

EXHIBIT C


April 22, 2012

To Whom it May Concern regarding the objection to the settlement of the Apple iPhone 4 Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW:

Karabeth J. Bigford
431 West 1st Avenue #203
Columbus, Ohio 43201
941-830-3555
Serial #: 801256BODZZ

I am writing to object this settlement. I object due to the inconvenience the phone has caused me. I feel that this settlement of \$15 is not fair. Please contact me for any further questions or information. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Karabeth J. Bigford". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "K" and "B".

Karabeth J. Bigford

BERT CHAPA
5209 TARTAN DRIVE
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS 78413
361-779-9153

June 14, 2012

Clerk of the Court
United States District Court for
The Northern District of California
San Jose Division
280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113

In re Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation, Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW

Dear Clerk:

My name, address, telephone number and serial number of my iPhone 4 are as follows:

Bert (Humberto) Chapa
5209 Tartan Drive
Corpus Christi, Texas 78413
361-779-9153
Serial No. H7Q114147A4S

I was the original owner (by purchase) of an iPhone 4 prior to February 17, 2012. I am therefore a member of the settlement class. I object to the class definition in that it does not make clear if the original owner in the case of a gift is the purchaser or the person to whom the iPhone 4 is given. In my case, I purchased the phone for myself.

The class settlement contains the following provisions to object:

If you're a Class Member, you can object to the settlement if you don't like any part of it. You can give reasons why you think the Court should not approve it. The Court will consider your views. To object, you must send a letter saying that you object to the settlement in *In re Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation*, Case No. 5:10-md- 02188-RMW. Be sure to include your name, address, telephone number, the serial number of your iPhone 4, your signature, and the reasons you object to the settlement. The objection and any supporting papers must be mailed to and actually received by all of the following three addressees no later than June 15, 2012[.]”


As an initial matter, I object to these procedures to object. I object to the requirement of “mailing” to the extent that means US mail. Moreover, one cannot control the US mail system sufficiently to ensure that the objection is delivered and received by June 15, 2012.

I object that the settlement is not fair, adequate and reasonable. The requirements to make a cash claim are ridiculous. This case is about a defective antenna on an iPhone. If you owned a defective iPhone, you should be eligible for the cash compensation. It is unfair to require class members to jump through so many hoops simply to get \$15. All the claims provisions do is drive down the amount of legitimate claims and limit what Apple will have to pay. The non-cash relief (the "bumper") cannot even be considered part of this settlement, Apple has already been giving out free bumpers and will continue to do so whether this Court approves the settlement or not. So iPhone 4 customers can continue to request a bumper, just like before.

Against the utterly inadequate relief and burdensome claims procedures which will make it so Apple pays next to nothing in claims and just continues its "free bumper" program as before, class counsel seeks an award of \$5.9 million, which I object to as grossly excessive. It is excessive as a percentage of the recovery the class will receive, and based on a lodestar.

The settlement should not be approved and in any event attorneys' fees should not be approved.

Sincerely,



Bert Chapa

cc: Rick Nelson
Class Member Relations
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd, LLP
655 West Broadway, Ste. 1900
San Diego, CA 92101

Penelope A. Prevolos
Morrison & Foerster, LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482

To: Rick Nelson
Class Member Relations
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101

From: Brittany Davis
82 Cypress Point Drive
Charles Town, WV 25414

Date: 29 May 2012

Re: Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation, Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW

This letter serves as notice that I object to the Apple iPhone4 settlement. I have experienced great frustration from dropped calls because the signal attenuates. As a result I have had to use the cell phone of family members and friends. This problem is greater than a \$15 payoff.

My iPhone serial number is 67039ZPPA4S.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Brittany Davis", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Brittany Davis

240.481.3831.

Charles L. Farnum

5 April 2012

414 Rue Des Yours

Mary Esther, FL 32569-2342

To Whom It May Concern,

I object to the settlement in re Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation, Case No. 5:10-md-021888-RMW. I do not agree with the current settlement. I object for said reasons, I have had a lot of problems with the iPhone 4 that went unsolved. I had to go back to the store several times which resulted from time off from work and travel. Now they want me to settle for a \$15.00 payment. iPhone serial no. 870288R8A4S. Charles L. Farnum. 414 Rue Des Tours, Mary Esther, FL 32569-2342, (850) 218-6092

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles L. Farnum', written in a cursive style.

Charles L. Farnum.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

In re Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation

NO. 5:10-md-02188-RMW

OBJECTION TO SETTLEMENT

To The Honorable District Judge:

I object to the proposed Settlement and the request for attorneys' fees. As my declaration below shows, I am a member of the settlement class.

The settlement is not fair because I and many other class members lose our claims but do not receive any compensation in exchange.

Under the settlement everyone in the class releases their claims against Apple if they do not object or exclude themselves. The class is defined as:

All United States residents who are or were the original owners of an iPhone 4 as of February 17, 2012. The Settlement Class excludes Apple; any entity in which Apple has a controlling interest; Apple's directors, officers, and employees; and Apple's legal representatives, successors, and assigns.

But to receive the \$15 payment:

Settlement Class Members shall also declare in the Claim Form that they: (a) experienced antenna or reception issues with their iPhone 4; (b) completed the troubleshooting steps on <http://www.apple.com/support/iphone/assistant/calls/>; (c) could not have returned their iPhone 4 without incurring any costs; and (d) were unwilling to use a case or free bumper for their iPhone 4.

I do not meet that claim requirement. So the settlement will release my claims against Apple but provide me with no compensation. That is not fair.


Furthermore, the wording of these requirements can easily confuse otherwise eligible class members, leading them to falsely conclude that they are not class members.

I also object to Plaintiffs' counsel's request for \$5.9 million in attorneys' fees. These attorneys have not provided a benefit to me or the many class members like me who lose our rights but get no compensation. Thus, they should not receive any attorneys' fees.

DECLARATION:

1. My name is Burke Fort. I am capable of making this Declaration. The facts stated in this Declaration are within my personal knowledge and are true and correct.
2. I am a United States resident who is the original owner of an iPhone 4 as of February 17, 2012.
3. My iPhone 4's serial number is C8QGM0BDDDP8.
4. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 11, 2012 in Austin, Texas.



Burke O'Hara Fort

Address: 3206 Gilbert Street, Austin, Texas 78703


Phone: 512-479-6159

I mailed by first class mail a copy of the above and foregoing document to the following on June 11, 2012:

Clerk of the Court
United States District Court for
the Northern District of
California
San Jose Division
280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Rick Nelson
Class Member Relations
Robbins Geller Rudman &
Dowd LLP
655 West Broadway, Suite
1900
San Diego, CA 92101

Penelope A. Prevolos
Morrison & Foerster LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482



Burke O'Hara Fort

Michael Karlesky
80 Woodruff Ave, Apt. 6G
Brooklyn, NY 11226-1271

T (616) 334-0169

iPhone Serial #: 81035BV6A4T

May 22, 2012

Clerk of the Court
United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
San Jose Division
280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113

In re: Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation, Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW

To whom it may concern:

Per the notice I received via e-mail, I am a member of the Apple iPhone 4 Settlement. I object to the settlement and ask that the court reject it in its entirety.

Any signal reception "harm" done in relation to the iPhone 4's antenna design has been greatly exaggerated. In my evaluation, this class action is opportunistic rather than realistic.

Yes, I have seen my signal strength drop when I have touched the area of the iPhone 4's antenna in question. However, I have never experienced dropped calls or any noticeable degradation in wireless performance due to it.

As an engineer, I can attest to the simple fact that tradeoffs are always necessary in any product design. Apple's chosen tradeoffs seem to balance out overall performance quite nicely. On the whole, the iPhone 4's reception is excellent. Further, all cellular handsets necessarily experience reception attenuation due to the placement of the human hand upon the device. This is a simple reality of electromagnetic radiation in wireless communication devices and has been thoroughly documented among other mobile phones though not necessarily widely highlighted in press coverage of this issue.


Apple's only transgression in the design of the iPhone 4 antenna was to unwittingly provide a physical demarcation point on the device at which the human hand most readily causes signal attenuation. Undue media attention fomented outrage.

Briefly, I object to the settlement for these reasons:

1. The iPhone 4's reception performance is excellent. In fact, in my experience, it is much superior to earlier iPhone designs I have personally owned. That is, upon switching to the iPhone 4 from earlier models, I *gained* reception where it was previously unavailable to me.
2. All cellular handsets experience attenuation due to the effect of the human hand interacting with the space surrounding handsets' antennas. This is physics. Many handset manuals recommend locations on the handset to avoid touching for improved reception.
3. Any harm done due to the iPhone 4's antenna design is trivial if, in fact, at all real to begin with.
4. I do not believe Apple's choice to provide their bumpers to iPhone 4 customers is an admission of culpability. I'm confident that Apple's move to do so was merely a goodwill attempt to placate unfounded outrage.

I am not a lawyer. If I am not mistaken, the spirit of class action suits is to provide legal recourse to a large group otherwise unable to seek restitution. Those who own the iPhone 4 have the means to pursue redress directly with Apple or any number of consumer advocacy groups if they believe they have truly been harmed by Apple's design choices. In short, this class action seems to be unnecessary legal angling based on sentiment rather than evidence.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Karlesky', written in a cursive style.

Michael Karlesky

Jordan D. Maglich
2225 Soho Bay Ct
Tampa, FL 33606
813-347-5100 (Work)

March 29, 2012

Via United States Mail

The Honorable Judge Ronald M. Whyte
c/o Clerk of the Court
United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
San Jose Division
280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: *In re Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation*,
Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW

Judge Whyte,

Please accept this correspondence as my objection to the proposed settlement in the above-captioned case (the “**Settlement**”). I am objecting on the grounds that the Settlement (1) is neither fair, reasonable, nor accurate; (2) is the result of frivolous and unnecessary litigation; and (3) provides for an award of attorneys’ fees and expenses that are wholly undeserved and “shock the conscience.” For these reasons, I request that you reject the Settlement.

As both an attorney in private practice and a shareholder of Apple, it is distressing to witness the continued and wanton abuse of our legal system in the so-called “class action sweepstakes”. While taking the appearance of determined advocates seeking to rectify wrongs on behalf of aggrieved clients, the whole process is nothing more than a first-to-file contest whose sole goal is to line the pockets of those so-called advocates at the expense of company shareholders, while returning a pittance, if anything, to those individuals allegedly wronged in the first place.

The relief contained in the settlement is far from reasonable, and warrants the rejection of the Settlement. Indeed, the gap between the amount of proposed relief for “victims” and the award of attorneys’ fees is grounds alone to reject the Settlement. Indeed, to quote the Ninth Circuit’s recent opinion in *In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liability Litigation*¹, “the disparity between the value of the class recovery and class counsel’s compensation raises at least an

¹ District Case No. 2:07-ml-01822-DSF-E. A copy of the opinion is available at <http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2011/08/19/09-56683.pdf>

The Honorable Judge Ronald M. Whyte

Page 2


March 29, 2012

inference of unfairness.” Additionally, Apple has already taken actions to alleviate any concerns of potentially unsatisfied customers that make this Settlement entirely unnecessary.

While seeking to return \$15 to each Claimant who completes the claims process and whose claim is approved, the attorneys in this case seek an award of nearly \$6 million for their efforts. I have reviewed the docket in this matter, and am amazed at the contrast between the large amount of the award and the lack of nearly any substantive filings by the attorneys seeking this award. A large portion of the docket consists of attorney information for each putative plaintiff. Moreover, out of forty-eight docket entries, a near-majority consists of stipulations and orders continuing the case management conference from February 25, 2011, when it was originally scheduled, until the conference was removed from the calendar in late-October, 2011. The only substantive motion, besides the memorandum seeking the approval of the settlement, is a 54-page class action complaint. Thus, the attorneys essentially seek a separate award of nearly \$6 million for the filing of a 54-page complaint and their efforts to postpone the case management conference. These actions serve no purpose other than the thinly-veiled attempt to line the pockets of class-action attorneys at the expense of both the target company and the judicial system.

For the aforementioned reasons, I respectfully request that you reject the proposed settlement in the above-captioned case.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jordan D. Maglich". The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive, with a large initial "J" and "M".

Jordan D. Maglich, Esq.

cc: Rick Nelson
Class Member Relations
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101

Penelope A. Prevolos
Morrison & Foerster LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482

COURT	CLASS COUNSEL	DEFENSE COUNSEL
Clerk of the Court United States District Court for the Northern District of California San Jose Division 280 South 1st Street San Jose, CA 95113	Rick Nelson Class Member Relations Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101	Penelope A. Preovolos Morrison & Foerster LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105-2482

My iPhone 4 Serial Number: C38F4Q19DDP9 / Model:MC678LL

April 21, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing to inform you that I wish to object to the settlement with Apple regarding Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW, iPhone 4 Products Liability. I have followed the recommendations by Apple to resolve the signal issue without success. In addition, I had to purchase a network signal extender to be able to use the iPhone 4 within my home. This action was not necessary with the previous versions of the iPhone that we owned using the same network. If I knew the iPhone 4 signal was going to be an issue, I would have avoided this version of the iPhone. There are significant design flaws with the iPhone 4 regarding the external antenna as evident when the phone is held and the signal immediately decreases resulting in lost calls and interrupted data reception.

My issue with the settlement is that \$15 does nothing to resolve or mitigate the signal quality attenuation when users handle the phone and that Apple engaged in misrepresentations regarding the phone. I believe that a replacement ~~iPhone 4S~~ iPhone 4S would be appropriate since the antenna issue appears to have been resolved in this revised model of the iPhone 4. I would be willing to exchange my existing iPhone 4 for an iPhone 4S at a local Apple store. Alternatively, I believe that all iPhone 4 owners should be provided the \$500 settlement to allow them to replace their iPhone 4 with another more functional phone if a replacement is not offered. This offer appears to have been given to the original plaintiffs.

I will provide my objections to all parties indicated above and await a response. If the responsible party does not agree upon my objection and settlement, I wish to reserve the option to exclude myself from the class action settlement against Apple.

Kind Regards,

Gregg Salomon
23541 Lipari
Laguna Hills, CA 92653
415-828-8646
greggsalomon@yahoo.com



RECEIVED

APR 26 2012

Penelope A. Preovolos

Wesley Sullivant
3316 Fairlane Ave
Paducah, KY 42001
270-564-1423
Serial #: DNQGLGMRDPON

I purchased the Apple iPhone 4 from AT&T believing that it was THE phone to have. The iPhone 4 was advertised as the latest and greatest phone available to own in the market. Perfect signal, most apps, face time and all kinds of perks only available with the iPhone. But this was hugely disappointing due to the disgustingly poor antenna reception. The signal and reception cuts in and out so horribly you cannot do any of the great things you should be able to. The bare basics of any phone is to call and communicate with people. And when you can't place a call, it frustratingly becomes just a very expensive paper weight. Calls get dropped because you lose service and cant get a decent signal due to the poor antenna. Text messages refuse to send. I not only object to the settlement but am also outraged. To offer a tiny settlement of \$15 is an insult. This settlement is offered only to keep the voices and opinions of the consumers quietly at bay. The voice needs to be heard of the little people that made Apple the company it is today and there are plenty of us who are unhappy with the service. Every person who bought an iPhone put faith and trust that it was the best. We have used the phone and it was not even close to what was advertised. All of the hardships of being out of contact with family, friends and loved ones is an unacceptable burden put on the consumer. Many of us, like myself, cannot afford a different phone and are reluctantly stuck with this one since it cost anywhere from two-hundred dollars to three-hundred dollars out of pocket. Not to mention the data plans required to even use the phones, which the settlement would not cover. The bad quality makes myself question ever purchasing another Apple product. The court should not approve the settlement.

Wesley Sullivant