STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS (FOR MERCHANTS WHO DO NOT OPT OUT)

	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT STERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
In re FEE ANT	PAYMENT CARD INTERCHANGE AND MERCHANT DISCOUNT FITRUST LITIGATION	:	No. 05-MD-01720 (JG) (JO)
	ement of Objections	A	
Mer	a member of the plaintiff class in the case chant Discount Antitrust Litigation. I am a	class me	ember because I operate [business name
and i	I have accepted Visa and/or MasterCard from	Om [approxi	mate date]
until	["present," or approximate date]		·
I obj	ect to the settlement in this lawsuit. My re	asons for	objecting are:
 2. 	The proposed settlement does not addre interchange rates for the banks, the subj settlement actually validates that practic illegally fix fees for the banks that merc pay. Our portion of the compensatory r interchange, and given that Visa and Ma can recoup the settlement amount by rai Instead of addressing the core claims in	ect of the ee, enabling hants and elief amounts asterCard sing inter	e core claims in the case. The proposed ng Visa and MasterCard to continue to d their customers have no choice but to punts to only a fraction of what we pay in can continue to fix interchange, they rehange rates in the future.
2.	merchants with a limited ability to surch transactions that is of no value to us.		
3.	OK and TX] We operate stores in the state(s) of		tions. Because of this law, the principal
4.	[If merchant accepts American Express] We a settlement limits our ability to surcharge because under its terms we can only sur	e Visa and charge V ctions. I with Am avoid this	d MasterCard credit card transactions is a and MasterCard transactions if we However, we cannot surcharge American erican Express. Since we cannot limitation, this is another reason why

- 5. The proposed settlement includes unacceptable obligations, such as requiring us to disclose to customers at the point of sale that we are imposing the surcharge, when in fact the only reason we would charge such fees is the onerous fees set by Visa and MasterCard.
- 6. The release is overly broad. It purports to cover all Visa and MasterCard rules and conduct that were in place upon preliminary approval, and all future rules and future conduct that are substantially similar to rules and conduct in place at preliminary approval.
- 7. Based on the outcome of the settlement, we do not believe the lawyers who negotiated it represented our best interests.
- 8. We did not opt out to assert past damages claims because prosecuting such claims against large companies like Visa and MasterCard is not a realistic option for a merchant of our size. That is especially true given that we are not permitted to opt out of other provisions of the settlement which are, overall, far more important than the small amount of dollars that individual merchants might receive in this case. In addition, the settlement does not allow us to opt out to pursue claims for ongoing or future damages. Our decision not to opt out should not be construed as agreement that the compensatory damages amount accurately reflects our losses because it is a small fraction of what we paid in interchange for Visa and MasterCard transactions. Nor should it be construed as acceptance of the release set forth in the settlement. We consider the release overbroad and object to its scope.

My personal information is:

Trif personal information is:						
Name [first, middle, last]:						
Address:						
Phone No.:						
[If your own lawyer is representing you with respect to the settlement] The contact information for my lawyer is:						
Dated:						
Signed:						
Printed name:						
Merchant name:						
Address:						