

Olsen, Wendy

From: ATS2495@aol.com
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2005 10:10 AM
To: Olsen, Wendy; blbg@blbglaw.com; worldcominfo@gardencitygroup.com; info@worldcomlitigation.com
Subject: Worldcom Settlements



tmp.htm

I have received notices in the mail concerning the subject matter. I am a claimant and have previously filed my Claim. I understand that Judge Cote has a preliminary hearing today, and another hearing on Sept 9th concerning the settlement allocations. Since I do not know how to reach Judge Cote directly, I would hope that in some way you can pass on this content to the Judge. I was a shareholder in Worldcom stock having invested my hard earned money in what was thought to be a good investment. Outright thieves and criminals took part in this charade. I am not rich and not represented by counsel as are the wealthy involved in this matter. It is my understanding based on what I read at this point that I will receive peanuts, or approximately \$.56 per share for my losses. In my case, I lost \$20,000, I will receive about \$280.00. I guess this just re-enforces the fact that the powerful control. The people who could least afford it and were robbed will get precious little, but corporations, bondholders and lawyers will build on there great wealth. It is shameful, unjust and totally absurd. Maybe there is yet a way to undue this if shareholders can band together to let there voices be heard.
S. Kaiser

Olsen, Wendy

From: Stof56@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2005 5:28 PM
To: Olsen, Wendy
Subject: Honorable Denise Cote's 6/14/05 Order re. Worldcom, Inc litigation.



tmp.htm

Dear Judge Cote:

With all due respect, I would appreciate clarification re. how you could possibly justify the issue of equitableness that was involved in reaching your decision to develop a new deadline, after the fact as of June 14, in the Worldcom case, to extend the time for submission of proofs of claim until August 26.

We all go through life faced with various deadlines imposed by parents, by schools, by governmental jurisdictions, and the like, some of which carry substantial penalties, and/or can result in very real losses being incurred, if they are not met. For example, this very morning, there was a Federal case, mentioned in the media, involving a man serving a life sentence being denied a possible re-trial because he waited too long, and thereby missed his opportunity to file an appeal. Anyway, what's done is done, and I fully realize you have been given authority which enables you to reach any decision you please.

Nonetheless, it is patently unfair for all those who followed instructions, (to unknown degrees of inconvenience), to meet the March 4 deadline, only to now learn that many others, who in the interim became aware of the magnitude of the settlement, will have a second opportunity to participate. We have already suffered huge losses, and now you see fit to penalize even further those who followed the original instructions by taking action which will obviously reduce the potential recovery to be realized.

It is definitely not a 'just' decision; what were you thinking?

Most respectfully,

S.R.Stofle
P.O.Box 786
Carmel-by-the-Sea, CA 93921