3540 Valley Circle
Birmingham, AL 35243
June 5, 2010
XXX XXX XXXX

Clerk of the Court
Somerset County Courthouse
20 North Bridge Street
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1262

reference: IN RE MERCK & CO. INC. SHAREHOLDER LITIGATION
Consolidated Docket No. HNT-C-14008-09

Dear Sir;

I have owned for many years and continue to own 1000 shares of stock in Merck. I object to the Plaintiffs' lawyers being paid anything in regard to the above litigation because they have provided no value to shareholders and in fact what they have done is worse than nothing which brings me to my second objection. I also object because the entire case has been unfair to Merck and its shareholders because the distraction and expense of this case damages the value of Merck. No shareholder benefits from a distraction to their investment. The plaintiffs' lawyers owe Merck instead.

I inquired to James S. Notis concerning share ownership of lead Plaintiffs, Golombuski and Kahn, and any type of compensation they might receive concerning this case. He informed me of the share amounts and that neither will receive any compensation, direct, indirect, or private. Well good, that is as it should be. But then why would Golombuski who owns only 200 shares of Merck be so concerned or even be cognizant of any alleged unfairness of the deal as to rush to file suit within hours of the merger announcement, particularly if there is to be no effect in the value of Merck stock and in the fact that no compensation is to be received for the trouble? It is just not credible. The case for Kahn is a bit more credible as he owns 12,500 shares but the same question still applies. Why file a lawsuit if there is to be no benefit to anyone except lawyers on each side? Both lead Plaintiffs have a record of filing similar suits so it makes me wonder that something is going on that has not been disclosed – interesting – that is what this case is all about. Clearly there is some ulterior motive. I do not believe the suit was filed on behalf of shareholders but rather for the benefit of some entity unknown to me.

I examined in detail the revisions in the Notice concerning additional disclosure brought about by this litigation. The valuations of Schering-Plough by J.P. Morgan are only opinions of the analyst. True value is only determined in the market place. Although the complaint was that the deal was unfair to Merck shareholders, both the original and

revised J.P. Morgan analysis concerning Remicade both show an increase (again, analyst's opinion) in value to Merck as a result of the merger. The only question is how much of an increase – a question only the market can ultimately answer. What is unfair about that?

As for the revised disclosure concerning fees paid to J.P. Morgan, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley it is obvious that the original text was prepared prior to final negotiations to set the fees. I see no evidence that Merck or Schering-Plough attempted to hide any detail. Disclosure of actual fees and actions are routinely put in stockholder reports without any lawsuit being necessary. The additional disclosure concerning arbitration with Centocor over Remicade distribution only says that there may or may not be an issue. Nothing is new. It is well known that all mergers have issues that may require additional efforts to resolve. Only the naive expect a merger to be perfectly clean.

The Defendants acknowledgement that the litigation was the sole factor in making additional disclosures is only a cover for the fact that this case was really about extortion via court for fees for the Plaintiffs' lawyers – either the Defendants settle or be faced with open-ended distraction and expense concerning additional discovery and expanded scope of the lawsuit.

So who was harmed in any way by Merck? No one. Did any shareholder benefit from the litigation? No. Although there was some additional text regarding the merger, there was no change to the terms or price of the deal. The deal went through as it was going to anyway. The allegation of unfairness to Merck shareholders was only an ulterior motive to open the door to discovery to fish for a basis after the fact.

Money, or payment, is an exchange of value. If there is no value then there should be no payment. The bottom line is that the Plaintiffs' lawyers provided no service or value to shareholders. Thus, the proper amount for them to be paid is zero.

This case never should have been admitted by the Court. The Court was 100 percent wrong to allow a non-specific, open-ended suit. The Court was 100 percent wrong to consolidate the suit into class action status without survey of all shareholders to determine if there was sufficient interest. It is absurd to think that two small shareholders represent the interests of thousands. My experience is that the courts and the entire practice of law in the United States are a hopelessly corrupt Mafioso that lives only on extortion payments. No useful value.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth A. Kuhn

cc: Gardy & Notis LLP; Lite Depalma Greenburg, LLC; Day Pitney LLP; Lowenstein Sandler PC