

3540 Valley Circle
Birmingham, AL 35243
November 17, 2007
Home: xxx xxx xxxx
Bus: xxx xxx xxxx
kennethakuhn@xxxxx.com

Clerk of the Court
United States Courthouse
Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse
50 Walnut Street
Room 4015
Newark, N.J. 07101

In Re: Schering-Plough Corporation Shareholders Derivative Litigation
Master Derivative Docket No. 01-1412 (KSH)

Dear Sir;

I object to the Settlement and I object to the plaintiffs' counsel's request for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses. I currently own 200 shares of Schering-Plough common stock that were purchased on Oct. 15, 1999 (100) and Jan. 4, 2000 (100). My objections are as follows:

1. All of the matters outlined in the Settlement of Derivative Claims document on pages 2 through 5 are normal and typical issues routinely resolved by shareholders via shareholder resolutions at shareholder meetings. That is the proper venue. The Court has no jurisdiction in these matters as shareholder vote determines the course of action. The board of directors, not the Court, is responsible for implementing shareholder interests in corporate governance.
2. It is improper for the Court to usurp shareholder authority and rights. The Court by accepting a minority shareholder suit has trespassed the rights of the majority shareholders thus damaging their rights. Such a Settlement is not in the interests of either Schering-Plough or its shareholders. My rights as a shareholder have been violated as changes in governance are imposed without my vote.
3. No evidence has been shown indicating that Schering-Plough, its board of directors, or anyone in the company have denied shareholders their rights to oversee corporate governance. Thus, there is no basis for a lawsuit.
4. The only reason that a settlement exists is because of the threat of unending distraction and legal expense – no different than settlements paid to the Mafioso over the years. In this case the scales of justice are biased heavily in favor of the plaintiffs' counsel. The Court has seriously failed in its obligation and

responsibility to insure balance between defendant and plaintiff rights and should not commit further error by accepting a Settlement based on imbalance.

5. That a matter of this simplicity has existed in the Court for so many years is proof of incompetence by the Court and the plaintiffs' counsel (or could instead it be proof of the corruption that exists in U.S. courts using frivolous lawsuits to run up exorbitant legal fees with gratuities for the various participants including the Court?). Any competent Court would be well aware of objections 1 and 2 and would have dismissed the case immediately. No competent counsel would have filed such a suit. The Court exists as a remedy when there are no other remedies. It is wrong to use the Court as a first remedy when in this case there are other standard remedies available to the plaintiff. The plaintiff could have filed shareholder resolutions addressing the various issues in the Settlement and all shareholders would have then had the right to vote on and make the resolutions binding. The cost of this would have been a miniscule fraction of the compensation sought by plaintiff's counsel. If the majority shareholder vote was against a resolution then that matter is settled and the plaintiff has to accept that. In either case the Court is not needed or desired.
6. The monetary amount sought by plaintiffs' counsel is excessive considering that counsel should have been competent to advise plaintiff of the proper venue for settling such matters without unnecessary legal expense to any party. The proposed changes to corporate governance did not require legal skills to produce thus legal fees should not be paid.

The Court should dismiss the Settlement and the Case. The matter should be closed. The majority shareholders should be allowed to act according to their interests without interference from the Court.

Based on objections 1 through 6 discussed above the correct amount to award for attorneys' fees and expenses is zero. Further, the plaintiffs' counsel should be fined severely for filing a frivolous lawsuit and serve not less than thirty days in jail for contempt. Their actions are a disgrace to law and an insult to the majority shareholders.

Finally, it is highly offensive that I received this notice on Nov. 14, 2007 and am informed that delivery of any objection must take place no later than Nov. 28. This is a conspiracy for no objections. The Court should be very ashamed. It affirms my comment about corruption in objection 5.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth A. Kuhn

Copies of this have been sent to: each Plaintiff's Counsel, and the Defense Counsel at the addresses specified in the Settlement notice.