



Jeanine Buckley
Apt 5C
175 W 90th St
New York, NY 10024-1238

July 30, 2010

The United States Bankruptcy Court
Southern District of New York
Southern District of New York, NY
#1 Bowling Green Station

Case: 09-50026 (REG)

In re
Motor Liquidation Company, et al.
Objection by Creditors to the Notice
of Debtors - Twenty-seven Omnibus
Objections claims

FILED
U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
2010 JUL 30 P 3:42
S.D. OF N.Y.

JEANINE BUCKLEY
175 WEST 90th STREET, #5C
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024

DATE: JULY 30, 2010

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CHAPTER 11 Case No.
09-50026 (REG)

IN re

MOTORS Liquidation Company, et al.,
F/K/a GENERAL MOTORS Corp., et al

Jointly Administered

Objection BY Creditor TO THE NOTICE
OF DEBTORS' TWENTY SEVENTH Omnibus
Objection TO CLAIMS (Incorrectly Classified Claims)

Please take notice that
the classified claim filed by Jeanine
Buckley on November 30, 2009, should
not be re-classified as incorrectly classified.

The Debtors had many months even a year to determine if the Claims that they have recently determine incorrectly classified and appropriately handled. There have been extensive hearing by the Congress, extensive coverage in the media of the stimulus package for the Automobile manufactures at the expense of the public as to how the American people should pay for their (Auto makes) errors malfunction vehicles such as the Blazer I purchased and nearly destroyed in.

The exhibit "A" is obviously made up of ordinary "folks" like myself who is unable to find an attorney to help us.

In my limited research I've found no case cite stating that "Exhibit A" should be re-classified. I believed the Debtors is bias and have not shown any argument to warrant reclassification for "Exhibit A" who are ordinary Americans who the government took our hard earned funds to assist with bail out when we were already fighting for our life in Federal Court from poorly manufactured vehicles, such as myself who have become a senior citizen and permanently damaged from the accident in 1996. "Under 11 USC §502 claim or interest is deemed allowed only when proof of claim is filed and no objection is made, and where no proof of claim has been filed by secured creditor, or debtor or trustee, debtor cannot seek determination"

of secured status under 11 USC § 506." (See) In re Hotel Associates, Inc. (1980, BC Ed Pa) 3 BR 340, 6 BCL 145, 1 C BC 2d 819, CCH Bankr L Rptr P 67409."

(See) In re Palombo Farms of Colorado, Inc. (1984, BC DC Colo) 43 BR 709.

Under the heading "background" by the debtors (pg 3) in the 27 objection notice, I did make attempts to everyone one of the attorney and government agencies to get clarity of who to write to or call and received no answers. The only answer from GM + the government was that they would notify all creditors. After nearly a year or more they have discovered they made an error. Why make the error after receiving the Stimulus package, your timing is questionable.

I ask the court to deny this notice of Deators Twenty seventh Omnibus Objection to Claims. They have ^{had} more than enough time to research (staff of many expert legal advisers) to make their objections by way of another hearing and the people (regular) pro-se have no chance of making our case to the court. I come to the hearing and no one would take my name so I could have my questions asked. I was denied and I was there everyday. I was one of three ordinary persons there.

Further, I oppose the Deators Notice for the hearing on August 6, 2010. And ask the court to deny the notice simply for all the reasons state.