

EXHIBIT C

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

In re:

Apple iPhone 3G Products Litigation

MDL Docket No.

**SEPARATE STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY ORAL ARGUMENT SHOULD
BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR TRANSFER AND
CONSOLIDATION OF RELATED APPLE IPHONE 3G PRODUCTS
LITIGATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

PENELOPE A. PREVOLOS
ANDREW D. MUHLBACH
HEATHER A. MOSER
MORRISON & FOERSTER^{LLP}
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: (415) 268-7000

JAMIE A. LEVITT
MORRISON & FOERSTER^{LLP}
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-0185
Telephone: (212) 468-8000

DON G. RUSHING
MORRISON & FOERSTER^{LLP}
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5100

JEFFREY J. GREENBAUM
SILLS CUMMIS & GROSS P.C.
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Telephone: (973) 643-7000

JANET T. MUNN
FELDMAN GALE, P.A.
One Biscayne Tower, 30th Floor
2 South Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33131-4332
Telephone: (305) 397-0798

Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.

Pursuant to Rule 16.1(b) of the Rules of Procedure for the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (the "Panel"), defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple") submits this Separate Statement of Reasons Why Oral Argument Should Be Heard in further support of its concurrently filed Motion for Transfer and Consolidation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1407.

There are numerous reasons why oral argument should be heard on Apple's pending motion to transfer. Oral argument is necessary to address any possible opposition raised regarding whether the objectives of the transfer statute are sufficiently served to justify transfer. Moreover, the parties will be able to respond to any inquiries the Panel might have about the specific advantages posed by transfer to the Northern District of California. Finally, oral argument would serve the purposes of efficiency and judicial economy. There are twelve separate actions pending in five different federal district courts. The parties are collectively represented by nineteen (19) law firms. Having counsel present before the Panel to respond to any questions the Panel may have that were not addressed by the parties' briefs would ensure that the Panel has complete information regarding the facts and the parties' positions as to the propriety of transfer or the propriety of the proposed transferee district.

For the foregoing reasons, Apple respectfully requests that the Panel grant oral argument on its motion for an order transferring and consolidating the related Apple iPhone 3G Products Litigation to the Northern District of California.

Dated: March 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

PENELOPE A. PREVOLOS
ANDREW D. MUHLBACH
HEATHER A. MOSER
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 268-7000
Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

JAMIE LEVITT
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-0185
Telephone: (212) 468-8000

DON G. RUSHING
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5100

JEFFREY J. GREENBAUM
SILLS CUMMIS & GROSS P.C.
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, NJ 07102
Telephone: (973) 643-7000

JANET T. MUNN
FELDMAN GALE, P.A.
One Biscayne Tower, 30th Floor
2 South Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33131-4332
Telephone: (305) 397-0798

By: 
Penelope A. Prevolos

Attorneys for Defendant
APPLE INC.