Exhibit A

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:	)	Chapter 11
	)	
The SCO GROUP, INC., et al.,[1]	)	Case No, 07-11337 (KG)
	)	(Jointly Administered)
Debtors.	)	
	)	

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF STUART H. SINGER, ON BEHALF OF BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP, AS PROPOSED SPECIAL LITIGATION COUNSEL FOR THE DEBTORS, NUNC PRO TUNC TO THE PETITION DATE

1. I am Stuart H. Singer. I am an attorney and partner in the law firm of Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP ("the firm"). I make this Declaration based on my personal knowledge and review of business records of the firm, and in supplementation of my Declaration dated October 12, 2007, in this matter, concerning *Debtors' Application, Pursuant To 11 U.S.C. §§ 327(e), 328 and 330, for Approval of Employment of Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP as Special Litigation Counsel to the Debtors Nunc Pro Tunc to Petition Date.*

2. The firm represents no interest adverse to the Debtors or their estates with respect to the matters upon which BSF seeks to be employed. There has been no suggestion raised that the firm represents any interests adverse to the Debtors in connection with these matters.

3. Although we do not seek to be engaged as general bankruptcy counsel, we disclose in the following paragraphs the relationships that the firm has with creditors that have been identified as the 20 largest creditors known to the Debtors.

[1] The Debtors and the last four digits of each of the Debtors' federal tax identification numbers are as follows: (a) The SCO Group, Inc., a Delaware corporation, Fed. Tax. ID. #2823; and (b) SCO Operations, Inc., a Delaware corporation, Fed. Tad ID. #7393. The address for both Debtors is 355 South 520 West, Lindon, UT 84042.

4. The firm has represented Transworld Entertainment in connection with a number of matters entirely unrelated to SCO. These are the following: litigation settled in 2003 against the State of Arizona, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Connecticut, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Florida, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Illinois, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Kansas, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Michigan, but not the Department of Treasury; against the State of Missouri, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of New Mexico, but not the Department of Taxation and Revenue; against the State of New York, but not the Department of Sales Tax Processing; against the State of North Carolina, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Pennsylvania, but not the Department of Revenue; against the State of Texas, but not the Comptroller of Public Accounts; against the State of Utah, but not the Tax Commission; and against the State of Washington, but not the Department of Revenue.

5. The firm has paid Colorado state tax to the Colorado Department of Revenue.

6. The firm represents Kathleen Blanco, the Governor of Louisiana, in pending litigation unrelated to SCO, but does not represent the Department of Revenue.

7. The firm has paid state tax to the State of New Jersey.

8. The firm has used Arch Wireless as a vendor for the firm's wireless modems connectivity.

9. The firm is a pending candidate to represent the State of Louisiana, but not specifically the Department of Revenue, in connection with potential litigation unrelated to SCO.

10. The firm represents American Express in pending litigation unrelated to SCO.

11. The firm used AMICI LLC as a vendor for document management before that entity was acquired by Xerox Litigation Services. Members of the family of partner David Boies formerly held a passive, indirect minority interest in AMICI LLC, of which less than a 10% interest was formerly held by children who are also lawyers at the firm. Members of the family of firm partner Nick Gravante formerly held an interest of approximately 1.5%.

12. The firm uses AMLAW Discovery (d/b/a Echelon Group LLC) as a vendor for certain document-reproduction functions, including as the in-house document center for the firm. Entities in which certain firm partners and family members of certain of those partners are owners hold minority ownership interests in Echelon Group LLC.

13. The firm represents AT&T and its predecessors-in-interest such as SBC Communications, in various matters, none of which are related to SCO.

14. The firm has used Canon Business Solutions as a vendor for the firm's wireless modems connectivity.

15. The firm is adverse to Cintas Document Management in pending litigation against the firm's client Associated Uniform Rental + Linen Supply.

16. The firm formerly represented Computer Associates International in a matter that was closed in 1999. This matter was unrelated to SCO.

17. The firm has used Computershare Trust Company as a vendor for supplies.

18. The firm has used DHL Express as a vendor.

19. The firm is co-counsel with Dorsey & Whitney LLP for SCO in certain litigation and has paid that firm fees in that capacity, and proposes to continue to pay Dorsey & Whitney fees pursuant to the engagement agreement between BSF and SCO for that firm's continued assistance on certain litigation matters.

20. The firm has used Filterfresh as a vendor for pantry supplies.

21. The firm has paid Goodwin Procter LLP costs and attorneys' fees in connection with that firm's representation of a third party in stayed litigation against SCO.

22. The firm is co-counsel with Hatch, James & Dodge for SCO in certain litigation and has paid that firm fees in that capacity and proposes to continue to pay Hatch, James & Dodge fees pursuant to the Engagement Agreement with SCO for that firm's continued assistance on certain litigation matters.

23. HP-Nonstop Royalty Accounting is adverse to a potential client of the firm, Hewlett Packard, in a matter unrelated to SCO.

24. The firm has purchased computer equipment from Insight as a vendor.

25. The firm has used Kelly Services as a vendor for temporary personnel.

26. The firm is co-counsel with Kevin McBride and his law firm in pending litigation for SCO, and pursuant to the engagement agreement has paid McBride certain fees, and the firm has also previously acquired from Kevin McBride 2.5% of the 10% contingency fee interest he holds under the Engagement Agreement with SCO. By this current motion, the firm does not seek approval for retention of Mr. McBride or to pay him any amounts pursuant to the Engagement Agreement.

27. The firm has used Lexis Nexis as a vendor for computer research. In addition, the firm represents former shareholders of Seisint in pending arbitration adverse to Lexis Nexis that is unrelated to SCO.

28. The firm has used OfficeMax as a vendor for office supplies.

29. The firm has used Pitney Bowes Purchase Power as a vendor for office supplies and equipment maintenance.

30. The firm has used PR Newswire as a vendor for public relations.

31. The firm has used RandD Strategic Solutions, LLC as a vendor for consulting work, including work in connection with SCO.

32. The firm represents Qwest in pending litigation unrelated to SCO.

33. The firm represents Qwest and Cel Tech. in pending litigation adverse to Sprint that is unrelated to SCO.

34. The firm has used UCN as a vendor for telephone service.

35. The firm has used Verizon as a vendor for telephone service.

36. The firm has used XO Communications LLC as a vendor for telephone service.

37. The firm represents Unisys Corporation in a pending international arbitration that is unrelated to SCO.

38. The firm formerly represented UPS in a matter unrelated to SCO, which closed in 2005.

39. SCO has paid amounts to the firm pursuant to the Engagement Agreement. The firm does not hold any of these funds as property for SCO either as a retainer, as a separate segregated account or otherwise.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 5th of December 2007
at Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Stuart H. Singer