the Estate needed to be filed. This was done shortly after the settlement had been reached and Court approval to reopen the Estate was granted October 17, 2014. At the same time the Probate Court accepted Letters of Authority and filed an Entry Appointing the Fiduciary.

The Estate next had to file for authority to engage counsel and have the contingency contract approved. This was all accomplished by the end of October.

Ms. Whitehead was survived by nine individuals in addition to her son and grandson. Ms. Whitehead and her sister, Ms. Dickens, had very little contact with most of these persons, most of who qualified as "Other Next of Kin" under the Wrongful Death statute. Pursuant to the Tenth District decision *In re Payne*, 2005-OHIO-2391 and the practice of the Franklin County Probate Court, "Other Next of Kin" must be notified of potential claims. The Franklin County Probate Court requires practitioners to conduct more than a single attempt.

Much time was consumed in trying to locate potential Other Next of Kin. These people resided in New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio and Virginia. No direct contact information was

495 SOUTH HIGH STREET, SUITE 400 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215  
PHONE (614) 222-4444 (877) 706-6446 FAX (614) 221-6633 WWW.PROTECTINGOHIO.COM

**ON COMPUTER**

ANDREW W. CECIL\*† MICHAEL K. GEISER† SYDNEY S. MCLAFFERTY MATTHEW E. ICE BRIAN A. GIBBS

HENSLEY LEGAL GROUP, PC INDIANA, Of Counsel‡ CHARLES W. KRANSTUBER, Of Counsel§

\*Board Certified - Civil Trial Advocate-National Board of Trial Advocacy †Million Dollar Advocates Forum

‡Hensley Legal Group, PC, Indiana Affiliated as 'of counsel' Co-counsel on Social Security Matters\*

§Charles W. Kranstuber Affiliated as 'of counsel' Co-counsel on Workers' Compensation Matters\*

Judge Dale A. Crawford

April 24, 2015

Page 2

available so we had to find A to locate B and then locate C and so on.. Once contact was made, additional time was necessary to explain what was going on, why we needed action on their part, answer questions about the Probate process and then push to get Waivers signed and returned. Looking from the "Kin's" point of view, they receive a letter from some attorney in Ohio about someone they may not even know asking for a signature for filing in Ohio. Under such circumstances, an immediate response is rare.

On March 25, 2015, an Application to Approve Settlement and Distribution was filed with the Probate Court. A hearing date of May 25, 2015 was scheduled by the Court. The potential beneficiaries are now located and they will receive notice of the settlement and will be given an opportunity to object, approve or generally ignore the matter before the Probate Court. The Court set the hearing to give adequate time for each party to get counsel and object to any of the settlement and distribution proceeding in the Probate Court. The Probate Court will then authorize the Administrator to settle the claim and direct the distribution,

Very truly yours,

**CECIL & GEISER** <sup>LLP</sup>

*Andrew Cecil / spw*

Andrew W. Cecil

AWC/spw

Enclosures

cc: Jeffrey L. Maloon, Esq. w/enclosures

[Cite as *In re Estate of Payne*, 2005-Ohio-2391.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO  
TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

In the Matter of: :  
Estate of Jerrod D. Payne, :  
(Sharma Presley, Administratrix, : No. 04AP-1176  
Appellant). : (Prob. No. 497840)  
: (REGULAR CALENDAR)

---

O P I N I O N

Rendered on May 17, 2005

---

*Vickery, Riehl & Alter, and Mitchell J. Alter*, for appellee Kathy Altizer.

*George C. Rogers*, for appellant.

---

APPEAL from the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas,  
Probate Division.

BRYANT, J.

{¶1} Appellant, Sharma Presley, appeals from a judgment of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas, Probate Division, and its distribution of wrongful death settlement proceeds. Because the Probate Court erred in its distribution, we reverse.

{¶2} While walking home from school, Jerrod D. Payne, a minor, was killed as a result of being struck by an uninsured motorist. Appellant is decedent's paternal grandmother and was his legal custodian at the time of his death. Appellant filed an uninsured motorist claim with her insurer, Progressive Insurance Company and settled

with Progressive in the amount of \$105,000. As administratrix of decedent's estate, appellant presented an application to the Probate Court to approve the settlement.

{¶3} While the matter was pending in the Probate Court, appellee, Kathy Altizer, decedent's maternal aunt, sought to participate in the distribution. Altizer was decedent's legal custodian from 1999 through 2002, as Jerrod's parents had abandoned him. The magistrate found that both appellant and Altizer were "other next of kin" under the wrongful death statute and that both suffered emotional loss as a result of decedent's death. The magistrate recommended that (1) \$17,000 go to appellant for the initial shock and trauma of Jerrod's death, including making the funeral arrangements; (2) the party who paid the funeral benefits be reimbursed; and (3) the remaining net proceeds be divided equally between appellant and Altizer.

{¶4} Appellant filed objections to the magistrate's decision, contending the magistrate improperly concluded that Altizer is a "next of kin" for purposes of recovery under Ohio's wrongful death statute. The Probate Court overruled the objections and adopted the magistrate's decision. On appeal, appellant assigns the following error:

THE PROBATE COURT ERRED IN ITS DETERMINATION THAT A MATERNAL AUNT IS INCLUDED ALONG WITH A PATERNAL GRANDMOTHER (CHILD CUSTODIAN) AS AN OTHER NEXT OF KIN FOR PURPOSES OF RECEIVING A DISTRIBUTION OF WRONGFUL DEATH PROCEEDS RECOVERED FROM THE GRANDMOTHER'S UNINSURED MOTORIST INSURER.

{¶5} The Ohio Supreme Court has stated "[i]n the case of the death of an insured, the settlement proceeds under an uninsured motorist provision are to be distributed among those persons who are entitled by statute to bring a wrongful death action." *In re Reeck* (1986), 21 Ohio St.3d 126, syllabus. An action for wrongful death in

Ohio is purely a creation of statute, subject to the rights and limitations imposed in R.C. 2125.02. *Rubeck v. Huffman* (1978), 54 Ohio St.2d 20. According to R.C. 2125.02(A), an "action for wrongful death shall be brought in the name of the personal representative of the decedent for the exclusive benefit of the surviving spouse, the children, and the parents of the decedent, all of whom are rebuttably presumed to have suffered damages by reason of the wrongful death, and for the exclusive benefit of the other next of kin of the decedent." R.C. 2125.02(A)(1).

{¶6} Here, decedent left no surviving spouse, his parents legally abandoned him and are not entitled to any distribution, and decedent had no children. The narrow issue presented in this appeal is whether the phrase "other next of kin" includes Altizer so that she may recover a portion of the settlement proceeds. Because the issue requires an interpretation of the wrongful death statute, we apply a de novo standard of review. *BP Exploration & Oil, Inc. v. Ohio Dept. of Commerce*, Franklin App. No. 04AP-619, 2005-Ohio-1533.

{¶7} Ohio's wrongful death statute is remedial in nature and is liberally construed to give effect to its purpose. *Ramage v. Central Ohio Emergency Serv., Inc.* (1992), 64 Ohio St.3d 97. Under the statute, the surviving spouse, parents, or children may maintain an action for wrongful death. In addition, other next of kin may maintain an action despite the existence of survivors who maintain a closer relationship to the decedent. *Ramage*, supra; *Senig v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co.* (1992), 76 Ohio App.3d 565. Unlike the spouse, children, and parents of the decedent, other next of kin are not rebuttably presumed to have suffered damages by reason of the wrongful death. R.C. 2125.02(A)(1). Rather,

next of kin must prove their damages. *Id.*; *Ramage*, *supra*; *Shoemaker v. Crawford* (1991), 78 Ohio App.3d 53, 64.

{¶8} For example, in *Ramage*, the Ohio Supreme Court held the decedent's grandparents were entitled to recover wrongful death compensatory damages for mental anguish and loss of society, even though a surviving spouse, parent, or child may exist. *Ramage*, at 106. The court stated, "[i]n R.C. 2125.02, the General Assembly recognized that the bonds [other next of kin] may enjoy with the decedent may be different from those of the surviving parent, spouse, and minor children, and so provided that other next of kin are not presumed to have suffered damages but must instead prove their damages. We cannot agree with appellants that the General Assembly intended to exclude next of kin simply because another category of survivors exists. To hold otherwise would be contrary to the remedial purposes of the statute." *Id.* at 105. Similarly, in *Wise v. Timmons* (1992), 64 Ohio St.3d 113, the decedent's siblings were permitted to recover even though decedent's father survived. In *Senig*, this court also allowed grandchildren of the decedent to recover despite surviving children.

{¶9} Appellant acknowledges that other next of kin may recover despite the existence of a closer surviving relative, but contends Ohio has not extended recovery to include aunts, uncles, or cousins. Under civil law rules for the computation of degrees of kinship or consanguinity, parents and children are related in the first degree; grandparents, grandchildren, brothers and sisters are related in the second degree; and aunts, uncles, nieces and nephews are related in the third degree. Ohio Jurisprudence 3d, Decedent's Estates, Section 90-91. According to appellant, if relatives in the second degree exist, such persons as "next of kin," in addition to relatives in the first degree

named in the statute, may bring an action and potentially recover damages to the exclusion of other more remote relatives.

{¶10} By contrast, Altizer argues that any relative is entitled to bring a wrongful death action. According to Altizer, since next of kin are not presumed to have suffered damages, but instead must prove their damages, the potential class of individuals thus is limited and sufficiently protects against "any" relative being entitled to recover.

{¶11} Because R.C. 2125.02 does not define the phrase "next of kin," we must determine its meaning. "The object of judicial investigation in the construction of a statute is to ascertain and give effect to the intent of the law-making body which enacted it." *State v. Hairston*, 101 Ohio St.3d 308, 2004-Ohio-969, ¶11, quoting *Slingluff v. Weaver* (1902), 66 Ohio St. 621. "[T]he intent of the law-makers is to be sought first of all in the language employed, and if the words be free from ambiguity and doubt, and express plainly, clearly and distinctly \* \* \* there is no occasion to resort to other means of interpretation. \* \* \* That body should be held to mean what it has plainly expressed, and hence no room is left for construction." *Hairston*, at ¶12. If a term or phrase is not ambiguous, a court must simply apply it. *Id. Benjamin v. Credit General Ins. Co.*, Franklin App. No. 04AP-642, 2005-Ohio-1450, ¶20 ("When a statute conveys a meaning that is clear, unequivocal and definite, the statute must be applied as written").

{¶12} Courts lack the authority to ignore the plain language of a statute under the guise of statutory interpretation or liberal or narrow construction. *Covington v. Airborne Express, Inc.*, Franklin App. No. 03AP-733, 2004-Ohio-6978. Rather, a court must give effect to the words used in the statute, accord the words their usual and customary meaning, and not delete words used or insert words that are not used. *Cleveland Elec.*

*Illum. Co. v. Cleveland* (1988), 37 Ohio St.3d 50, paragraph three of the syllabus; *Benjamin*, supra.

{¶13} In accordance with the noted rules of construction, we observe that R.C. 2125.02(A)(1) first lists the individuals entitled to recover who are closest in relationship to the decedent: parent(s), child(ren), or a spouse. It further permits recovery "for the exclusive benefit of the other next of kin of the decedent." R.C. 2125.02(A)(1). In its common and ordinary meaning, the phrase "next of kin" is a person's nearest relative or relatives. *Senig*, supra. "Not all kin or relatives of a decedent are 'next of kin,' regardless of the degree of relationship. Rather \* \* \* the relatives *nearest* to decedent are the 'next of kin.'" (Emphasis sic.) *Id.* at 574.

{¶14} Ordinarily, then, the "next" of kin to a deceased minor child is the parent or parents. Because, however, the wrongful death statute explicitly provides for parents, children, and spouse and then separately includes "other next of kin," next of kin means the nearest surviving relatives after accounting for the parents, children, or spouse. Ohio cases allowing recovery to relatives with differing degrees of relationships within the same case, such as grandparents and parents, thus are consistent with the plain language of the statute. Were we to hold that "next of kin" includes any degree of relationship to the decedent, such as aunts, uncles, or cousins, we would effectively delete the word "next" from the statute, something a court is not permitted to do. *Benjamin*, supra. Indeed, all of the cases we cite involve the specific individuals listed in the statute and the "next" surviving relatives, which happened to be in the second degree.

{¶15} As a result, Altizer is unpersuasive in contending that because next of kin must prove their damages under the statute, any relative is entitled to bring a wrongful

death action, subject to the need to prove damages. Altizer's argument ignores that the word "next" means the next closest relative after accounting for a surviving spouse, children, or parents. The legislature's mandate that next of kin must prove their damages does not imply that any relative may bring an action; it simply recognizes that even next of kin may not be as close to the decedent as a parent, child, or spouse is presumed to be.

{¶16} Altizer nonetheless contends *Ponser v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 104 Ohio St.3d 621, 2004-Ohio-7105 demonstrates that an aunt is next of kin under the wrongful death statute and entitled to maintain an action. In *Ponser*, the mother, grandparents, and maternal aunt sought to recover uninsured motorist benefits under their respective policies. The maternal aunt maintained her own insurance policy that provided for payment of "compensatory damages as a result of bodily injury suffered by you or a relative and due by law." *Ponser*, at ¶15. The certified conflict question before the Ohio Supreme Court asked whether an insured must file a wrongful death action against a tortfeasor within the two-year statute of limitations set forth in R.C. 2125.02(D) to be legally entitled to recover benefits under the policy. *Id.* at ¶37.

{¶17} Based on the language in the policies at issue, the court held that the maternal aunt was not required to file a wrongful death action because whether an insured is legally entitled to recover is determined at the time of the accident. *Id.* Despite the narrow holding in *Ponser*, Altizer asserts that because *Ponser* concluded the maternal aunt was legally entitled to recover under the terms of her insurance policy, a maternal aunt necessarily is included among the persons who are entitled to bring a wrongful death action. *Ponser*, however, is not dispositive of the issues before us.

{¶18} First, the aunt in *Ponser* had her own insurance policy that permitted, under the circumstances set forth in the policy, her recovery of compensatory damages for bodily injury to herself or "a relative." If Altizer has or had such an uninsured/underinsured policy, it was not presented to the court and is not at issue. Second, and more pertinent to the present case, the court in *Ponser* did not address the maternal aunt's status as next of kin for purposes of the wrongful death statute. Instead, the issue was the viability of an uninsured claim pursuant to a contractual insurance policy where the insured had not pursued an action against the tortfeasor.

{¶19} According to the plain, ordinary and clear meaning of the phrase "next of kin," appellant, related in the second degree, is entitled to recover to the exclusion of Altizer, related in the third degree. Appellant is the "next" of kin: the nearest surviving relative to the decedent after accounting for parents, children, or spouse, of which none exist. If the deceased had no surviving relatives of the second degree, Altizer would be the "next" of kin. Because she is not, she is not entitled to any of the proceeds of the settlement at issue. Appellant's single assignment of error is sustained.

{¶20} Having sustained appellant's single assignment of error, we reverse the judgment of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas, Probate Division, and remand for proceedings consistent with this opinion.

*Judgment reversed  
and case remanded.*

PETREE and McGRATH, JJ., concur.

---

**PROBATE COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO**  
**ROBERT G. MONTGOMERY, JUDGE**

ESTATE OF ELLA FRANCES WHITEHEAD, DECEASED  
CASE NO. 554055

**APPLICATION TO APPROVE SETTLEMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF  
WRONGFUL DEATH AND SURVIVAL CLAIMS**

[R.C.2117.05, 2125.02, 2125.03, Civ. R. 19.1 AND Sup. R. 70]

The fiduciary states: [Check whichever of the following are applicable, strike inapplicable words, and incorporate all attachments into a single statement.]

- There is an offer of (full) (partial) settlement without suit being filed.
- There is an offer of (full) (partial) settlement after suit was filed. The style of the case, the court and the case number being \_\_\_\_\_
- A judgment has been recovered for damages for decedent's wrongful death (and personal injury and property damage arising out of the same act and which survive the decedent).
- The amount of the settlement or judgment is \$ 275,000.00
- This is a partial settlement and therefore the estate must remain open pending final disposition of the claims.
- The offer includes, or the judgment sets forth separately, reasonable funeral and burial expenses in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- Reasonable compensation for the fiduciary's services is \$ \_\_\_\_\_ and an itemization of such services is attached.
- Reasonable attorney fees for the attorney's services is \$ 111,500.00 and reimbursement to the attorney for case expenses is \$ 4,092.55. A copy of the attorney's fee contract that (has) (has not) received prior approval of this court subject to modification, and an itemization of case expenses are attached.
- The net proceeds of \$ 159,407.45 should be allocated; \$ 159,407.45 to the wrongful death action and \$ 0.00 to the survival action. A statement in support thereof is attached.
- A statement in support of the proffered settlement is attached.
- Supplemental forms required by local rule of court are attached.
- All of the beneficiaries of the wrongful death action are on an equal degree of consanguinity, and are adults and have agreed how the net proceeds are to be distributed.
- The beneficiaries of the wrongful death action are not on an equal degree of consanguinity, or one or more of the beneficiaries is a minor, or the beneficiaries have not agreed how the net proceeds are to be distributed.

FILED  
CUSTOMER COPY #1  
**MAR 25 2015**  
Robert G. Montgomery, Judge  
Franklin County Probate Court

The surviving spouse, children and parents of the decedent and other next of kin who have suffered damages by reason of the wrongful death are as follows and the distribution should be, as follows:

Name	Residence Address	Relationship to Decedent	Birthdate of Minor	Amount
Shawn Whitehead	22131 Lake Jordan Dr. Petersburg, VA 23803	Son	A	\$79,703.73
Javon Whitehead	22131 Lake Jordan Dr. Petersburg, VA 23803	Grandson		\$31,881.49
Luedella Dickens	2605 Lime Street Temple Hill, MD 20748	Sister	A	\$31,881.49
Anna Hawkins	871 Ann Street Columbus, OH 43206	Sister	A	\$1,992.59
Andrance James	4626 Heritage Manor Crestwood, KY 40014	Sister	A	\$1,992.59

See attached additional next of kin

The survival claim beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Residence Address	Relationship to Decedent	Birthdate of Minor

The fiduciary requests that the Court approve the application and authorize the fiduciary to execute a (complete) (partial) release which upon payment of the settlement shall be a (complete) (partial) discharge of the claim.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Attorney for Fiduciary  
 Adam R. Rinehart 0041572  
 Attorney Registration No.

*Luedella Dickens*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Fiduciary  
 Luedella Dickens

FILED  
 CUSTOMER COPY #1  
 MAR 25 2015  
 Robert G. Montgomery, Judge  
 Franklin County Probate Court

**ENTRY SETTING HEARING AND ORDERING NOTICE**


The Court sets May 20, 2015 at 9:30 o'clock A.M. as the date and time for hearing the above application and orders notice to be given by the fiduciary, as provided in Rules of Civil Procedure, to the wrongful death and survival claim beneficiaries who have not waived notice.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Robert G. Montgomery, Judge

Estate of Ella Frances Whitehead  
Case No. 554055

Additional Next of Kin

Alice Lewis PO Box 86 Battleboro, NC 27809	\$1,992.59
Mattie Thorne 917 Greenwhich St Raleigh, NC 27610	\$1,992.59
Charles Whitehead, Jr. 317 Myrtle Ave. Irvington, NJ 07111	\$1,992.59
Alexander Whitehead PO Box 171 Battleboro, NC 27809	\$1,992.59
James Whitehead PO Box 342 Battleboro, NC 27809	\$1,992.59
Johnny Whitehead PO Box 86 Battleboro, NC 27809	\$1,992.59



Dickens v. OSUMC - 2013-00204

Case Expenses		TOTAL	
Payee	Date	Description of Transaction	Expense (€)
HealthPort	9/13/12	Records - OSU Medical Center	\$ 36.99
Sandi Nappi	10/9/12	Records Review	\$ 321.00
Jeffrey S. Garrett MD	11/1/12	Expert - Review and Report	\$ 1,000.00
HealthPort	11/21/12	Records - OSU Medical Center	\$ 21.14
Sandi Nappi	1/29/13	Records Review	\$ 203.00
HealthPort	2/7/13	Records - OSU Medical Center	\$ 56.92
Jeffrey S. Garrett MD	3/28/13	Expert - Review	\$ 350.00
Court of Claims	4/1/13	Filing Fees	\$ 25.00
Jeffrey S. Garrett MD	9/11/13	Expert - Review	\$ 170.00
Jeffrey S. Garrett MD	8/21/14	Expert - Deposition Prep and Time	\$ 1,575.00
Jeffrey S. Garrett MD	8/21/14	Expert - Phone Conference	\$ 133.50
TOTAL			\$ 3,892.55

+ 200.00  
 Probate cost  
 + mailing  
 costs  
 = \$4092.55

FILED  
 CUSTOMER COPY #1  
 MAR 25 2015  
 Robert G. Montgomery, Judge  
 Franklin County Probate Court

**PRELIMINARY CLOSING STATEMENT**

**DONAHAY DEFOSSEZ & BEAUSAY**

495 South High Street, Suite 300  
 Columbus, Ohio 43215  
 614-224-8166  
 614-849-0475

TOTAL SETTLEMENT AMOUNT \$  
 DATE:  
 CLIENT:  
 CASE:

275,000.00  
 November 21, 2014  
 Luedella Dickens, Adm.  
 Dickens v. OSUMC - 2013-00204

CLOSING STATEMENT		
ITEM	AMOUNT	BALANCE
Attorney's Fees (40%)		
50% Attorney Fees to Donahay Defossez & Beausay per Notification and Consent Form	110,000.00	165,000.00
50% Attorney Fees to Cecil & Geiser per Notification and Consent Form	55,000.00	165,000.00
Case Expenses	55,000.00	165,000.00
Probate Fees and Expenses <i>Cost \$200 + fee \$1500.00</i>	3,892.55	161,107.45
	<i>- 1,700.00</i>	<i>\$ 159,407.45</i>
<b>TOTAL SETTLEMENT TO CLIENT:</b>		

**FILED  
 CUSTOMER COPY #1  
 MAR 25 2015  
 Robert G. Montgomery, Judge  
 Franklin County Probate Court**



ADAM R. RINEHART  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

ADAM.RINEHARTLAW@SBCGLOBAL.NET

P.O. BOX 490 • DUBLIN, OH • 43017 • PHONE: 614 - 717 - 9701 • FAX: 614 - 717 - 9704

April 22, 2015

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Andrew W. Cecil, Esq.  
Cecil & Geiser, LLP  
495 South High Street, Suite 400  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: Estate of Ella Whitehead  
Franklin County Probate Court Case #554055

Dear Andy:

This letter is being written at your request to address the questions raised about the timeframe for getting the Ella Whitehead Estate Wrongful Death/Survival action heard by the Franklin County Probate Court. In an attempt to give you the timeframe of any probate court case that involves multiple litigants and potential beneficiaries, I would refer you to the *In re Payne* case, which states as a probate practitioner, we are to send out extraordinary notice to the spouse, children, and parents who are all presumed to be injured. In addition, *In re Payne* places an extraordinary burden of determining who the additional next of kin are which, in this case, exceed fifteen persons. These next of kin are scattered among various states (Virginia, New Jersey, North Carolina and Ohio). Some are connected to the decedent as minimally as a cousin. However, due to the fact that the standard for notice requires us to first, find them, and to, secondly, serve them, additional time is necessary to process these types of claims. Since the deceased in most cases has had no contact with these distant blood relatives, sending notice often takes additional time and explanation.

Secondly, as you are aware, the subrogation negotiation process after your initial settlement often takes months to resolve before you are even able to provide me with accurate settlement figures. In this particular case, the timeframe set by the court has been caused by locating and sending notice to the distant next of kin and unknown address of the many out-of-state next of kin. This has required the fiduciary, who has had no contact with these persons, to work through other next of kin to identify addresses for these individuals so they may be provided with notice. Should you need anything further, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam R. Rinehart', written over a horizontal line.

Adam R. Rinehart

ARR