

Adam M. Apton, Esq.
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-cv-05258-WJM-AME

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

CLASS ACTION

Motion Day: October 16, 2023

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that under Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, on October 16, 2023, in Courtroom 4B of this Court located at 50 Walnut Street, Newark, New Jersey 07101, Plaintiffs will move for an Order (i) granting preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement, (ii) certifying a class for settlement purposes, (iii) approving the proposed plan of allocation and notices

to be disseminated to potential class members, and (iv) setting a date for a hearing to determine *inter alia* whether the settlement should be finally approved and the above-captioned action dismissed with prejudice.

This motion is based upon this notice of motion and brief, declarations, and exhibits filed in support hereof.

Plaintiffs also submit a proposed order granting the motion.

Dated: September 22, 2023

LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP

s/ Adam M. Apton
Adam M. Apton, Esq.
Devyn R. Glass
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171
aapton@zlk.com
dglass@zlk.com

-and-

POMERANTZ LLP

Jeremy A. Lieberman (*pro hac vice*)
Brenda Szydlo (*pro hac vice*)
Thomas H. Przybylowski
Dean P. Ferrogari (*pro hac vice*)
600 Third Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 661-1100
Facsimile: (917) 463-1044
jalieberman@pomlaw.com
bszydlo@pomlaw.com
tprzybylowski@pomlaw.com

dferrogari@pomlaw.com

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

-and-

SCHALL LAW FIRM

Brian Schall
2049 Century Park East, Ste. 2460
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 301-3335
Facsimile: (213) 519-5876
brian@schallfirm.com

*Additional Counsel to Lead Plaintiff
Joshua Mailey*

-and-

**BRONSTEIN, GEWIRTZ &
GROSSMAN, LLC**

Peretz Bronstein
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4600
New York, New York 10165
Telephone: (212) 697-6484
Facsimile: (212) 697-7296
peretz@bgandg.com

*Additional Counsel to Plaintiff
Alejandro Pieroni*

Adam M. Apton, Esq.
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-cv-05258-WJM-AME

**PLAINTIFFS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT
OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS .	3
	A. Plaintiffs’ Claims and Allegations	3
	B. Procedural History.....	4
III.	THE PROPOSED TERMS OF SETTLEMENT.....	6
	A. The Class Definition.....	6
	B. Monetary Consideration and Plan of Allocation.....	6
	C. Release Provisions.....	7
IV.	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT IS APPROPRIATE	7
	A. The Settlement Approval Process	7
	B. The Proposed Settlement Meets the Requirements for Preliminary Approval under Rule 23(e)(2).....	9
V.	PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT UNDER RULE 23 IS APPROPRIATE	19
	A. The Class Members Are So Numerous that Joinder Is Impracticable.	20
	B. Common Questions of Law or Fact Exist	21
	C. Plaintiffs’ Claims are Typical of Those of the Class	22
	D. Plaintiffs Are Adequate Representatives of the Class	22
	E. The Requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) Are Also Satisfied	23
VI.	THE PROPOSED NATURE AND METHOD OF CLASS NOTICE ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY SOUND AND APPROPRIATE.....	25
VII.	PROPOSED SCHEDULE	26
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alves v. Main,
 No. CIV.A. 01-789 DMC, 2012 WL 6043272 (D.N.J. Dec. 4, 2012) 10, 14

In re Am. Bank Note Holographics, Inc. Sec. Litig.,
 127 F. Supp. 2d 418 (S.D.N.Y. 2001)12

Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor,
 521 U.S. 591 (1997) 20, 22, 23

Blum v. Stenson,
 465 U.S. 886 (1984).....16

In re Cendant Corp. Litig.,
 264 F.3d 201 (3d Cir. 2001)8

Chavarria v. N.Y. Airport Serv., LLC,
 875 F. Supp. 2d 164 (E.D.N.Y. 2012)19

In re Community Bank of Northern Virginia,
 418 F.3d 277 (3d Cir. 2005)23

Consol. Rail Corp. v. Town of Hyde Park,
 47 F.3d 473 (2d Cir. 1995)20

In re Datatec Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.,
 No. 04-CV-525 (GEB), 2007 WL 4225828 (D.N.J. Nov. 28, 2007)18

In re DVI Inc. Sec. Litig.,
 249 F.R.D. 196 (E.D. Pa. 2008).....21

In re Gen. Instrument Sec. Litig.,
 209 F. Supp. 2d 423 (E.D. Pa. 2001).....19

In re Gen. Motors Corp. Pick-Up Truck Fuel Tank Prod. Liab. Litig.,
 55 F.3d 768 (3d Cir. 1995)20

Gen. Tel. Co. of Southwest v. Falcon,
 457 U.S. 147 (1982).....22

Hefler v. Wells Fargo & Co.,
 No. 16-cv-05479-JST, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 150292 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 4,
 2018)17

In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.,
 297 F.R.D. 136 (D.N.J. 2013).....16

Louisiana Mun. Police Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Sealed Air Corp.,
 No. 03- CV-4372 (DMC), 2009 WL 4730185 (D.N.J. 2009).....16

In re Metlife Demutualization Litig.,
 689 F. Supp. 2d 297 (E.D.N.Y. 2010)12

Milliron v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.,
 No. 08-4149, 2009 WL 3345762 (D.N.J. Sept. 14, 2009).....16

Missouri v. Jenkins,
 491 U.S. 274 (1989).....16

Myers v. Hertz Corp.,
 624 F.3d 537 (2d Cir. 2010)20

In re Nat'l Football League Players Concussion Injury Litig.,
 821 F.3d 410 (3d Cir. 2016)8

In re Ocean Power Techs., Inc.,
 No. 3:14-CV-3799, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158222 (D.N.J. Nov. 15, 2016)...19

In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.,
 962 F. Supp. 450 (D.N.J. 1997)11

Riedel v. Acqua Ancien Bath New York LLC,
 2016 WL 3144375 (S.D.N.Y May 19, 2016)11

In re Schering-Plough Corp. ENHANCE ERISA Litig.,
 No. 08-1432 (DMC) (JAD), 2012 WL 1964451 (D.N.J. May 31, 2012)16

In re Schering-Plough Corp. Sec. Litig.,
 No. 01 Civ. 0829, 2009 WL 5218066 (D.N.J. Dec. 31, 2009)..... 13, 26

Sullivan v. DB Invs., Inc.,
 667 F.3d 273 (3d Cir. 2011)19

In re Veeco Instruments Inc. Sec. Litig.,
No. 05 MDL 0165, 2007 WL 4115809 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2007).....18

In re ViroPharma Inc. Sec. Litig.,
No. 12-2714, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8626 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 25, 2016)24

In re WorldCom, Inc. Sec. Litig.,
388 F. Supp. 2d 319 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)18

Statutes

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2).....21

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)(D)24

FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e).....8, 20

Other Authorities

2 W. Rubenstein, Newberg on Class Actions (5th ed. 2012)21

Manual for Complex Litigation, Third (West ed. 1995) 10, 25

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs seek preliminary approval from the Court to settle this class action securities fraud lawsuit.¹ The Settlement, embodied in the Stipulation filed contemporaneously herewith, provides a cash recovery of \$3,000,000 to the Class which is a favorable outcome in an otherwise unfavorable situation. Simply put, although Plaintiffs faced a number of significant obstacles in terms of their theory of liability and Humanigen's current financial state, Plaintiffs were still able to secure a settlement that restores a considerable amount of compensation back to the Class. But for this Settlement, the Class would not be receiving anything to offset the damages it sustained.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, approval of settlements in class action lawsuits is completed in two stages. First, the Court must assess whether the settlement appears likely to warrant final approval and, if so, order that notice be provided to potential class members. Second, having allowed notice to proceed, the Court must hold a hearing to evaluate any objections and decide whether the settlement should be confirmed. As explained herein, Plaintiffs meet the requirements for obtaining preliminary approval and, therefore, should be permitted

¹ Unless otherwise defined, capitalized terms herein have the same meaning as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement dated September 22, 2023 (the "Stipulation") (Dkt. No. 44).

to provide notice of the Settlement to the Class.

The proposed settlement easily meets the criteria for approval at this stage of the process, largely because the history of the litigation, the risks involved, and the recovery at hand weigh heavily in favor of the conclusion that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Plaintiffs conducted an extensive investigation into Humanigen's operations and, in particular, the clinical development of its lead drug candidate, lenzilumab. Based on the results of their research, Plaintiffs prepared and filed a consolidated complaint with detailed factual allegations supporting their claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Defendants disputed the viability of Plaintiffs' allegations and, following a full-day mediation session and subsequent negotiations conducted by Mr. Jed Melnick, Esq., the parties were able to clearly evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their claims and defenses. Mr. Melnick ultimately issued a "mediator's recommendation" to settle the action for \$3,000,000, which the parties accepted and then memorialized in the Stipulation.

The cash payment of \$3,000,000 accounts for the significant legal and factual obstacles that Plaintiffs will face if the case continues. For example, Defendants were likely to challenge the allegation that any of their statements were false or materially misleading. Key to this defense is the reality that the National Institute of Health ("NIH") allowed lenziliumab to be tested as a COVID-19 treatment in its

ACTIV-5/BET-B trial. Thus, Defendants would have argued, and Plaintiffs would have needed to explain to a jury, why a prestigious institution like the NIH would have allowed patients to be treated with lenzilumab in the first place if the drug were truly dangerous to patients with COVID-19, as Plaintiffs alleged. Separate and apart from this issue, but equally if not more important, Humanigen's financial health is dire. According to its most recent filings with the SEC, Humanigen anticipates filing for bankruptcy in the near future. Thus, the proposed Settlement truly is the only avenue for damaged shareholders to receive any compensation for their losses.

Plaintiffs have carefully considered this Settlement and believe it to be in the best interests of the Class. Accordingly, they respectfully request that the Court grant preliminary approval so that the parties can proceed with providing notice and bringing this matter to a close, as discussed below in further detail.

II. SUMMARY OF LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENT

NEGOTIATIONS

A. Plaintiffs' Claims and Allegations

This action arises from alleged misrepresentations contained in Humanigen's public filings, including press releases, conference call transcripts, and SEC filings. Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants violated the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5.

In particular, Plaintiffs alleged that Humanigen and its executive officers

misrepresented the appropriateness of using lenzilumab as a treatment for COVID-19 and concealed material adverse information concerning the drawbacks of using an anti-GM-CSF (like lenzilumab) to treat patients with lung dysfunction. Plaintiffs alleged in detail how and why GM-CSF is necessary for healthy and normal lung function. Thus, as alleged, by inhibiting or blocking GM-CSF, a drug like lenzilumab in fact posed acute risks and dangers to patients with pre-existing lung dysfunction, including patients with COVID-19.

Plaintiffs alleged that they sustained damages when the truth concerning lenzilumab became publicly known by, first, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration denying Humanigen's request for Emergency Use Authorization for lenzilumab and then, second, the revelation that lenzilumab produced negative trial results in the NIH's ACTIV-5/BET-B clinical trial. Defendants have vigorously denied and continue to deny each and all of the claims asserted against them and deny that Plaintiffs or any other members of the Class were harmed or suffered any damages as a result of the conduct alleged in the action.

B. Procedural History

Plaintiffs commenced this action with the filing of the initial complaints. *See* Declaration of Adam M. Apton and Brenda Szydlo (the "Joint Decl."), ¶¶5-6. These complaints were preceded by preliminary investigations conducted by Lead Counsel at Levi & Korsinsky, LLP and Pomerantz LLP. *Id.* at ¶4. Following the appointment

of lead plaintiffs, investigation continued and ultimately culminated in the filing of the Amended Complaint. *Id.* at ¶10. Importantly, Plaintiffs’ investigation included an extensive review of Humanigen’s public statements and relevant analyst reports as well as a review of public filings with the FDA and consultations with experts on issues pertaining to market efficiency, loss causation, and damages. *Id.* at ¶¶11-14.

Plaintiffs filed the Amended Complaint on March 27, 2023. *Id.* at ¶12. In pertinent part, the Amended Complaint alleged that Defendants misrepresented the appropriateness of using lenzilumab as a treatment for COVID-19 and concealed material adverse information concerning the drawbacks of using an anti-GM-CSF (like lenzilumab) to treat patients with lung dysfunction. *Id.* at ¶15. The Amended Complaint alleged that Defendants failed to disclose the risks of using lenzilumab to treat COVID-19 patients while at the same time claiming that the drug was viable based on unpublished foreign research. *Id.* at ¶¶15, 27.

Following the filing of the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs and Defendants scheduled a mediation with Jed Melnick, Esq. *Id.* at ¶16. The parties prepared thorough mediation statements and ultimately held the mediation on May 23, 2023. *Id.* at ¶¶17-18. The mediation was unsuccessful initially but, following subsequent negotiations by and through Mr. Melnick, the parties ultimately agreed to a “mediator’s recommendation” to settle the lawsuit for \$3,000,000 and executed a term sheet tentatively agreeing to the Settlement. *Id.* at ¶¶21-22.

III. THE PROPOSED TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

A. The Class Definition

The Settlement Class is defined as all Persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Humanigen securities during the Class Period. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Defendants; (ii) the officers, directors, and affiliates of Humanigen, at all relevant times; (iii) Humanigen's employee retirement or benefit plan(s) and their participants or beneficiaries to the extent they purchased or acquired Humanigen securities through any such plan(s); (iv) any entity in which Defendants have or had controlling interest; (v) Immediate Family members of any excluded person; and (vi) the legal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns of any excluded person or entity. Stipulation, ¶1.29.

B. Monetary Consideration and Plan of Allocation

Plaintiffs are securing a total benefit for the Class of \$3,000,000 to be paid by or on behalf of Defendants. The Plan of Allocation is based on the Amended Complaint. It provides compensation to those Settlement Class Members that sustained losses in response to the decline in the price of Humanigen's securities that occurred on September 8, 2021 and July 12, 2022. All Class Members will receive the same distribution depending on the quantity and cost basis of the Humanigen securities held on these days. The Plan of Allocation will be applied uniformly to all Class Members that submit valid and timely claims. The Plan of Allocation is

described in full in the Notice. *See* Joint Decl. at ¶¶34-36; *see also* Stipulation at Exhibit A-1.

C. Release Provisions

In exchange for the monetary consideration described above, Plaintiffs are releasing Defendants and their Related Parties from all claims arising from their purchase of Humanigen securities. Specifically, the Stipulation defines the term “Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” as follows:

“Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” means any and all claims and causes of action of every nature and description, whether known or Unknown Claims, asserted or unasserted, whether arising under federal, state, statutory, regulatory, common or foreign law concerning, based on, arising out of, or in connection with : (i) the purchase or other acquisition or sale of Humanigen securities during the Class Period; and (ii) the allegations, transactions, acts, facts, matters, occurrences, disclosures, statements, filings, representations, omissions, or events that were or could have been alleged or asserted in the Litigation; and (iii) disclosures, public filings, registration statements, press releases, presentations, or other statements made by Defendants during the Class Period.

Stipulation at ¶1.25.

IV. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT IS APPROPRIATE

A. The Settlement Approval Process

Rule 23(e) provides a two-step process for approving class action settlements. First, if a proposed settlement would bind class members, then the court should evaluate the proposed settlement to determine whether giving notice to class

members would be justified. FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e)(1). Second, once notice is given, the court should only approve the proposed settlement upon a finding that it is fair, reasonable, and adequate. FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e)(2).

Under Rule 23(e)(1), notice to class members should be directed if, based upon the parties' showing, it appears likely that the court will be able to approve the settlement under Rule 23(e)(2) and certify the class for the purposes of settlement. In the context of determining whether approval is likely to occur, Rule 23(e)(2) instructs the court to consider whether: "(A) the class representatives and class counsel have adequately represented the class; (B) the proposal was negotiated at arm's length; (C) the relief provided for the class is adequate . . . ; and (D) the proposal treats class members equitably relative to each other." "An initial 'presumption of fairness for the settlement is established if the court finds that: (1) the negotiations occurred at arm's length; (2) there was sufficient discovery; (3) the proponents of the settlement are experienced in similar litigation; and (4) only a small fraction of the class objected.'" *In re Cendant Corp. Litig.*, 264 F.3d 201, 232 n. 18 (3d Cir. 2001); *see also In re Nat'l Football League Players Concussion Injury Litig.*, 821 F.3d 410, 436 (3d Cir. 2016).

B. The Proposed Settlement Meets the Requirements for Preliminary Approval under Rule 23(e)(2).

1. Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel Adequately Represented the Class.

This was a difficult case to litigate. Factually, Plaintiffs were faced with the immediate issue of obtaining evidence to substantiate their theory of liability without the benefit of discovery and the reality that any favorable documents were non-public and under the control of Defendants. To overcome this obstacle, Plaintiffs engaged in a comprehensive investigation to support their claims against Defendants. Joint Decl. at ¶¶11-14. These efforts ultimately resulted in the filing of the Amended Complaint that led to the scheduling of the mediation with Jed Melnick, Esq. *Id.* at ¶¶16-18.

The mediation process that ensued was lengthy and involved in-depth discussion and analysis of the parties' respective claims and defenses. *Id.* at ¶17. It was not immediately successful. Instead, Defendants proceeded with the filing of a motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). The motion argued that Plaintiffs failed to adequately allege falsity and scienter. *Id.* at ¶19. With the benefit of seeing Defendants' arguments and understanding that Humanigen's financial strength was deteriorating, Plaintiffs resumed settlement negotiations with Mr. Melnick. *Id.* at ¶20. These negotiations ultimately ended with Mr. Melnick's

recommendation to settle the case for \$3,000,000. *Id.* at ¶21.

Plaintiffs' efforts during the investigation and pleading stage followed by their negotiations during the mediation demonstrate that Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel adequately represented the Class. This factor weighs in favor of granting preliminary approval and directing notice under Rule 23(e).

2. The Proposal Was Negotiated at Arm's Length.

The parties reached the proposed Settlement through mediation and only by way of a "mediator's recommendation." These negotiations only took place and were finalized after Lead Counsel conducted a substantial review of the file and were able to present Plaintiffs' arguments in support of their theory of liability and damages. The history and context of these negotiations strongly supports the conclusion that the parties negotiated at arm's length. *See also* Manual for Complex Litigation, Third, § 30.42 (West 1995)) ("A presumption of fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness may attach to a class settlement reached in arm's-length negotiations between experienced, capable counsel after meaningful discovery."). This fact further supports the motion for preliminary approval and directing notice to the Class. *See, e.g., Alves v. Main*, No. CIV.A. 01-789 DMC, 2012 WL 6043272, at *22 (D.N.J. Dec. 4, 2012), *aff'd*, 559 F. App'x 151 (3d Cir. 2014) ("courts in this Circuit traditionally 'attribute significant weight to the belief of experienced counsel that settlement is in the best interest of the class.'"); *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*

Sales Practices Litig., 962 F. Supp. 450, 543 (D.N.J. 1997) *aff'd*, 148 F.3d 283 (3d Cir. 1998) (“[T]he Court credits the judgment of Plaintiffs’ Counsel, all of whom are active, respected, and accomplished in this type of litigation.”); *see also Riedel v. Acqua Ancien Bath New York LLC*, 14 Civ. 7238 (JCF), 2016 WL 3144375, at *7 (S.D.N.Y. May 19, 2016) (document exchange reflects ability of counsel to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of claims).

3. The Relief Provided for the Class Is Adequate.

Rule 23(e) identifies four factors for the court to consider when determining whether the relief provided under a proposed settlement is adequate: (i) the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal; (ii) the effectiveness of any proposed method of distributing relief to the class, including the method of processing class-member claims; (iii) the terms of any proposed award of attorney’s fees, including timing of payment; and (iv) any agreement required to be identified under Rule 23(e)(3). The proposed Settlement meets these criteria and is therefore adequate.

(a) The costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal.

A settlement is favored where “continuing litigation through trial would have required additional discovery, extensive pretrial motions addressing complex factual and legal questions and ultimately a complicated, lengthy trial.” *In re Warfarin Sodium Antitrust Litig.*, 391 F.3d 516, 536 (3d Cir. 2004). Courts have noted that “[s]ecurities fraud class actions are notably complex, lengthy, and expensive cases

to litigate.” *In re Par Pharm. Sec. Litig.*, No. 06 Civ 3226, 2013 WL 3930091, at *4 (D.N.J. July 29, 2013). As discussed below, Plaintiffs would have had to overcome numerous hurdles to achieve a litigated verdict against Defendants. Even assuming that the claims survived motions to dismiss and summary judgment, a jury trial would have required a substantial amount of factual and expert testimony. *See, e.g., In re Metlife Demutualization Litig.*, 689 F. Supp. 2d 297, 332 (E.D.N.Y. 2010) (“The proof on many disputed issues – which involve complex financial concepts – would likely have included a battle of experts, leaving the trier of fact with difficult questions to resolve.”); *In re Am. Bank Note Holographics, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 127 F. Supp. 2d 418, 426-27 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (“In such a battle, Plaintiffs’ Counsel recognize the possibility that a jury could be swayed by experts for Defendants.”). Whatever the outcome at trial, it was likely that an appeal would have been taken. All of the foregoing would have posed considerable expense to the parties, and would have delayed any potential recovery, if one was even achieved.

Plaintiffs secured a cash payment of \$3,000,000. While this result is below the median recovery for similar cases (*see* Joint Decl. at ¶26), the Settlement is nonetheless fair, reasonable, and adequate given the obstacles Plaintiffs faced (*id.* at ¶27). These risks included the following:

- Plaintiffs’ potential inability to prove that Defendants’ statements were false and/or materially misleading, given that additional published research may have ultimately supported Defendants’ decision to repurpose the drug for use in treating COVID-19. *Id.* at ¶27.

- Plaintiffs would have been forced to explain at some point in the litigation why the NIH approved the testing of lenzilumab in its ACTIV-5/BET-B trial. *Id.* at ¶28.
- Although motive is not required to establish liability, Plaintiffs decided to rely on insider sales by a group of entities affiliated with Humanigen’s Chief Scientific Officer Dale Chappell. However, only a portion of the proceeds from these sales may have actually been received by Chappell, potentially leaving Plaintiffs without a discrete individual financial benefit to point to. *Id.* at ¶29.
- Plaintiffs faced additional risks concerning class certification and, in particular, their ability to rely on the “fraud-on-the-market” presumption of reliance for the period before Humanigen traded on the NASDAQ. *Id.* at ¶30.
- Humanigen’s present financial position is dire, leaving Plaintiffs with potential collectability problems if the Settlement is not approved. *Id.* at ¶31.

These risks are, of course, in addition to the general risks inherent in all litigation, such as appeals or the unpredictability of juries. Thus, Plaintiffs believe that this is a favorable outcome for the class as it secures an immediate benefit in light of the expected difficulties in proving liability based on the discovery reviewed to date. The “fact that [defendants] could afford to pay more does not mean that [they are] obligated to pay any more than what the [] class members are entitled to under the theories of liability that existed at the time the settlement was reached.” *Warfarin*, 391 F.3d at 538; see also *In re Schering-Plough Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 01 Civ. 0829, 2009 WL 5218066, at *5 (D.N.J. Dec. 31, 2009) (“pushing for more in the face of risks and delay would not be in the interests of the class”). Given the real and

substantial risk that Plaintiffs would not prevail on the merits, the recovery at bar is fair and reasonable to the Class. *See Alves*, 2012 WL 6043272, at *21 (finding settlement approval was warranted as the recovery provides immediate benefits and “continued litigation involves considerable risk that the Plaintiffs would lose the merits of the case”).

- (b) The effectiveness of any proposed method of distributing relief to the class, including the method of processing class-member claims.

Plaintiffs retained A.B. Data, Ltd. (“A.B. Data”) to serve as the Claims Administrator. A.B. Data has been in the claims administration business for forty years. *See* Declaration of Eric Schachter dated September 21, 2023 (“Schachter Decl.”), Exhibit A. In total, it has been involved in a number of significant settlements responsible for disbursing millions of dollars to shareholder claimants. *Id.* at ¶3.

A.B. Data distributes funds in accordance with the following process. Notice is provided to potential class member by mailing notice to a company’s shareholders of record, including recipients consisting of brokers and various investment advisors as a standard operating procedure. *Id.* at ¶4. These recipients manage accounts on behalf of thousands of retail investors who then forward the notice to potential class members. *Id.* at ¶¶5-6. A.B. Data also provides notice via an electronic press release

through a service. *Id.* at ¶8.

Class members then respond to the notice by submitting completed claim forms. The Claims Administrator receives these claims forms either by mail or electronically and, once the claims deadline passes, begins to vet each claim. The Claims Administrator reviews the claims to make sure they are authorized, *i.e.*, validly submitted in accordance with the class definition, completed correctly, properly signed, and include all necessary supporting documentation. Claimants who submit deficient claims are then notified and given an opportunity to cure the deficiency. *Id.* at ¶¶9-11. Once the claims have been vetted, the Claims Administrator will calculate the *pro rata* distribution from the settlement fund and distribute the funds via check after court approval. Payees are usually given between 90 and 180 days to negotiate the checks. Payees who do not negotiate their checks in that period of time are given an additional opportunity to receive their distribution, either in the form of a new check or by wire if feasible. *Id.* at ¶13.

A.B. Data (as well as almost all securities claims administrators) routinely follows the aforementioned process. *Id.* at ¶14. A.B. Data will be able to administer the settlement fund in this case without issue.

- (c) The proposed award of attorney's fees, including timing of payment.

Lead Counsel intends to seek an award of attorneys' fees equal to or less than

one-third of the Settlement Fund. The Supreme Court has recognized that an appropriate court-awarded fee is intended to approximate what counsel would receive if they were bargaining for the services in the marketplace. *See Missouri v. Jenkins*, 491 U.S. 274, 285-86 (1989). If this were a non-representative action, the customary fee arrangement would be contingent, on a percentage basis, and in the range of 30% to 33% of the recovery. *See Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 903-04 (1984) (“In tort suits, an attorney might receive one-third of whatever amount the plaintiff recovers. In those cases, therefore, the fee is directly proportional to the recovery.”) (Brennan, J., concurring). Accordingly, the requested fee will be equal to the percentage fee awards granted in many other comparable securities class actions within the Third Circuit.²

Lead Counsel respectfully submits that at this stage of the approval proceedings, the fact that the intended fee request will be in line with Third Circuit precedent supports Plaintiffs’ request for preliminary approval. When Lead Counsel

² *See, e.g., In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.*, 297 F.R.D. 136, 155 (D.N.J. 2013) (“Courts within the Third Circuit often award fees of 25% to 33% of the recovery.”); *Louisiana Mun. Police Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Sealed Air Corp.*, No. 03- CV-4372 (DMC), 2009 WL 4730185, at *8 (D.N.J. 2009) (same); *Milliron v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, No. 08-4149, 2009 WL 3345762 (D.N.J. Sept. 14, 2009) (awarding 33% of settlement); *In re Schering-Plough Corp. ENHANCE ERISA Litig.*, No. 08-1432 (DMC) (JAD), 2012 WL 1964451, at *6-7 (D.N.J. May 31, 2012) (awarding 33.3% of settlement); *Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.*, 297 F.R.D. at 154-56 (awarding 33% of settlement).

formally moves for an award of attorneys' fees, it will submit additional evidence in support of its request.

- (d) Any agreement required to be identified under Rule 23(e)(3).

Aside from the Stipulation, the parties have entered into a Supplemental Agreement that, as described in the Stipulation, provides Defendants with the right to terminate the Settlement if a certain number of damaged shares exceeds a threshold. *See* Stipulation at ¶7.3. The Supplemental Agreement is “confidential” as is customarily the case. *See Hefler v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, No. 16-cv-05479-JST, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 150292, at *23 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 4, 2018) (allowing confidential filing of supplemental agreement in order to “avoid the risk that one or more shareholders might use this knowledge to insist on a higher payout for themselves by threatening to break up the Settlement.”).

4. The Settlement Treats Class Members Equitably.

The Settlement does, in fact, treat Class Members equitably. This is because the proposed Plan of Allocation treats all claimants uniformly. “An allocation formula need only have a reasonable, rational basis, particularly if recommended by experienced and competent class counsel.” *In re WorldCom, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 388 F. Supp. 2d 319, 344 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (citation omitted). As described in the Notice (Stipulation, Exhibit A-1), the Plan of Allocation has a rational basis and was

formulated by Lead Counsel ensuring its fairness and reliability. *See In re Veeco Instruments Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 05 MDL 0165, 2007 WL 4115809, at *13 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2007); *In re Datatec Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 04-CV-525 (GEB), 2007 WL 4225828, at *5 (D.N.J. Nov. 28, 2007) (granting final approval of settlement as “The Plan of Allocation is rational and consistent with Lead Plaintiffs’ theory of the case.”). Under the proposed Plan of Allocation, each Authorized Claimant will receive a *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount, with that share to be determined by the ratio that the claimant’s allowed claim bears to the total allowed claims of all claimants. *See* Joint Decl. at ¶¶34-36. The Plan of Allocation is based upon the Amended Complaint’s premise that Settlement Class Members sustained damages by purchasing Humanigen securities at artificially inflated prices and seeks to compensate them in accordance with the devaluation that occurred when the alleged corrective disclosures entered the public sphere. *Id.* The Plan of Allocation relies on the corrective disclosures listed in the Amended Complaint, which is common in securities class actions. *Datatec Sys.*, 2007 WL 4225828, at *5.

The Plan of Allocation is substantially similar to other plans of allocation that have been approved and successfully implemented in other securities class action settlements, including within this Circuit. *See In re Ocean Power Techs., Inc.*, No. 3:14-CV-3799, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158222, at *73 (D.N.J. Nov. 15, 2016) (“pro rata distributions are consistently upheld, and there is no requirement that a plan of

allocation ‘differentiat[e] within a class based on the strength or weakness of the theories of recovery’”) (quoting *Sullivan v. DB Invs., Inc.*, 667 F.3d 273, 328 (3d Cir. 2011)); *see also In re Gen. Instrument Sec. Litig.*, 209 F. Supp. 2d 423, 431 (E.D. Pa. 2001) (deeming plan of allocation where “claimants are to be reimbursed on a *pro rata* basis for their recognized losses based largely on when they bought and sold their shares of [company] stock” as “even handed”). In assessing a proposed plan of allocation, the Court may give great weight to the opinion of informed counsel. *See, e.g., Chavarria v. N.Y. Airport Serv., LLC*, 875 F. Supp. 2d 164, 175 (E.D.N.Y. 2012) (“In determining whether a plan of allocation is fair, courts look primarily to the opinion of counsel. That is, ‘as a general rule, the adequacy of an allocation plan turns on whether counsel has properly apprised itself of the merits of all claims, and whether the proposed apportionment is fair and reasonable in light of that information.’”). Accordingly, given Lead Counsel’s opinion concerning the Plan of Allocation, this factor weighs in favor of granting preliminary approval.

V. PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT UNDER RULE 23 IS APPROPRIATE

As instructed by Rule 23(e), notice to class members should be directed if it appears likely that the court will be able to certify the class for the purposes of settlement. FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e). Conditional certification of a class for settlement purposes is allowable under Rule 23. *In re Gen. Motors Corp. Pick-Up Truck Fuel*

Tank Prod. Liab. Litig., 55 F.3d 768, 794 (3d Cir. 1995). Before a class may be certified, the following requirements of Rule 23(a) must be satisfied: (a) the class is so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the class; (c) the claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class; and (d) the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. FED. R. CIV. P. 23. For the reasons stated below, certification would be appropriate and, therefore, the Court should proceed with authorizing notice.

A. The Class Members Are So Numerous that Joinder Is Impracticable.

Rule 23(a)(1) requires that a class action must be advanced on behalf of a number of individuals so large that the joinder of all members is impractical. *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 613 (1997). “[N]umerosity is presumed at a level of 40 members” *Consol. Rail Corp. v. Town of Hyde Park*, 47 F.3d 473, 483 (2d Cir. 1995). While the precise number of Class Members is unknown, the number certainly exceeds any number considered practical for joinder. As alleged, Humanigen’s common stock was actively traded on OTC and the NASDAQ markets. During the Class Period, Plaintiffs’ damages expert estimated 63.6 million damaged shares. Indeed, courts routinely hold that Rule 23(a)’s numerosity requirement is satisfied under similar facts. *See In re DVI Inc. Sec. Litig.*,

249 F.R.D. 196, 200 (E.D. Pa. 2008), *aff'd sub nom. In re DVI, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 639 F.3d 623 (3d Cir. 2011) (finding numerosity where stock traded on NYSE).

B. Common Questions of Law or Fact Exist

In order to maintain a class action, there must be “questions of law or fact common to the class” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) (emphasis added). Rule 23(a)(2) merely requires that a plaintiff demonstrate common questions of law or fact that are susceptible to class-wide proof. 2 W. Rubenstein, *Newberg on Class Actions* § 4:50, 196-97 (5th ed. 2012). Identity of all facts and legal questions is not necessary – commonality will be demonstrated where the named plaintiff demonstrates just one common question. *Id.* (citations omitted).

This case presents numerous common questions of both law and fact for Settlement purposes, which include: (i) whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants’ acts; (ii) whether Defendants made material misrepresentations and omissions concerning lenzilumab; (iii) whether Defendants acted with the requisite state of mind in misrepresenting or failing to disclose material facts; (iv) whether the corrective disclosures of the prior misrepresentations and omissions caused artificial inflation of the market price of Humanigen’s securities, and if so, how much; and whether the Settlement Class Members have sustained damages and, if so, the appropriate measure thereof.

C. Plaintiffs' Claims are Typical of Those of the Class

Rule 23(a)(3) requires that the claims of the named plaintiff are typical of the class's claims. The heart of the inquiry is whether the representative's claims and the class claims are interrelated so that class treatment is economical. *Gen. Tel. Co. of Southwest v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147 (1982). Here, Plaintiffs' claims are similar to the claims of the other Settlement Class Members for Settlement purposes. Defendants' alleged course of conduct uniformly affected all Settlement Class Members, as they each allegedly suffered economic injury when the truth about the company's misstatements was revealed. Thus, the typicality requirement of Rule 23(a)(3) is met.

D. Plaintiffs Are Adequate Representatives of the Class

The purpose of the adequacy requirement is to "uncover conflicts of interest between named parties and the class they seek to represent." *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 594 (1997). The adequacy inquiry also tests the qualifications of counsel to represent a class. *See Viropharma*, 2016 WL 312108, at *7.

There are no apparent conflicts of interest between Plaintiffs and the absent Class Members for Settlement purposes. Indeed, Plaintiffs have been committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action from the outset and have reached a resolution that they believe is in the best interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have shown that they

are more than adequate representatives by, among other things, aiding with the development of the theory of liability laid out in the Amended Complaint and participating in the mediation process. *See* Declarations of Dr. Scott Greenbaum, Joshua Mailey, and Alejandro Pieroni (filed herewith).

E. The Requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) Are Also Satisfied

The class must satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(b)(1), (2), or (3). In this case, Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed to request conditional certification under Rule 23(b)(3), “the customary vehicle for damage actions.” *In re Community Bank of Northern Virginia*, 418 F.3d 277, 302 (3d Cir. 2005). Rule 23(b)(3) requires that Plaintiffs show that common questions of law and fact predominate over individual inquiries, and that resolution of the dispute via a class action is a superior method of adjudication. Rule 23(b)(3)’s predominance requirement “tests whether proposed classes are sufficiently cohesive to warrant adjudication by representation.” *Amchem Prod., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 594 (1997). This case meets these requirements.

1. Common Legal and Factual Question Predominate

“Predominance is a test readily met in certain cases alleging . . . securities fraud” *Amchem*, 521 U.S. at 625. In this securities action, Defendants’ alleged liability arises from its conduct with respect to statements made about lenzilumab. Whether Defendants’ publicly disseminated releases and statements during the Class

Period omitted and/or misrepresented material facts and Defendants' scienter predominate over any individual issue that theoretically might arise for Settlement purposes. *See Viropharma*, 2016 WL 312108, at *7 (finding common questions "dominate the Class, including whether Defendants' statements to the investing public during the Class Period caused the price of ViroPharma's securities during the Class Period to artificially inflate.").

**2. A Class Action is the Superior Means to Adjudicate
Plaintiffs' and Class Members' Claims**

The second prong of Rule 23(b)(3) is essentially satisfied by the proposed Settlement itself. As explained in *Amchem*, "[c]onfronted with a request for settlement-only class certification, a district court need not inquire whether the case, if tried, would present intractable management problems for the proposal is that there be no trial." 521 U.S. at 620 (citing FED. R. CIV. P. 23(b)(3)(D)). Thus, any manageability problems that may have existed here—and Plaintiffs know of none—are eliminated by the Settlement. *See In re ViroPharma Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 12-2714, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8626, at *23 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 25, 2016) (finding class action superior as all class members were "complaining of the same behavior by Defendants" and "[t]he alternative would produce individual suits throughout the country, redundantly wasting judicial resources to litigate the same claims over and over).

**VI. THE PROPOSED NATURE AND METHOD OF CLASS NOTICE
ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY SOUND AND APPROPRIATE**

Preliminary approval of the proposed Settlement permits notice to be given to the Settlement Class Members of a hearing on final settlement approval, at which they and the settling parties may be heard with respect to final approval. *See Manual for Complex Litigation*, Third, § 23.14 (West ed. 1995). Here, the parties propose that notice be given by U.S. mail. *See* Stipulation at Exhibit A, ¶9. In addition, the Stipulation provides for publication of a summary notice, which will be published one time over a national business newswire. *See id.*

The proposed form of Notice (Exhibit A-1 to the Stipulation), provides the following details of the Stipulation to prospective Settlement Class Members in a fair, concise and neutral way: (1) the existence of and their rights with respect to the class action, including the requirement for timely opting out of the Class; and (2) the Settlement with Defendants and their rights with respect to the Settlement. The proposed form of Summary Notice (Exhibit A-3 to the Stipulation), provides essential information about the litigation and the Settlement, including an address for potential class members to write in order to obtain the full long form of notice. The proposed form of Postcard Notice (Exhibit A-4 to the Stipulation), provides information to Settlement Class Members in terms of where to obtain additional information about the Settlement and how to participate.

The means and forms of notice proposed here constitute valid and sufficient notice to the Class, the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and comply fully with the requirements of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, Rule 23 and due process. *See e.g., Schering-Plough*, 2009 WL 5218066, at *1, 6 (finding that a settlement notice with a mailing to all class members who could be identified with reasonable effort and publication of a summary notice and over the *PR Newswire*, satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 and due process).

VII. PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court to schedule the dates set forth below and enter them in the [Proposed] Preliminary Approval Order, including:

Last day to complete mailing of Postcard Notice (the “Notice Date”).	14 days after entry of order granting preliminary approval.
Last day for filing and serving papers in support of final approval of the proposed Settlement and request for fees, reimbursement of expenses, and awards to Plaintiffs.	42 days before Fairness Hearing (defined below).
Last day for Settlement Class Members to object to the proposed Settlement and request for fees, reimbursement of expenses, and awards to Plaintiffs.	At least 28 days before Fairness Hearing.
Last day for potential Settlement Class Members to request exclusion from the Class.	At least 28 days before Fairness Hearing.
Last day for filing and serving papers in response to objections to the proposed Settlement and request for fees, reimbursement of expenses, and awards to Plaintiffs.	At least 14 days before Fairness Hearing.
Fairness Hearing	Approximately 110 days after entry of order granting preliminary approval.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The proposed Settlement is presumptively fair and presents no obvious deficiencies. Accordingly, the Court should grant preliminary approval of the proposed Settlement and enter an order substantially in the form of the accompanying [Proposed] Preliminary Approval Order.

Dated: September 22, 2023

LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP

s/ Adam M. Apton
Adam M. Apton, Esq.
Devyn R. Glass
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171
aapton@zlk.com
dglass@zlk.com

-and-

POMERANTZ LLP

Jeremy A. Lieberman (*pro hac vice*)
Brenda Szydlo (*pro hac vice*)
Thomas H. Przybylowski
Dean P. Ferrogari (*pro hac vice*)
600 Third Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 661-1100
Facsimile: (917) 463-1044
jalieberman@pomlaw.com
bszydlo@pomlaw.com
tprzybylowski@pomlaw.com
dferrogari@pomlaw.com

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

-and-

SCHALL LAW FIRM

Brian Schall
2049 Century Park East, Ste. 2460
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 301-3335
Facsimile: (213) 519-5876
brian@schallfirm.com

*Additional Counsel to Lead Plaintiff
Joshua Mailey*

-and-

**BRONSTEIN, GEWIRTZ &
GROSSMAN, LLC**

Peretz Bronstein
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4600
New York, New York 10165
Telephone: (212) 697-6484
Facsimile: (212) 697-7296
peretz@bgandg.com

*Additional Counsel to Plaintiff Alejandro
Pieroni*

Adam M. Apton, Esq.
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-cv-05258-WJM-AME

**DECLARATION OF ADAM M.
APTON AND BRENDA SZYDLO
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

We, ADAM M. APTON and BRENDA SZYDLO, declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 as follows:

1. I, Adam M. Apton, am a partner at the law firm of Levi & Korsinsky, LLP (“Levi & Korsinsky”), attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs Dr. Scott Greenbaum and Joshua Mailey, individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated (“Plaintiffs”), and Co-Lead Counsel for the Class along with Pomerantz LLP (“Pomerantz”). I am admitted to practice before this Court and have personal

knowledge of the various matters set forth herein based on my day-to-day participation in the prosecution and settlement of this Litigation. I submit this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement.¹

2. I, Brenda Szydlo, am a partner at the law firm of Pomerantz LLP, attorneys for Plaintiffs and Co-Lead Counsel for the Class along with Levi & Korsinsky. I am admitted *pro hac vice* to practice before this Court and have personal knowledge of the various matters set forth herein based on my day-to-day participation in the prosecution and settlement of this Litigation. I submit this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement.

BACKGROUND

3. Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz are nationally recognized firms for their expertise in securities litigation. The firms actively follow corporate disclosures and initiate investigations under circumstances that, in their attorneys' opinions, suggest potential wrongdoing or violations of the federal securities laws. That is precisely what happened here. On July 13, 2022, Humanigen, Inc. disclosed that its lead drug candidate at the time, lenzilumab, had failed to return positive results from

¹ Unless otherwise defined, capitalized terms herein have the same meaning as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement dated September 22, 2023 (the "Stipulation") (Dkt. No. 44).

a pivotal clinical trial being administered by the National Institute of Health. This news came on the heels of an earlier disclosure from the company concerning the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's ("FDA") decision to reject Humanigen's request for Emergency Use Authorization for lenzilumab.

4. The stream of negative news from Humanigen contradicted positive statements made by its executives at or around the same time. Consequently, Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz commenced investigations into potential violations of the federal securities laws. These investigations were preliminary in nature and spanned several weeks. They included a review of Humanigen's public statements, filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, public filings made with the FDA, and analyst reports relating to the company's development and testing of lenzilumab. The investigation also included analysis of Humanigen's stock price at various points during relevant times both before and after public statements concerning lenzilumab's clinical trials.

5. On August 26, 2022, Plaintiff Alejandro Pieroni and his attorneys at Pomerantz filed the initial lawsuit in the above-captioned matter against Humanigen. Dkt. No. 1. The Complaint asserted violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5 occurring between May 28, 2021 and July 12, 2022. As such, the lawsuit was subject to the provisions of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the "PSLRA"), including the procedures regarding the

appointment of a lead plaintiff and the various pleading requirements and standards.

6. On October 17, 2022, Lead Plaintiff Dr. Greenbaum filed a subsequent class-action complaint with his attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky. Dr. Greenbaum's complaint concerned the same subject matter, class and allegations, but included Humanigen's Chief Scientific Officer Dale Chappell as an additional named defendant and asserted violations under the federal securities laws ranging from May 16, 2020 through July 12, 2022.

7. On October 25, 2022, in accordance with the PSLRA, Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz filed timely motions for lead plaintiff on behalf of their respective proposed lead plaintiff clients, Dr. Greenbaum and Mr. Mailey. Dkt. Nos. 7, 9.

8. On December 6, 2022, after briefing the motions but before the Court issued a decision, Dr. Greenbaum and Mr. Mailey submitted a proposed stipulation resolving the motions and requesting that they be appointed as "Co-Lead Plaintiffs" and their attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz appointed as "Co-Lead Counsel." Dkt. No. 19.

9. On December 9, 2022, the Court granted Dr. Greenbaum and Mr. Mailey's stipulation. In addition, the Court consolidated Dr. Greenbaum's lawsuit with and into Mr. Pieroni's lawsuit for all purposes pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a). Dkt. No. 20.

10. Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz continued their investigations following Dr. Greenbaum and Mr. Mailey's appointments as Co-Lead Plaintiffs. The purpose of this further investigation was to obtain additional factual support for the alleged securities fraud violations that would then be used to amend the initial complaint. Given the pleading standards for securities fraud violations, additional factual support for our allegations was critical in order to defeat an anticipated motion to dismiss.

11. Our firms spent the next three months researching the alleged claims. As explained below, this entailed further review of Humanigen's public statements and relevant analyst reports. It also included review of public filings by other regulators, such as the FDA. We also consulted with an expert on issues pertaining to market efficiency, loss causation, and damages.

12. On March 27, 2023, Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint for Violations of the Federal Securities Laws (the "Amended Complaint"). Dkt. No. 36. The Amended Complaint asserted the same Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 violations that were asserted in the Complaint but included a significant amount of additional factual support. This additional factual support was the end result of an intensive investigation that had spanned the course of several months. It included the review and analysis of:

- public statements made by or on behalf of Humanigen prior to,

during and after the Class Period, *i.e.*, a period spanning from early-2020 to late-2022;

- Humanigen's quarterly reports, annual reports and press release filings with the SEC, which comprised thousands of pages of corporate financial and operational information;
- investment bank analyst reports providing discussions about Humanigen's clinical trial and drug develop operations;
- public statements made by regulators concerning Humanigen in particular as well as historical research and guidance concerning treatments for COVID-19; and
- various public communications by and between investors and Humanigen.

13. Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz, through third-party investigators, also conducted interviews with former employees of Humanigen to obtain information concerning the company's clinical development efforts bearing on whether the negative trial results were anticipated or the result of disagreements with guidance provided by the FDA.

14. The material obtained by Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz in the course of their investigation was expansive. It required many hours to digest, evaluate, and incorporate into the Amended Complaint. The product was a

comprehensive complaint that provided a complete factual analysis of all public information available at the time that supported claims of securities fraud. For the benefit of context, Levi & Korsinsky and Pomerantz's investigation yielded an Amended Complaint that was 103 pages long, almost four times longer than the Complaint initially filed on August 26, 2022.

15. In pertinent part, the Amended Complaint alleged that Humanigen and its executive officers misrepresented the appropriateness of using lenzilumab as a treatment for COVID-19 and concealed material adverse information concerning the drawbacks of using an anti-GM-CSF (like lenzilumab) to treat patients with lung dysfunction. The Amended Complaint explained in detail how and why GM-CSF or, as its formally known, "granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor" is necessary for healthy and normal lung function. Thus, as alleged, by inhibiting or blocking GM-CSF, a drug like lenzilumab in fact posed acute risks and dangers to patients with pre-existing lung dysfunction, including patients with COVID-19.

16. Following the filing of the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs and Defendants scheduled a private mediation session and requested a modification of the case schedule in place at the time. The modification of the case schedule extended Defendants' time to respond to the Amended Complaint and provided the parties adequate time to schedule and participate in a private mediation session with Mr. Jed Melnick, Esq. On May 23, 2023, the Court granted the requested

modification. Dkt. No. 38.

17. Mr. Melnick is a well-respected mediator with substantial experience in the field of securities litigation. Plaintiffs' counsel and defense counsel alike routinely use his services to mediate difficult cases. Mr. Melnick requires detailed briefing in advance of any mediation and this case was no exception. Plaintiffs and Defendants submitted detailed briefing in support of their respective positions. Plaintiffs submitted additional factual material to support their claims regarding the necessity of GM-CSF for healthy lung function and, in turn, the acute risks lenzilumab could present in patients with COVID-19.

18. On May 23, 2023, Plaintiffs and Defendants participated in a full-day mediation session. The mediation session ended without a resolution.

19. On July 7, 2023, Defendants, represented by the law firms of Polsinelli PC and Kleinberg Kaplan Wolff & Cohen PC, filed a motion to dismiss. Dkt. No. 40. Defendants argued in the motion that the Amended Complaint failed to meet the heavy pleading requirements under the PSLRA and, therefore, the case should be dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). In particular, Defendants argued that Plaintiffs failed to identify actionable false statements and plead sufficiently the element of scienter.

20. On July 25, 2023, while Plaintiffs were preparing their response to Defendants' motion to dismiss, Humanigen filed a current report on Form 8-K with

the SEC. The report stated, in pertinent part, that Humanigen had failed to complete negotiations with a potential acquiror and had not been able to raise debt or equity financing in sufficient amounts to fund ongoing operations. The report also stated that Humanigen anticipated it would not be able to continue as a going concern and was therefore contemplating commencing a bankruptcy in the third quarter of 2023.

21. On August 3, 2023, following further extensive settlement negotiations, Mr. Melnick issued a “mediator’s recommendation” to settle the matter for \$3,000,000. On August 8, 2023, Mr. Melnick confirmed that both parties agreed to his recommendation.

22. On August 21, 2023, Plaintiffs and Defendants signed a confidential Settlement Term Sheet specifying the key terms of the proposed settlement. Shortly afterwards, on August 29, 2023, Plaintiffs notified the Court that the parties had reached a tentative settlement and requested that the case be administratively terminated for 60 days pursuant to District of New Jersey Local Rule 41.1(b). Dkt. No. 41. The Court granted the request, administratively terminating the deadlines for briefing on the pending motion to dismiss and allowing the parties to finalize and submit the proposed Settlement for approval. Dkt. No. 42.

THE SETTLEMENT

23. The Stipulation contains the full terms of the Settlement. Plaintiffs and Defendants have also negotiated a separate Supplemental Agreement that allows

Defendants to terminate the Settlement at their discretion if a certain portion of the Settlement Class requests to be excluded from the Settlement.

24. The Settlement provides for a cash payment by or on behalf of Defendants of \$3,000,000. In exchange for this payment, Plaintiffs will provide to Defendants a full release of all claims related to this action.

25. The amount of the recovery supports the conclusion that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. This is primarily because Plaintiffs' theory of liability presented unique risks that, even if overcome, were far from guaranteed to be successful in light of Humanigen's precarious financial situation.

26. Cornerstone Research is a leading economics consulting firm. Every year it publishes a report on class action settlements in securities fraud lawsuits. Most recently, in its report titled *Securities Class Action Settlements—2022 Review and Analysis*, Cornerstone Research reported that the median settlement as a percentage of total class-wide damages in securities fraud cases with damages ranging from \$500 million to \$999 million in 2022 was 1.7%. Plaintiffs' class-wide damages in this case was approximately \$514.9 million. Thus, the recovery here equals approximately 0.5% of total recoverable damages, which falls in line with the range of reasonableness in class action settlements of this nature, which by definition always include estimated percentages greater and lesser than some generically imputed "median." A true and accurate copy of the Cornerstone Research report is

attached hereto as Exhibit A.

27. The amount of the monetary recovery supports granting approval of the Settlement when considering the liability risks faced by Plaintiffs. These risks include Plaintiffs' potential inability to prove that Defendants' statements were false and/or materially misleading. While academic literature supported the conclusion that GM-CSF was necessary for healthy lung function, there was a growing area of research suggesting that over-production of GM-CSF exacerbated lung dysfunction in certain patients. Thus, although Defendants initially premised their application of lenzilumab to COVID-19 patients on unpublished foreign research papers, additional published research may have ultimately supported their decision to repurpose the drug for use in treating COVID-19. This additional research could have been persuasive to a jury and especially harmful to Plaintiffs' theory of liability.

28. In addition, Plaintiffs would have been forced to explain at some point in the litigation why the National Institute of Health approved the testing of lenzilumab in its ACTIV-5/BET-B trial. The fact that the National Institute of Health deemed it appropriate to treat patients with lenzilumab (even if only in the clinical trial setting) would have weighed heavily against Plaintiffs theory of liability at trial. Defendants would have relied on this when arguing that Plaintiffs' interpretation of the academic literature was incorrect.

29. Plaintiffs also faced potential challenges in terms of proving scienter. Although motive is not required to establish liability, Plaintiffs decided to rely on significant insider sales by a group of entities affiliated with Humanigen's Chief Scientific Officer Dale Chappell. These entities, referred to in the Amended Complaint as the Black Horse Entities, were at one time Humanigen's largest shareholder and continually sold stock throughout the Class Period. These sales totaled approximately \$68.7 million but only a portion of the proceeds were received by Mr. Chappell. Thus, without a sufficient individual financial incentive to commit fraud, Plaintiffs faced potential dismissal under the case law for failing to properly establish motive.

30. An additional risk faced by Plaintiffs related to their ability to certify a class for the entire alleged Class Period. At the start of the Class Period, Humanigen's stock was traded over-the-counter and was not followed by many analysts. Thus, Defendants likely would have argued that Humanigen's stock during this period was not trading in an "efficient market" and, therefore, Plaintiffs could not rely on the "fraud-on-the-market" presumption of reliance. Had Defendants made this argument, Plaintiffs were at risk of their Class Period being confined to only the period of time within which Humanigen traded on the NASDAQ (*i.e.*, after September 18, 2020).

31. Humanigen's present financial position raises additional obstacles for

Plaintiffs that further warrant approval of the Settlement. As mentioned previously, on July 25, 2023, Humanigen reported it was contemplating commencing a bankruptcy in the third quarter of 2023. Since then, Humanigen's financial situation has grown worse. On August 14, 2023, it reported that it was unable to timely file its quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the period ended June 30, 2023, and reiterated its plans to file for bankruptcy before the end of the quarter. As of March 31, 2023, the date of its last reported balance sheet, Humanigen had cash and cash equivalents of just over \$3 million.

32. In addition to the risks discussed above, Plaintiffs faced a litany of routine obstacles if they continued with the litigation. For example, Defendants could have appealed Plaintiffs' class certification (assuming the Court would have granted it) or successfully excluded expert testimony at trial under *Daubert*, leaving Plaintiffs unable to establish liability or damages in front of a jury. Alternatively, even if Plaintiffs succeeded on every issue at trial, Defendants could have appealed the final judgment. These uncertainties, as well as others, all stand in support of approving the Settlement.

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

33. If approved, Plaintiffs will proceed with the notice program described in the Stipulation. The proposed claims administrator, A.B. Data, Ltd. ("A.B. Data"), will mail copies of the Postcard Notice to all potential Class Members and post the

Notice online. A.B. Data will also publish the Summary Notice once over a national newswire service. In addition, A.B. Data will also create and maintain a website devoted to the administration of this action, which will contain the aforementioned documents and other relevant court filings, and field telephone calls from potential claimants during normal business hours. In connection with the foregoing, Plaintiff has filed herewith the Declaration of Eric Schachter on behalf of A.B. Data which provides further detail about the administration process.

34. The Notice contains the Plan of Allocation for this action. The Plan of Allocation compensates all Settlement Class Members in a uniform manner. Depending on the number of Humanigen shares held at particular points during the Class Period, Class Members will receive certain amounts of compensation. The compensation received corresponds to the decline in the price of Humanigen stock in response to announcements concerning lenzilumab clinical trial results.

35. Specifically, the Plan of Allocation accounts for the declines in the price of Humanigen stock that occurred on September 8, 2021 and July 12, 2022. As explained in the Amended Complaint, on each of these days the market reacted to negative news about Humanigen and lenzilumab. The first date, September 8, 2021, relates to the announcement that the FDA had rejected Humanigen's request for Emergency Use Authorization for lenzilumab. The second date, July 12, 2022, relates to Humanigen's disclosure that lenzilumab failed to show statistical

significance on the primary endpoint of the ACTIV-5/BET-B study being conducted by the National Institute of Health.

36. The Plan of Allocation provides class members with a recoverable loss equal to the amount of the market decline on each of these days and for whichever day(s) the class member(s) held Humanigen stock or options. Each class member will then receive a distribution from the Settlement Fund equal to his or her pro rata share of the total recoverable losses from all class members. The full terms of the Plan of Allocation are contained in the Notice.

37. The payment to Class Members will (if the Settlement is approved) return compensation to shareholders that have been damaged. In our opinion, this is a fair, reasonable, and adequate result for the Settlement Class and represents the best possible outcome shareholders could attain in this otherwise unfortunate situation. Plaintiffs also support the Settlement and believe that it should be approved.

38. In exchange for our efforts, Lead Counsel intends to seek an award of attorneys' fees in an amount equal to or less than one-third of the Settlement Fund (\$1,000,000). This amount is intended to compensate Lead Counsel for our attorneys' fees and the risk that Lead Counsel accepted when we initially accepted this case on a contingency basis. This percentage comports with Third Circuit precedent on this issue.

39. Lead Counsel also intends to request reimbursement for our out-of-pocket expenses up to \$75,000 which include court filing fees, legal research fees, expert fees and other customarily reimbursed expenses.

40. When Lead Counsel files its motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses, the motion will be supported by supplemental information from Lead Counsel. This supplemental information will include time and expense information, including a description of the work performed by Lead Counsel, the hours expended by Lead Counsel, and the hourly rates typically billed by Lead Counsel. It will also include a detailed description of the expenses incurred during the course of the litigation.


41. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and accurate copy of the firm resume for Levi & Korsinsky, LLP.

42. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and accurate copy of the firm resume for Pomerantz LLP.

[Signatures on following page]

We declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 22nd day of September 2023.


Adam M. Apton



Brenda Szydlo

EXHIBIT “A”



CORNERSTONE RESEARCH

Economic and Financial Consulting and Expert Testimony

Securities Class Action Settlements

2022 Review and Analysis

Table of Contents

2022 Highlights	1
Author Commentary	2
Total Settlement Dollars	3
Settlement Size	4
Type of Claim	5
Rule 10b-5 Claims and “Simplified Tiered Damages”	5
’33 Act Claims and “Simplified Statutory Damages”	7
Analysis of Settlement Characteristics	9
GAAP Violations	9
Derivative Actions	10
Corresponding SEC Actions	11
Institutional Investors	12
Time to Settlement and Case Complexity	13
Case Stage at the Time of Settlement	14
Cornerstone Research’s Settlement Analysis	15
Research Sample	16
Data Sources	16
Endnotes	17
Appendices	18
About the Authors	23

Figures and Appendices

Figure 1: Settlement Statistics	1
Figure 2: Total Settlement Dollars	3
Figure 3: Distribution of Settlements	4
Figure 4: Median and Average “Simplified Tiered Damages” in Rule 10b-5 Cases	5
Figure 5: Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages” by Damages Ranges in Rule 10b-5 Cases	6
Figure 6: Settlements by Nature of Claims	7
Figure 7: Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Statutory Damages” by Damages Ranges in ‘33 Act Claim Cases	8
Figure 8: Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages” and Allegations of GAAP Violations	9
Figure 9: Frequency of Derivative Actions	10
Figure 10: Frequency of SEC Actions	11
Figure 11: Median Settlement Amounts and Institutional Investors	12
Figure 12: Median Settlement by Duration from Filing Date to Settlement Hearing Date	13
Figure 13: Median Settlement Dollars and Resolution Stage at Time of Settlement	14
Appendix 1: Settlement Percentiles	18
Appendix 2: Settlements by Select Industry Sectors	18
Appendix 3: Settlements by Federal Circuit Court	19
Appendix 4: Mega Settlements	19
Appendix 5: Median and Average Settlements as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages”	20
Appendix 6: Median and Average Settlements as a Percentage of “Simplified Statutory Damages”	20
Appendix 7: Median and Average Maximum Dollar Loss (MDL)	21
Appendix 8: Median and Average Disclosure Dollar Loss (DDL)	21
Appendix 9: Median Docket Entries by “Simplified Tiered Damages” Range	22

Analyses in this report are based on 2,116 securities class actions filed after passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (Reform Act) and settled from 1996 through year-end 2022. See page 16 for a detailed description of the research sample. For purposes of this report and related research, a settlement refers to a negotiated agreement between the parties to a securities class action that is publicly announced to potential class members by means of a settlement notice.

2022 Highlights

In 2022, the number of settled cases reached its highest level in 15 years, increasing 21% relative to 2021. The median settlement amount, median “simplified tiered damages,” and median total assets of the defendant issuer also rose dramatically.¹

- In 2022, the number of securities class action settlements increased to 105 with a total settlement value of over \$3.8 billion, compared to 87 settlements in 2021 with a total value of \$1.9 billion. (page 3)
- The median settlement amount of \$13.0 million represents an increase of 46% from 2021, while the average settlement amount (\$36.2 million) increased by 63%. (page 4)
- The \$3.8 billion total settlement dollars were 97% higher than the prior year. (page 3)
- There were eight mega settlements (equal to or greater than \$100 million), ranging from \$100 million to \$809.5 million. (page 3)
- The increase in the proportion of “midsize” settlement amounts (\$10 million to \$50 million) was accompanied by a decrease in the proportion of cases that settled for less than \$10 million. (page 4)
- Median “simplified tiered damages” increased more than 125% and reached a record high.² (page 5)
- Median “disclosure dollar losses”³ grew by more than 160%, also reaching an all-time high. (page 5)
- Compared to defendant firms involved in cases that settled in 2021, defendant firms involved in 2022 settlements were 97% larger, as measured by median total assets. (page 5)
- The historically low rate of settled cases involving a corresponding action by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) observed in 2021 persisted in 2022, remaining below 9%. (page 11)

Figure 1: Settlement Statistics

(Dollars in millions)

	2017–2021	2021	2022
Number of Settlements	395	87	105
Total Amount	\$16,714.3	\$1,932.4	\$3,805.5
Minimum	\$0.3	\$0.7	\$0.7
Median	\$10.2	\$8.9	\$13.0
Average	\$42.3	\$22.2	\$36.2
Maximum	\$3,496.8	\$202.5	\$809.5

Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented.

Author Commentary

Findings

The year 2022 was a record year for settlement activity. The number of securities class action settlements in 2022 increased sharply from 2021 and reached levels not observed since 2007. This sharp increase was accompanied by dramatic growth in case settlement amounts, “simplified tiered damages” (our rough proxy for potential shareholder losses), and the size of issuer defendant firms.

The historically high number of settlements in 2022 can be explained by the elevated number of case filings in 2018–2020, when over 70% of these settled cases were filed.

The median settlement amount is the highest since 2018. This was likely driven by the record-high level of “simplified tiered damages,” an estimate of potential shareholder losses that our research finds is the single most important factor in explaining settlement amounts.

The all-time-high median “simplified tiered damages” reflects a number of factors such as larger issuer defendants (measured by the company’s total assets) and larger disclosure dollar losses (a measure of the change in the issuer defendant’s market capitalization following the class-ending alleged corrective disclosure). Institutional investors are more likely to serve as lead plaintiffs in larger cases, i.e., cases with relatively high “simplified tiered damages.” Consistent with this observation, institutional investor involvement as lead plaintiffs for 2022 settled cases was higher than the prior year and the 2017–2021 average. Larger cases also tend to take longer to settle, and accordingly, we observe an increase in the median time to settlement in 2022 relative to prior years.

2022 was an interesting year as settlement activity reached historically high levels across several dimensions, including the number and size of settlements, and a record-high for our proxy for potential shareholder losses.

*Dr. Laarni T. Bulan
Principal, Cornerstone Research*

In contrast to the historic highs, settlements in relation to our proxy for potential shareholder losses declined sharply. In particular, both the median and average settlement as a percentage of “simplified tiered damages” in 2022 fell to their lowest levels among post–Reform Act years. These low levels are consistent with a low presence in 2022 of factors often associated with higher settlement amounts, such as the presence of an SEC action, criminal charges, or accounting irregularities.⁴

Securities class action settlements in 2022 involved substantially larger cases with larger issuer defendant firms. Overall, these cases took longer to resolve and reached more advanced litigation stages before settlement than in prior years.

*Dr. Laura E. Simmons
Senior Advisor, Cornerstone Research*

Looking Ahead

In light of the reduced level in the number of securities class action case filings in 2021–2022, we may begin to see a slowdown or flattening out in settlement activity in the upcoming years,⁵ absent a decrease in dismissal rates.

Given that SEC enforcement actions have tended to increase subsequent to when a new SEC Chair is sworn in (which last occurred in 2021), we may also begin to see a reversal in the frequency of corresponding SEC actions among settled cases in the near term. For additional details, see Cornerstone Research’s *SEC Enforcement Activity: Public Company and Subsidiaries—FY 2022 Update*.

As discussed in Cornerstone Research’s *Securities Class Action Filings—2022 Year in Review*, certain issues have emerged as focus areas in securities class actions. In particular, 26% of all core federal filings in 2020–2022 were related to special purpose acquisition company (SPAC), COVID-19, or cryptocurrency matters. While very few of these types of cases have settled to date, we expect increased settlement activity for these cases in the future.

—Laarni T. Bulan and Laura E. Simmons

Total Settlement Dollars

As has been observed in prior years, the presence or absence of just a few very large settlements can have a substantial effect on total settlement dollars for a given year.


- The number of settlements in 2022 (105 cases) continued the upward trend since 2019 and represented a 38% increase from the prior nine-year average (76 cases).
- An increase in the number of mega settlements (i.e., settlements equal to or greater than \$100 million) contributed to total settlement dollars nearly doubling in 2022 compared to the prior year.

- There were eight mega settlements in 2022, ranging from \$100 million to \$809.5 million. Eight such settlements is the highest number since 2016.
- A decline in the proportion of very small settlements further contributed to the growth in total settlement dollars. Only 23% of settlements in 2022 were for less than \$5 million, compared to 33% of cases settled in the prior nine years.

The number of settlements in 2022 was the highest number since 2007.

Figure 2: Total Settlement Dollars 2013–2022

(Dollars in billions)



Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented. “N” refers to the number of cases.

Settlement Size


- The median settlement amount in 2022 was \$13.0 million, a 46% increase from 2021 and a 34% increase from the prior nine-year median. Median values provide the midpoint in a series of observations and are less affected than averages by outlier data.
- The average settlement amount in 2022 was \$36.2 million, a 63% increase from 2021. (See [Appendix 1](#) for an analysis of settlements by percentiles.)
- In 2022, 42% of cases settled for between \$10 million and \$50 million, compared to only 30% in 2021 and 34% in 2013–2021.

The median settlement amount in 2022 was the highest since 2018.

- The increase in the proportion of these “midsize” settlement amounts (\$10 million to \$50 million) was accompanied by a decrease in the proportion of cases that settled for less than \$10 million—43% in 2022 compared to 56% in 2021 and 51% in the prior nine years.

Figure 3: Distribution of Settlements 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented.

Type of Claim

Rule 10b-5 Claims and “Simplified Tiered Damages”

“Simplified tiered damages” uses simplifying assumptions to estimate per-share damages and trading behavior for cases involving Rule 10b-5 claims. It provides a measure of potential shareholder losses that allows for consistency across a large volume of cases, thus enabling the identification and analysis of potential trends.⁶

Cornerstone Research’s analysis finds this measure to be the most important factor in estimating settlement amounts.⁷ However, this measure is not intended to represent actual economic losses borne by shareholders. Determining any such losses for a given case requires more in-depth economic analysis.


- Similar to settlement amounts, the median “simplified tiered damages” in 2022 increased 125% compared to 2021 and was over 100% higher than the median of settled cases for the prior nine years.

- In 2022, nearly half of settlements with Rule 10b-5 claims involved “simplified tiered damages” over \$500 million, an all-time high.
- Higher “simplified tiered damages” are typically associated with larger issuer defendants. Consistent with this, the median total assets of issuer defendants in 2022 settled cases was 97% higher than the median total assets for 2021 settled cases.
- Higher “simplified tiered damages” are also generally associated with larger disclosure dollar losses. In 2022, the median DDL grew by more than 160% compared to 2021, reaching an all-time high.

Median “simplified tiered damages” reached an all-time high in 2022.

Figure 4: Median and Average “Simplified Tiered Damages” in Rule 10b-5 Cases 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)




Note: “Simplified tiered damages” are adjusted for inflation based on class period end dates for common stock only; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented. Damages are estimated for cases alleging a claim under Rule 10b-5 (whether alone or in addition to other claims).

Type of Claim (continued)

- Only 4% of settlements in 2022 had “simplified tiered damages” less than \$25 million, the lowest observed to date.
- Cases with smaller “simplified tiered damages” are more likely to be associated with issuers that had been delisted from a major exchange and/or declared bankruptcy prior to settlement. In 2022, the percentage of such issuers for settled cases was at an all-time low (11%).
- The 2022 median and average settlement as a percentage of “simplified tiered damages” of 3.6% and 5.4%, respectively, are all-time lows. (See [Appendix 5](#) for additional information on median and average settlements as a percentage of “simplified tiered damages.”)

Figure 5: Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages” by Damages Ranges in Rule 10b-5 Cases 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Note: Damages are estimated for cases alleging a claim under Rule 10b-5 (whether alone or in addition to other claims).

'33 Act Claims and "Simplified Statutory Damages"

For Securities Act of 1933 ('33 Act) claim cases—those involving only Section 11 and/or Section 12(a)(2) claims—potential shareholder losses are estimated using a model in which the statutory loss is the difference between the statutory purchase price and the statutory sales price, referred to here as "simplified statutory damages." Only the offered shares are assumed to be eligible for damages.⁸

- In 2022, there were nine settlements for cases with only '33 Act claims, in line with the average from 2017 to 2020 and well below the historically high number of 16 settlements observed in 2021.

- The median settlement as a percentage of simplified statutory damages in 2022 and 2021 were 4.7% and 4.4%, respectively—the lowest levels since 2002. (See *Appendix 6 for additional information on median and average settlements as a percentage of "simplified statutory damages."*)
- The average settlement amount for cases with only '33 Act claims was \$7.3 million in 2022, compared to \$14.9 million during 2013-2021.

In 2022, the median settlement amount for cases with only '33 Act claims was \$7.0 million, the lowest since 2013.

Figure 6: Settlements by Nature of Claims
 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)

	Number of Settlements	Median Settlement	Median "Simplified Statutory Damages"	Median Settlement as a Percentage of "Simplified Statutory Damages"
Section 11 and/or Section 12(a)(2) Only	82	\$9.2	\$145.2	8.7%

	Number of Settlements	Median Settlement	Median "Simplified Tiered Damages"	Median Settlement as a Percentage of "Simplified Tiered Damages"
Both Rule 10b-5 and Section 11 and/or Section 12(a)(2)	123	\$15.4	\$355.7	6.3%
Rule 10b-5 Only	581	\$9.0	\$250.1	4.5%


Note: Settlement dollars and damages are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented.

- Settlements as a percentage of the simplified proxies for potential shareholder losses used in this report are typically smaller for cases that have larger estimated damages. As with cases with Rule 10b-5 claims, this finding holds for cases with only '33 Act claims.
- In the past decade, over 85% of the settled '33 Act claim cases involved an underwriter (or underwriters) as a named codefendant.
- Over 80% of '33 Act claim cases that settled in 2013–2022 involved an initial public offering (IPO).

Consistent with the lower median settlement amount among '33 Act claim cases, the median “simplified statutory damages” in 2022 declined by 61% from the median in 2021 and was the lowest since 2016.

Figure 7: Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Statutory Damages” by Damages Ranges in '33 Act Claim Cases 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Jurisdictions of Settlements of '33 Act Claim Cases

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
State Court	1	0	2	4	5	4	4	7	6	6
Federal Court	7	2	2	6	3	4	5	1	10	3

Note: “N” refers to the number of cases. This analysis excludes cases alleging Rule 10b-5 claims..

Analysis of Settlement Characteristics

GAAP Violations


This analysis examines allegations of GAAP violations in settlements of securities class actions involving Rule 10b-5 claims, including two sub-categories of GAAP violations—financial statement restatements and accounting irregularities.⁹ For further details regarding settlements of accounting cases, see Cornerstone Research’s annual report on *Accounting Class Action Filings and Settlements*.¹⁰

- For the first time since 2017, the median settlement amount for cases involving GAAP allegations was larger than that for non-GAAP cases. Notably, in 2022 the median settlement amount for GAAP cases was more than double that of non-GAAP cases.
- As noted in prior years, settlements as a percentage of “simplified tiered damages” for cases involving GAAP allegations are typically higher than for non-GAAP cases. This result has continued despite a relatively low number of cases involving a financial restatement. For example, only 11% of settlements in 2022 involved a restatement of financial statements.

- Auditor codefendants were involved in only 3% of settled cases, consistent with 2021 but substantially lower than the average from 2013 to 2021.
- The infrequency of cases alleging accounting irregularities continued in 2022 at less than 2% of settled cases.

The proportion of settled cases in 2022 with Rule 10b-5 claims alleging GAAP violations remained at a historically low level.

Figure 8: Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages” and Allegations of GAAP Violations 2013–2022



Note: “N” refers to the number of cases. This analysis is limited to cases alleging Rule 10b-5 claims (whether alone or in addition to other claims).


Derivative Actions

- Securities class actions often involve accompanying (or parallel) derivative actions with similar claims, and such cases have historically settled for higher amounts than securities class actions without corresponding derivative matters.¹¹
- In 2022, the median settlement amount for cases with an accompanying derivative action was approximately 28% higher than for cases without (\$14.1 million versus \$11.0 million, respectively).
- For cases settled during 2018–2022, 38% of parallel derivative suits were filed in Delaware. California and New York were the next most common venues for such actions, representing 22% and 15% of such settlements, respectively.

Although the proportion of cases involving accompanying derivative actions in 2022 was higher compared to 2021, it was below the average for 2018–2021.

- It is commonly understood that most parallel derivative suits do not settle for monetary amounts (other than plaintiffs’ attorney fees). However, the likelihood of a monetary settlement among parallel derivative actions is higher when the securities class action settlement is large, as shown in Cornerstone Research’s *Parallel Derivative Action Settlement Outcomes*.¹²

Figure 9: Frequency of Derivative Actions 2013–2022




Corresponding SEC Actions

- Historically, cases with an accompanying SEC action have typically been associated with substantially higher settlement amounts.¹³ However, this pattern did not hold in 2022.
- The median settlement amount in 2022 for cases that involved a corresponding SEC action was less than 5% higher than the median for cases without such an action. In contrast, in 2021, the median settlement amount for cases with an accompanying SEC action was more than double that for cases without such an action.
- Both “simplified tiered damages” and DDL were lower in 2022 for cases with a corresponding SEC action when compared to those without, at 72% and 83% lower, respectively.
- Settled cases in 2022 with a corresponding SEC action were nearly 10% quicker to reach settlement, on average, compared to cases without such an action. In contrast, in 2021, cases with corresponding SEC actions took over 20% longer to reach a settlement than cases without corresponding SEC actions.
- The number of settled cases in 2022 involving either a corresponding SEC action or criminal charge remained below 13%, compared to an average of 24% for the years 2013–2021.

Settled cases involving SEC actions in 2022 were considerably smaller than cases without accompanying SEC actions.

Figure 10: Frequency of SEC Actions
 2013–2022



Institutional Investors

As discussed in prior reports, increasing institutional participation as lead plaintiffs in securities litigation was a focus of the Reform Act.¹⁴ Indeed, in years following passage of the Reform Act, institutional investor involvement as lead plaintiffs did increase, particularly in larger cases, that is, cases with higher “simplified tiered damages.”


- In 2022, for cases involving an institutional investor as lead plaintiff, median “simplified tiered damages” and median total assets were five times and eight times higher, respectively, than the median values for cases without an institutional investor as a lead plaintiff.
- Since passage of the Reform Act, public pension plans have been the most frequent type of institutional lead plaintiff.

- In 2022, a public pension plan served as lead plaintiff in two-thirds of cases with an institutional lead plaintiff. Moreover, in six of the seven mega settlement cases in 2022 involving an institutional lead plaintiff, the institutional investor was a public pension plan.
- Institutional participation as lead plaintiff continues to be associated with particular plaintiff counsel. For example, an institutional investor served as a lead plaintiff in 2022 in over 85% of settled cases in which Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP and/or Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP served as lead plaintiff counsel. In contrast, institutional investors served as lead plaintiffs in 21% of cases in which The Rosen Law Firm, Pomerantz LLP, or Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP served as lead plaintiff counsel.

Of the eight mega settlement cases in 2022, seven included an institutional lead plaintiff.

Figure 11: Median Settlement Amounts and Institutional Investors 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented.

Time to Settlement and Case Complexity


- Overall, the median time from filing to settlement hearing date in 2022 was longer—3.2 years for 2022 settlements, compared to 2.9 years for 2013–2021 settlements.
- Cases involving an institutional lead plaintiff continued to take longer to settle. In particular, settlements in 2022 with institutional lead plaintiffs took 33% longer to settle than cases not involving an institutional lead plaintiff.

Only 42% of cases in 2022 reached a settlement hearing date within three years of filing, the lowest percentage in the prior nine years.

- Larger cases (as measured by higher “simplified tiered damages”) often take longer to resolve. Consistent with this, in 2022, the median time to settlement for cases that settled for at least \$100 million was over 5.5 years—an all-time high for such cases.

Figure 12: Median Settlement by Duration from Filing Date to Settlement Hearing Date 2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented. “N” refers to the number of cases.


Case Stage at the Time of Settlement

In collaboration with Stanford Securities Litigation Analytics (SSLA),¹⁵ this report analyzes settlements in relation to the stage in the litigation process at the time of settlement.

- Cases settling at later stages continue to be larger in terms of total assets and “simplified tiered damages.”
- In particular, the median issuer defendant total assets for 2022 cases that settled after the ruling on a motion for class certification was over four times the median for cases that settled prior to such a motion being ruled on.
- In 2022, cases where a motion for class certification was filed were nearly three times as likely to have either Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP and/or Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP as lead plaintiff counsel than The Rosen Law Firm, Pomerantz LLP, or Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP.
- Cases settling at later stages often included an institutional investor lead plaintiff. For example, in 2022, an institutional investor served as lead plaintiff 69% of the time for cases that settled after the filing of a motion for class certification (slightly higher than the percentage over the prior four years), compared to 44% for cases that settled prior to the filing of a motion for class certification (38% in the prior four years)
- Overall, compared to settlements in 2021, a larger proportion of cases in 2022 did not reach settlement until after a motion for class certification was filed. In addition, 14% of 2022 settled cases were resolved after a summary judgment motion, compared to less than 9% for 2018–2021 settlements.

Figure 13: Median Settlement Dollars and Resolution Stage at Time of Settlement 2018–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented. “N” refers to the number of cases. MTD refers to “motion to dismiss,” CC refers to “class certification,” and MSJ refers to “motion for summary judgment.” This analysis is limited to cases alleging Rule 10b-5 claims (whether alone or in addition to other claims).

Cornerstone Research's Settlement Analysis

This research applies regression analysis to examine the relations between settlement outcomes and certain securities case characteristics. Regression analysis is employed to better understand the factors that are important for estimating what cases might settle for, given the characteristics of a particular securities class action.

Determinants of Settlement Outcomes

Based on the research sample of cases that settled from January 2006 through December 2022, important determinants of settlement amounts include the following:

- “Simplified tiered damages”
- Maximum Dollar Loss (MDL)—the dollar-value change in the defendant firm’s market capitalization from its class period peak to the trading day immediately following the end of the class period.
- Most recently reported total assets of the issuer defendant firm
- Number of entries on the lead case docket
- Whether there were accounting allegations
- Whether there was a corresponding SEC action against the issuer, other defendants, or related parties
- Whether there were criminal charges against the issuer, other defendants, or related parties with similar allegations to those included in the underlying class action complaint
- Whether there was an accompanying derivative action

- Whether Section 11 and/or Section 12(a) claims were alleged in addition to Rule 10b-5 claims
- Whether the issuer defendant was distressed
- Whether an institution was a lead plaintiff
- Whether securities other than common stock/ADR/ADS, were included in the alleged class

Cornerstone Research analyses show that settlements were higher when “simplified tiered damages,” MDL, issuer defendant asset size, or the number of docket entries was larger, or when Section 11 and/or Section 12(a) claims were alleged in addition to Rule 10b-5 claims.

Settlements were also higher in cases involving accounting allegations, a corresponding SEC action, criminal charges, an accompanying derivative action, an institution involved as lead plaintiff, or securities in addition to common stock included in the alleged class.

Settlements were lower if the issuer was distressed.

More than 75% of the variation in settlement amounts can be explained by the factors discussed above.

Research Sample

- The database compiled for this report is limited to cases alleging Rule 10b-5, Section 11, and/or Section 12(a)(2) claims brought by purchasers of a corporation's common stock. The sample contains only cases alleging fraudulent inflation in the price of a corporation's common stock.
- Cases with alleged classes of only bondholders, preferred stockholders, etc., cases alleging fraudulent depression in price, and mergers and acquisitions cases are excluded. These criteria are imposed to ensure data availability and to provide a relatively homogeneous set of cases in terms of the nature of the allegations.
- The current sample includes 2,116 securities class actions filed after passage of the Reform Act (1995) and settled from 1996 through 2022. These settlements are identified based on a review of case activity collected by Securities Class Action Services LLC (SCAS).¹⁶
- The designated settlement year, for purposes of this report, corresponds to the year in which the hearing to approve the settlement was held.¹⁷ Cases involving multiple settlements are reflected in the year of the most recent partial settlement, provided certain conditions are met.¹⁸

Data Sources

In addition to SCAS, data sources include Dow Jones Factiva, Bloomberg, the Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP) at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, Standard & Poor's Compustat, Refinitiv Eikon, court filings and dockets, SEC registrant filings, SEC litigation releases and administrative proceedings, LexisNexis, Stanford Securities Litigation Analytics (SSLA), Securities Class Action Clearinghouse (SCAC), and public press.

Endnotes

- ¹ Reported dollar figures and corresponding comparisons are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are analyzed.
- ² “Simplified tiered damages” are calculated for cases that settled in 2006 or later, following the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2005 landmark decision in *Dura Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336. “Simplified tiered damages” is based on the stock-price drops on alleged corrective disclosure dates as described in the settlement plan of allocation.
- ³ Disclosure Dollar Loss or DDL is the dollar-value change in the defendant firm’s market capitalization between the end of the class period and the trading day immediately following the end of the class period.
- ⁴ Accounting irregularities reflect those cases in which the defendant has reported the occurrence of accounting irregularities (intentional misstatements or omissions) in its financial statements.
- ⁵ *Securities Class Action Filings—2022 Year in Review*, Cornerstone Research (2023).
- ⁶ The “simplified tiered damages” approach used for purposes of this settlement research does not examine the mix of information associated with the specific dates listed in the plan of allocation, but simply applies the stock price movements on those dates to an estimate of the “true value” of the stock during the alleged class period (or “value line”). This proxy for damages utilizes an estimate of the number of shares damaged based on reported trading volume and the number of shares outstanding. Specifically, reported trading volume is adjusted using volume reduction assumptions based on the exchange on which the issuer defendant’s common stock is listed. No adjustments are made to the underlying float for institutional holdings, insider trades, or short-selling activity during the alleged class period. Because of these and other simplifying assumptions, the damages measures used in settlement outcome modeling may differ substantially from damages estimates developed in conjunction with case-specific economic analysis.
- ⁷ Laarni T. Bulan, Ellen M. Ryan, and Laura E. Simmons, *Estimating Damages in Settlement Outcome Modeling*, Cornerstone Research (2017).
- ⁸ The statutory purchase price is the lesser of the security offering price or the security purchase price. Prior to the first complaint filing date, the statutory sales price is the price at which the security was sold. After the first complaint filing date, the statutory sales price is the greater of the security sales price or the security price on the first complaint filing date. Similar to “simplified tiered damages,” the estimation of “simplified statutory damages” makes no adjustments to the underlying float for institutional holdings, insider trades, or short-selling activity.
- ⁹ The two sub-categories of accounting issues analyzed in Figure 8 of this report are (1) restatements—cases involving a restatement (or announcement of a restatement) of financial statements; and (2) accounting irregularities.
- ¹⁰ *Accounting Class Action Filings and Settlements—2022 Review and Analysis*, Cornerstone Research (2023), forthcoming in spring 2023.
- ¹¹ To be considered an accompanying or parallel derivative action, the derivative action must have underlying allegations that are similar or related to the underlying allegations of the securities class action and either be active or settling at the same time as the securities class action.
- ¹² *Parallel Derivative Action Settlement Outcomes*, Cornerstone Research (2022).
- ¹³ As noted previously, it could be that the merits in such cases are stronger, or simply that the presence of a corresponding SEC action provides plaintiffs with increased leverage when negotiating a settlement. For purposes of this research, an SEC action is evidenced by the presence of a litigation release or an administrative proceeding posted on www.sec.gov involving the issuer defendant or other named defendants with allegations similar to those in the underlying class action complaint.
- ¹⁴ See, for example, *Securities Class Action Settlements—2006 Review and Analysis*, Cornerstone Research (2007) and Michael A. Perino, “Have Institutional Fiduciaries Improved Securities Class Actions? A Review of the Empirical Literature on the PSLRA’s Lead Plaintiff Provision,” St. John’s Legal Studies Research Paper No. 12-0021 (2013).
- ¹⁵ Stanford Securities Litigation Analytics (SSLA) tracks and collects data on private shareholder securities litigation and public enforcements brought by the SEC and the U.S. Department of Justice. The SSLA dataset includes all traditional class actions, SEC actions, and DOJ criminal actions filed since 2000. Available on a subscription basis at <https://sla.law.stanford.edu/>.
- ¹⁶ Available on a subscription basis. For further details see <https://www.issgovernance.com/securities-class-action-services/>.
- ¹⁷ Movements of partial settlements between years can cause differences in amounts reported for prior years from those presented in earlier reports.
- ¹⁸ This categorization is based on the timing of the settlement hearing date. If a new partial settlement equals or exceeds 50% of the then-current settlement fund amount, the entirety of the settlement amount is re-categorized to reflect the settlement hearing date of the most recent partial settlement. If a subsequent partial settlement is less than 50% of the then-current total, the partial settlement is added to the total settlement amount and the settlement hearing date is left unchanged.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Settlement Percentiles

(Dollars in millions)

Year	Average	10th	25th	Median	75th	90th
2013	\$90.8	\$2.4	\$3.8	\$8.2	\$27.9	\$103.6
2014	\$22.5	\$2.1	\$3.5	\$7.4	\$16.3	\$61.8
2015	\$48.6	\$1.6	\$2.7	\$8.0	\$20.1	\$116.1
2016	\$86.1	\$2.3	\$5.1	\$10.4	\$40.2	\$178.0
2017	\$22.0	\$1.8	\$3.1	\$6.3	\$18.2	\$42.3
2018	\$75.6	\$1.8	\$4.2	\$13.1	\$28.8	\$57.3
2019	\$32.3	\$1.7	\$6.4	\$12.6	\$22.9	\$57.2
2020	\$62.3	\$1.6	\$3.6	\$11.1	\$22.9	\$60.3
2021	\$22.2	\$1.9	\$3.4	\$8.9	\$19.3	\$63.3
2022	\$36.2	\$2.0	\$5.0	\$13.0	\$33.0	\$71.8

Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented.

Appendix 2: Settlements by Select Industry Sectors

2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)

Industry	Number of Settlements	Median Settlement	Median “Simplified Tiered Damages”	Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages”
Financial	92	\$14.8	\$293.3	5.0%
Healthcare	20	\$14.2	\$189.4	6.4%
Pharmaceuticals	119	\$7.6	\$237.6	3.8%
Retail	50	\$13.2	\$294.2	4.8%
Technology	103	\$9.3	\$315.9	4.6%
Telecommunication	26	\$10.5	\$311.0	4.4%

Note: Settlement dollars and “simplified tiered damages” are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented. “Simplified tiered damages” are calculated only for cases involving Rule 10b-5 claims (whether alone or in addition to other claims).

Appendix 3: Settlements by Federal Circuit Court
 2013–2022


(Dollars in millions)

Circuit	Number of Settlements	Median Settlement	Median Settlement as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages”
First	21	\$12.4	3.0%
Second	202	\$9.0	5.0%
Third	81	\$7.5	4.9%
Fourth	26	\$22.9	3.8%
Fifth	38	\$10.7	4.9%
Sixth	32	\$13.5	7.4%
Seventh	37	\$15.5	3.6%
Eighth	14	\$46.4	5.1%
Ninth	191	\$7.6	4.6%
Tenth	17	\$10.2	5.8%
Eleventh	37	\$11.9	4.9%
DC	5	\$33.7	2.4%

Note: Settlement dollars are adjusted for inflation; 2022 dollar equivalent figures are presented. Settlements as a percentage of “simplified tiered damages” are calculated only for cases alleging Rule 10b-5 claims (whether alone or in addition to other claims).


Appendix 4: Mega Settlements
 2013–2022

- Total Mega Settlement Dollars as a Percentage of All Settlement Dollars
- Number of Mega Settlements as a Percentage of All Settlements




Note: Mega settlements are defined as total settlement funds equal to or greater than \$100 million.

Appendix 5: Median and Average Settlements as a Percentage of “Simplified Tiered Damages”
 2013–2022



Note: “Simplified tiered damages” are calculated only for cases alleging Rule 10b-5 claims (whether alone or in addition to other claims).

Appendix 6: Median and Average Settlements as a Percentage of “Simplified Statutory Damages”
 2013–2022




Note: “Simplified statutory damages” are calculated only for cases alleging Section 11 (‘33 Act) claims and no Rule 10b-5 claims.

Appendix 7: Median and Average Maximum Dollar Loss (MDL)

2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)




Note: MDL is adjusted for inflation based on class period end dates; 2022 dollar equivalents are presented. MDL is the dollar value change in the defendant firm’s market capitalization from the trading day with the highest market capitalization during the class period to the trading day immediately following the end of the class period. This analysis excludes cases alleging ‘33 Act claims only.

Appendix 8: Median and Average Disclosure Dollar Loss (DDL)

2013–2022


(Dollars in millions)



Note: DDL is adjusted for inflation based on class period end dates; 2022 dollar equivalents are presented. DDL is the dollar-value change in the defendant firm’s market capitalization between the end of the class period and the trading day immediately following the end of the class period. This analysis excludes cases alleging ‘33 Act claims only.

Appendix 9: Median Docket Entries by “Simplified Tiered Damages” Range
2013–2022

(Dollars in millions)



Note: “Simplified tiered damages” are calculated only for cases alleging Rule 10b-5 claims (whether alone or in addition to other claims).

About the Authors

Laarni T. Bulan

Ph.D., Columbia University; M.Phil., Columbia University; B.S., University of the Philippines

Laarni Bulan is a principal in Cornerstone Research’s Boston office, where she specializes in finance. Her work has focused on securities and other complex litigation addressing class certification, damages, and loss causation issues, firm valuation, and corporate governance, executive compensation, and risk management issues. She has also consulted on cases related to insider trading, market manipulation and trading behavior, financial institutions and the credit crisis, derivatives, foreign exchange, and securities clearing and settlement.

Dr. Bulan has published notable academic articles in peer-reviewed journals. Her research covers topics in dividend policy, capital structure, executive compensation, corporate governance, and real options. Prior to joining Cornerstone Research, Dr. Bulan had a joint appointment at Brandeis University as an assistant professor of finance in its International Business School and in the economics department.

Laura E. Simmons

Ph.D., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; M.B.A., University of Houston; B.B.A., University of Texas at Austin

Laura Simmons is a senior advisor with Cornerstone Research. She has more than 25 years of experience in economic consulting. Dr. Simmons has focused on damages and liability issues in securities class actions, as well as litigation involving the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA). She has also managed cases involving financial accounting, valuation, and corporate governance issues. She has served as a testifying expert in litigation involving accounting analyses, securities case damages, ERISA matters, and research on securities lawsuits.

Dr. Simmons’s research on pre- and post-Reform Act securities litigation settlements has been published in a number of reports and is frequently cited in the public press and legal journals. She has spoken at various conferences and appeared as a guest on CNBC addressing the topic of securities case settlements. She has also published in academic journals, including research focusing on the intersection of accounting and litigation. Dr. Simmons was previously an accounting faculty member at the Mason School of Business at the College of William & Mary. From 1986 to 1991, she was an accountant with Price Waterhouse.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the research efforts and significant contributions of their colleagues at Cornerstone Research in the writing and preparation of this annual update. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Cornerstone Research.

Many publications quote, cite, or reproduce data, charts, or tables from Cornerstone Research reports. The authors request that you reference Cornerstone Research in any reprint, quotation, or citation of the charts, tables, or data reported in this study.

Please direct any questions and requests for additional information to the settlement database administrator at settlementdatabase@cornerstone.com.

Boston

617.927.3000

Chicago

312.345.7300

London

+44.20.3655.0900

Los Angeles

213.553.2500

New York

212.605.5000

San Francisco

415.229.8100

Silicon Valley

650.853.1660

Washington

202.912.8900

www.cornerstone.com



EXHIBIT “B”



Firm Resume

**Representation.
Where & When You Need.**

New York

33 Whitehall Street
17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel : 212-363-7500
Fax : 212-363-7171

Washington D.C.

1101 Vermont Ave. NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: 202-524-4290
Fax: 202-333-2121

Connecticut

1111 Summer Street,
Suite 403
Stamford, CT 06905
Tel : 203-992-4523

California, LA

445 South Figueroa Street
31st Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: 213-985-7290

California, San Fran.

1160 Battery Street East,
Suite 100 - #3425
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: 415-373-1671
Fax: 415-484-1294

 [Levi&Korsinsky LLP](#)

 [Merger Alerts](#)

 [Www.Zlk.Com](#)

About The Firm

Practice Areas

Securities Fraud Class Actions

Derivative, Corporate Governance & Executive Compensation
Mergers & Acquisitions

Consumer Litigation

Our Attorneys

Managing Partners

- EDUARD KORSINSKY
 - JOSEPH E. LEVI
-

Partners

- ADAM M. APTON
 - DONALD J. ENRIGHT
 - SHANNON L. HOPKINS
 - GREGORY M. NESPOLE
 - GREGORY M. POTREPKA
 - NICHOLAS I. PORRITT
 - MARK S. REICH
 - DANIEL TEPPER
 - ELIZABETH K. TRIPODI
-

Counsel

- ANDREW E. LENCYK
 - COURTNEY E. MACCARONE
-

Our Attorneys

Associates

- RACHEL BERGER
 - JORDAN A. CAFRITZ
 - MORGAN EMBLETON
 - NOAH GEMMA
 - DEVYN R. GLASS
 - GARY ISHIMOTO
 - DAVID C. JAYNES
 - ALEXANDER KROT
 - NICHOLAS LANGE
 - ADAM C. MCCALL
 - AMANDA MILLER
 - MELISSA MULLER
 - CINAR ONEY
 - COLE VON RICHTHOFEN
 - BRIAN STEWART
 - CORREY A. SUK
 - MAX WEISS
-

Staff Attorneys

- KATHY AMES-VALDIVIESO
 - KAROLINA CAMPBELL
 - CHRISTINA FUHRMAN
 - RUBEN MARQUEZ
 - COLIN BROWN
-

Law Clerks

- AARON PARNAS

About The Firm

Levi & Korsinsky, LLP is a national law firm with decades of combined experience litigating complex securities, class, and consumer actions in state and federal courts throughout the country. Our main office is located in New York City and we also maintain offices in Connecticut, California, and Washington, D.C.

We represent the interests of aggrieved shareholders in class action and derivative litigation through the vigorous prosecution of corporations that have committed securities fraud and boards of directors who have breached their fiduciary duties. We have served as Lead and Co-Lead Counsel in many precedent-setting litigations, recovered hundreds of millions of dollars for shareholders via securities fraud lawsuits, and obtained fair value, multi-billion dollar settlements in merger transactions.

We also represent clients in high-stakes consumer class actions against some of the largest corporations in America. Our legal team has a long and successful track record of litigating high-stakes, resource-intensive cases and consistently achieving results for our clients.

Our attorneys are highly skilled and experienced in the field of securities class action litigation. They bring a vast breadth of knowledge and skill to the table and, as a result, are frequently appointed Lead Counsel in complex shareholder and consumer litigations in various jurisdictions. We are able to allocate substantial resources to each case, reviewing public documents, interviewing witnesses, and consulting with experts concerning issues particular to each case. Our attorneys are supported by exceptionally qualified professionals including financial experts, investigators, and administrative staff, as well as cutting-edge technology and e-discovery systems. Consequently, we are able to quickly mobilize and produce excellent litigation results. Our ability to try cases, and win them, results in substantially better recoveries than our peers.

We do not shy away from uphill battles – indeed, we routinely take on complex and challenging cases, and we prosecute them with integrity, determination, and professionalism.



Practice Areas

- Securities Fraud Class Actions
- Derivative, Corporate Governance & Executive Compensation Mergers & Acquisitions
- Consumer Litigation



Securities Class Action

Over the last four years, Levi & Korsinsky has been lead, or co-lead counsel in 35 separate settlements that have resulted in nearly \$200 million in recoveries for shareholders. During that time, Levi & Korsinsky has consistently ranked in the Top 10 in terms of number of settlements achieved for shareholders each year, according to reports published by ISS. In Lex Machina's Securities Litigation Report, Levi & Korsinsky ranked as one of the Top 5 Securities Firms for the period from 2018 to 2020. Law360 dubbed the Firm one of the "busiest securities firms" in what is "on track to be one of the busiest years for federal securities litigation" in 2018. In 2019, Lawdragon Magazine ranked multiple members of Levi & Korsinsky among the 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers in America. Our firm has been appointed Lead Counsel in a significant number of class actions filed in both federal and state courts across the country.

In **In re Tesla Inc. Securities Litigation**, Case No. 3:18-cv-4865-EMC (N.D. Cal.), the firm represents a certified class of Tesla investors who sustained damages when Elon Musk tweeted "Am considering taking Tesla private at \$420. Funding secured," on August 7, 2018. In a monumental win for the class, our attorneys successfully obtained partial summary judgment against Mr. Musk on

the issues of falsity and scienter, meaning that trial will primarily focus on damages, which are presently estimated to be well in excess of \$2 billion.

In **In re U.S. Steel Consolidated Cases**, Case No. 2:17-579-CB (W.D. Pa.), the firm represents a certified class of U.S. Steel investors who sustained damages in connection with the company's false and materially misleading statements about its Carnegie Way initiative.

In two related actions, **In re Nutanix, Inc. Securities Litigation**, Case No. 3:19-cv-01651-WHO (the "Stock Case") and **John P. Norton, on Behalf of the Norton Family Living Trust UAD 11/15/2002 v. Nutanix, Inc., et. al.**, Case No. 3:21-cv-04080-WHO (the "Options Case") Levi & Korsinsky achieved a settlement providing for the payment of \$71 million to eligible class members. Lead Plaintiff of the Stock Case, California Ironworkers Field Pension Trust, and Lead Plaintiff of the Options Case, John P. Norton, alleged violations of §§ 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 based on false and misleading misstatements that the company made that allegedly concealed from shareholders its rapidly declining sales pipeline, revenue, and billings.



Securities Class Action

As Lead Counsel in **In re Avon Products Inc. Securities Litigation**, Case No. 1:19-cv-1420-MKV (S.D.N.Y.), having been commenced in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, the Firm achieved a \$14.5 million cash settlement to successfully end claims alleged by a class of investors that the beauty company loosened its recruiting standards in its critical market in Brazil, eventually causing the company's stock price to crater. The case raised important issues concerning the use of confidential witnesses located abroad in support of scienter allegations and the scope of the attorney work product doctrine with respect to what discovery could be sought of confidential sources who are located in foreign countries.

In **Rougier v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.**, Case No. 4:17-cv-2399-GHC-CAB (S.D. Tex.), the Firm served as sole Lead Counsel, prevailed against Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and achieved class certification before the Parties reached a settlement. The Court granted final approval of a \$15.5 million settlement on November 24, 2020.

“Plaintiffs’ selected Class Counsel, the law firm of Levi & Korsinsky, LLP, has demonstrated the zeal and competence required to adequately represent the interests of the Class. The attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky have experience in securities and class actions issues and have been appointed lead counsel in a significant number of securities class actions across the country.”

The Honorable Christina Bryan in *Rougier v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.*, No. 4:17-cv-02399-GHC-CAB (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2019)

In **In Re Helios and Matheson Analytics, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, Case No. 1:18-cv-6965-JGK (S.D.N.Y.), the Firm served as sole Lead Counsel. Although the company had filed a voluntary Bankruptcy petition for liquidation and had numerous creditors (including private parties and various state and federal regulatory agencies), the Firm was able to reach a settlement. The settlement was obtained at a time when a motion to dismiss filed by the defendants was still pending and a risk to the Class. In its role as Lead Counsel, the Firm achieved a settlement of \$8.25 million on behalf of the class. The Court granted final approval of the settlement on May 13, 2021.



Securities Class Action

In **In re Restoration Robotics, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, Case No. 5:18-cv-3712-EJD (N.D. Cal.), the Firm was sole Lead Counsel and achieved a settlement of \$4,175,000 for shareholders.

In **Kirkland, et al. v. WideOpenWest, Inc., et al.**, Index No. 653248/2018 (N.Y. Sup.) the Firm was Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a settlement of \$7,025,000 for shareholders.

In **Stein v. U.S. Xpress Enterprises, Inc., et al.**, Case No. 1:19-cv-98-TRM-CHS (E.D. Tenn.), the Firm is Co-Lead Counsel representing a certified class of USX investors and has prevailed on a Motion to Dismiss. The class action is in the early stages of discovery and shareholders stand to recover damages in connection with an Initial Public Offering.

“I find the firm to be well-qualified to serve as Lead Counsel.”

The Honorable Andrew L. Carter, Jr. In *Snyder v. Baozun Inc.*, No. 1:19-cv-11290-ALC-KNF (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 8, 2020)



Securities Class Action

Appointed Lead or Co-Lead Counsel in the following securities class actions:

- **Solomon v. Peloton Interactive, Inc. et al.,**
1:23-cv-04279-MKB-JRC (E.D.N.Y. September 7th 2023)
- **Thant et al. v. Veru, Inc., et al.,**
1:22-cv-23960-KMW (S.D. Fla. July 27, 2023)
- **Joshua Zhang V. gaotu techedu inc. f/k/a GSX techedu inc., xiangdong chen and nan shen**
1:22-cv-07966-PKC-CLP (E.D.N.Y. July 16, 2023)
- **Miguel Jaramillo V. Dish Network Corporation, Et Al.,**
1:23-cv-00734-GPG-SKC (U.S.D.C. Colorado July 16, 2023)
- **Howard M. Rensin, Trustee Of The Rensin Joint Trust v. United States Cellular Corporation, et al.,**
1:23-cv-02764-MMR (N.D. Ill. July 11, 2023)
- **Holland et al., v. Rite Aid Corporation, et al.,**
23-cv-589 (N.D. Ohio June 22, 2023)
- **Rhonda Baylor v. Honda Motor Co., Ltd., et al.,**
2:23-cv-00794-GW-AGR (C.D. Cal. May 8, 2023)
- **Sophia Olsson v. PLDT Inc. et al.,**
2:23-cv-00885-CJC-MAA (C.D. Cal. April 26, 2023)

“ In appointing the Firm Lead Counsel, the Honorable Analisa Torres noted our “extensive experience” in securities litigation.

White Pine Invs. v. CVR Ref., LP, No. 1:20-CV-2863-AT (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 5, 2021)

- **Sean Ryan v. FIGS, Inc. et al.,**
2:22-cv-07939-ODW (C.D. Cal. February 14, 2023)
- **Schoen v. Eiger Biopharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.,**
3:22-cv-6985-RS (N.D. Cal. February 3, 2023)
- **Jamia Fernandes v. Centessa Pharmaceuticals plc, et al.,**
1:22-cv-08805-GHW-SLC (S.D.N.Y. December 12, 2022)
- **Gilbert v. Azure Power Global Limited, et al.,**
1:22-cv-07432-GHW (S.D.N.Y. December 8, 2022)
- **Pugley v. Fulgent Genetics, Inc. et al.,**
2:22-cv-06764-CAS-KLS (C.D. Cal. November 30, 2022)
- **Michalski v. Weber Inc., et al.,**
1:22-cv-03966-EEB (N.D. Ill. November 29, 2022)
- **Edge v. Tupperware Brands Corporation, et al.,**
6:22-cv-1518-RBD-LHP (M.D. Fla. September 16, 2022)



Securities Class Action

- **Carpenter v. Oscar Health, Inc., et al.,**
1:22-cv-03885-VSB-VF (S.D.N.Y. September 27, 2022)
- **In re Nano-X Imaging Ltd. Securities Litigation,**
1:20-cv-04355-WFK-MMH (E.D.N.Y. August 30, 2022)
- **Patterson v. Cabaletto Bio, Inc., et al.,**
2:22-cv-00737-JMY (E.D. Pa. August 10, 2022)
- **Rose v. Butterfly Network, Inc., et al.,**
2:22-cv-00854-MEF-JBC (D.N.J. August 8, 2022)
- **Winter v. Stronghold Digital Mining, Inc., et al.,**
1:22-cv-03088-RA (S.D.N.Y. August 4, 2022)
- **Poirer v. Bakkt Holdings, Inc.,**
1:22-cv-02283-EK-PK (E.D.N.Y. August 3, 2022)
- **In re Meta Materials Inc. Securities Litigation,**
1:21-cv-07203-CBA-JRC (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2022)
- **Deputy v. Akebia Therapeutics, Inc. et al.,**
1:22-cv-01411-AMD-VMS (E.D.N.Y. June 28, 2022)
- **In re Grab Holdings Limited Securities Litigation,**
1:22-cv-02189-JLR (S.D.N.Y. June 7, 2022)
- **Jiang v. Bluecity Holdings Limited et al.,**
1:21-cv-04044-FB-CLP (E.D.N.Y. December 22, 2021)

“ I find the firm to be well-qualified to serve as Lead Counsel.”

The Honorable Andrew L. Carter, Jr. In *Snyder v. Baozun Inc.*, No. 1:19-CV-11290 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 8, 2020)

- **In re AppHarvest Securities Litigation,**
1:21-cv-07985-LJL (S.D.N.Y. December 13, 2021)
- **In re Coinbase Global, Inc. Securities Litigation,**
3:21-cv-05634-TLT (N.D. Cal. November 5, 2021)
- **Miller v. Rekor Systems, Inc. et al.,**
1:21-cv-01604-GLR (D. Md. September 16, 2021)
- **Zaker v. Ebang International Holdings Inc. et al.,**
1:21-cv-03060-KPF (S.D.N.Y. July 21, 2021)
- **Valdes v. Kandi Technologies Group, Inc. et al.,**
2:20-cv-06042-LDH-AYS (E.D.N.Y. April 20, 2021)
- **John P. Norton, On Behalf Of The Norton Family Living Trust UAD 11/15/2002 V. Nutanix, Inc. Et Al,**
3:21-cv-04080-WHO (N.D. Cal. September 8, 2021)
- **The Daniels Family 2001 Revocable Trust v. Las Vegas Sands Corp., et al.,**
1:20-cv-08062-JMF (D. Nev. Jan. 5, 2021)
- **In re QuantumScape Securities Class Action Litigation,**
3:21-cv-00058-WHO (N.D. Cal. April 20, 2021)



Securities Class Action

- **In re Minerva Neurosciences, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
1:20-cv-12176-GAO (D. Mass. March 5, 2021)
- **White Pine Investments v. CVR Refining, LP, et al.,**
1:20-cv-02863-AT (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 5, 2021)
- **Yaroni v. Pintec Technology Holdings Limited, et al.,**
1:20-cv-08062-JMF (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 15, 2020)
- **Nickerson v. American Electric Power Company, Inc., et al.,**
2:20-cv-04243-SDM-EPD (S.D. Ohio Nov. 24, 2020)
- **Ellison v. Tufin Software Technologies Ltd., et al.,**
1:20-cv-05646-GHW (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 19, 2020)
- **Hartel v. The GEO Group, Inc., et al.,**
9:20-cv-81063-RS-SMM (S.D. Fla. Oct. 1, 2020)
- **Posey, Sr. v. Brookdale Senior Living, Inc., et al.,**
3:20-cv-00543-AAT (M.D. Tenn. Sept. 14, 2020)
- **Snyder v. Baozun Inc.,**
1:19-cv-11290-ALC-KNF (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 8, 2020)
- **In re eHealth Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
4:20-cv-02395-JST-LJC (N.D. Cal. Jun. 24, 2020)

“Class Counsel have demonstrated that they are skilled in this area of the law and therefore adequate to represent the Settlement Class as well.”

The Honorable Barry Ted Moskowitz in *In re Regulus Therapeutics Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 3:17-CV-182-BTM-RBB (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2020)

- **Mehdi v. Karyopharm Therapeutics Inc.,**
1:19-cv-11972-NMG (D. Mass. Apr. 29, 2020)
- **Brown v. Opera Ltd.,**
1:20-cv-00674-JGK (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 17, 2020)
- **In re Dropbox Sec. Litig.,**
5:19-cv-06348-BLF-SVK (N.D. Cal. Jan. 16, 2020)
- **In re Yunji Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
1:19-cv-6403-LDH-RML (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 3, 2020)
- **Zhang v. Valaris plc,**
1:19-cv-7816-NRB (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 23, 2019)
- **In re Sundial Growers Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
1:19-cv-08913-ALC-SN (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 20, 2019)
- **Costanzo v. DXC Technology Co.,**
5:19-cv-05794-BLF-VKD (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2019)



Securities Class Action

- **Ferraro Family Foundation, Inc. v. Corcept Therapeutics Incorporated,**
5:19-cv-1372-LHK-SVK (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2019)
- **Roberts v. Bloom Energy Corp.,**
4:19-cv-02935-HSG (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2019)
- **Luo v. Sogou Inc.,**
1:19-cv-00230-LJL (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 2, 2019)
- **In re Aphria Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
1:18-cv-11376-GBD-JEW (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2019)
- **Chew v. MoneyGram International, Inc.,**
1:18-cv-07537-MMP (N.D. Ill. Feb. 12, 2019)
- **Johnson v. Costco Wholesale Corp.,**
2:18-cv-01611-TSZ (W.D. Wash. Jan. 30, 2019)
- **Tung v. Dycom Industries, Inc.,**
9:18-cv-81448-RS-WM (S.D. Fla. Jan. 11, 2019)
- **Guyer v. MGT Capital Investments, Inc.,**
1:18-cv-09228-ER (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2019)
- **In re Adient plc Sec. Litig.,**
1:18-cv-09116-RA (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2018)
- **In re Prothena Corp. plc Sec. Litig.,**
1:18-cv-06425-ALC (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 31, 2018)

“ Vice Chancellor Sam Glasscock, III said “it’s always a pleasure to have counsel who are articulate and exuberant...” and referred to our approach to merger litigation as “wholesome” and “a model of... plaintiffs’ litigation in the merger arena.”

Ocieczanek v. Thomas Properties Group, C.A. No. 9029-VCG (Del. Ch. May 15, 2014)

- **Pierrelouis v. Gogo Inc.,**
1:18-cv-04473-JLA (N.D. Ill. Oct. 10, 2018)
- **Balestra v. Cloud With Me Ltd.,**
2:18-cv-00804-MRH-LPL (W.D. Pa. Oct. 18, 2018)
- **Balestra v. Giga Watt, Inc.,**
2:18-cv-00103-MKD (E.D. Wash. June 28, 2018)
- **Chandler v. Ulta Beauty, Inc.,**
1:18-cv-01577-MMP (N.D. Ill. June 26, 2018)
- **In re Longfin Corp. Sec. Litig.,**
1:18-cv-2933-DLC (S.D.N.Y. June 25, 2018)
- **Chahal v. Credit Suisse Group AG,**
1:18-cv-02268-AT-SN (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2018)



Securities Class Action

- **In re Bitconnect Sec. Litig.,**
9:18-cv-80086-DMM-DLB (S.D. Fla. June 19, 2018)
- **In re Aqua Metals Sec. Litig.,**
4:17-cv-07142-HSG (N.D. Cal. May 23, 2018)
- **Davy v. Paragon Coin, Inc.,**
4:18-cv-00671-JSW (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2018)
- **Rensel v. Centra Tech, Inc.,**
1:17-cv-24500-RNS-JB (S.D. Fla. Apr. 11, 2018)
- **Cullinan v. Cemtrex, Inc.**
2:17-cv-01067-SJF-AYS (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 3, 2018)
- **In re Navient Corporation Sec. Litig.,**
1:17-cv-08373-RBK-AMD (D.N.J. Feb. 2, 2018)
- **Huang v. Depomed, Inc.,**
3:17-cv-04830-JST (N.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2017)
- **In re Regulus Therapeutics Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
3:17-cv-00182-BTM-RBB (S.D. Cal. Oct. 26, 2017)
- **Murphy III v. JBS S.A.,**
1:17-cv-03084-ILG-RER (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 10, 2017)
- **Ohren v. Amyris, Inc.,**
3:17-cv-002210-WHO (N.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2017)
- **Beezley v. Fenix Parts, Inc.,**
2:17-cv-00233-SRC-CLW (D.N.J. June 28, 2017)
- **M & M Hart Living Trust v. Global Eagle Entertainment, Inc.,**
2:17-cv-01479-PA-MRW (C.D. Cal. June 26, 2017)
- **In re Insys Therapeutics, Inc.,**
1:17-cv-1954-PAC (S.D.N.Y. May 31, 2017)
- **Clevlen v. Anthera Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,**
3:17-cv-00715-RS (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2017)
- **In re Agile Therapeutics, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
3:17-cv-00119-AET-LHG (D.N.J. May 15, 2017)
- **Roper v. SITO Mobile Ltd.,**
2:17-cv-01106-ES-MAH (D.N.J. May 8, 2017)
- **In re Illumina, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
3:16-cv-03044-JL-MSB (S.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2017)
- **In re PTC Therapeutics, Inc.,**
2:16-cv-01224-KM-MAH (D.N.J. Nov. 14, 2016)
- **The TransEnterix Investor Group v. TransEnterix, Inc.,**
5:16-cv-00313-JCD (E.D.N.C. Aug. 30, 2016)
- **Gormley v. magicJack VocalTec Ltd.,**
1:16-cv-01869-VM (S.D.N.Y. July 12, 2016)



Securities Class Action

- **Azar v. Blount Int'l Inc.,**
3:16-cv-00483-MHS (D. Or. July 1, 2016)
- **Plumley v. Sempra Energy,**
3:16-cv-00512-RTB-AGS (S.D. Cal. June 6, 2016)
- **Francisco v. Abengoa, S.A.,**
1:15-cv-06279-ER (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2016)
- **De Vito v. Liquid Holdings Group, Inc.,**
2:15-cv-06969-KM-JBC (D.N.J. Apr. 7, 2016)
- **Ford v. Natural Health Trends Corp.,**
2:16-cv-00255-TJH-AFM (C.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2016)
- **Levin v. Resource Capital Corp.,**
1:15-cv-07081-LLS (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 24, 2015)
- **Martin v. Altisource Residential Corp.,**
1:15-cv-00024-AET-GWC (D.V.I. Oct. 7, 2015)
- **Paggos v. Resonant, Inc.,**
2:15-cv-01970-SJO-MRW (C.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2015)
- **Fragala v. 500.com Ltd.,**
2:15-cv-01463-JFW-CFE (C.D. Cal. July 7, 2015)
- **Stevens v. Quiksilver Inc.,**
8:15-cv-00516-JVS-JCG (C.D. Cal. June 26, 2015)
- **In re Ocean Power Technologies, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
3:14-cv-3799-FLW-LHG (D.N.J. Mar. 17, 2015)
- **In re Energy Recovery Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
3:15-cv-00265-EMC-LB (N.D. Cal. Jan. 20, 2015)
- **Ford v. TD Ameritrade Holding Corporation, et al.,**
8:14-cv-00396-JFB-SMB (D. Neb. Dec. 2, 2014)
- **In re China Commercial Credit Sec. Litig.,**
1:15-cv-00557-ALC (D.N.J. Oct. 31, 2014)
- **In re Violin Memory, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
4:13 cv-05486-YGR (N.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2014)
- **Berry v. KiOR, Inc.,**
4:13-cv-02443-LHR (S.D. Tex. Nov. 25, 2013)
- **In re OCZ Technology Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
3:12-cv-05265-RS (N.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2013)
- **In re Digital Domain Media Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.,**
2:12-cv-14333-JEM-FJL (S.D. Fla. Sept. 20, 2012)



Derivative, Corporate Governance & Executive Compensation

As a leader in achieving important corporate governance reforms for the benefit of shareholders, the Firm protects shareholders by enforcing the obligations of corporate fiduciaries. Our efforts include the prosecution of derivative actions in courts around the country, making pre-litigation demands on corporate boards to investigate misconduct, and taking remedial action for the benefit of shareholders. In situations where a company's board responds to a demand by commencing its own investigation, we frequently work with the board's counsel to assist with and monitor the investigation, ensuring that the investigation is thorough and conducted in an appropriate manner.

We have also successfully prosecuted derivative and class action cases to hold corporate executives and board members accountable for various abuses and to help preserve corporate assets through longlasting and meaningful corporate governance changes, thus ensuring that prior misconduct does not reoccur. We have extensive experience challenging executive compensation and recapturing assets for the benefit of companies and their shareholders. We have secured corporate governance changes to ensure that executive compensation is consistent

with shareholder-approved compensation plans, company performance, and federal securities laws.

In **Franchi v. Barabe**, C.A. No. 2020-0648-KSJM (Del. Ch.), the Firm secured \$6.7 million in economic benefits for Selecta Biosciences, Inc. in connection with insiders' participation in a private placement while in possession of material non-public information as well as the adoption of significant governance reforms designed to prevent a recurrence of the alleged misconduct.

The Firm was lead counsel in the derivative action styled **Police & Retirement System of the City of Detroit et al. v. Robert Greenberg et al.**, C.A. No. 2019-0578-MTZ (Del. Ch.). The action resulted in a settlement where Skechers Inc. cancelled nearly \$20 million in equity awards issued to Skechers' founder Robert Greenberg and two top officers in 2019 and 2020. Also, under the settlement, Skechers' board of directors must retain a consultant to advise on compensation decisions going forward.



Derivative, Corporate Governance & Executive Compensation

In **In re Google Inc. Class C Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 7469-CS (Del. Ch.), we challenged a stock recapitalization transaction to create a new class of nonvoting shares and strengthen the corporate control of the Google founders. We helped achieve an agreement that provided an adjustment payment to existing shareholders harmed by the transaction as well as providing enhanced board scrutiny of the Google founders' ability to transfer stock. Ultimately, Google's shareholders received payments of \$522 million and total net benefits estimated as exceeding \$3 billion.

In **In re Activision, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation**, Case No. 06-cv-04771-MRP-JTL (C.D. Cal.), we were Co-Lead Counsel and challenged executive compensation related to the dating of options. This effort resulted in the recovery of more than \$24 million in excessive compensation and expenses, as well as the implementation of substantial corporate governance changes.

“...A Model For How [The] Great Legal Profession Should Conduct Itself.”

Justice Timothy S. Driscoll in *Grossman v. State Bancorp, Inc.*, Index No. 600469/2011 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Nassau Cnty. Nov. 29, 2011)

In **Pfeiffer v. Toll** (Toll Brothers Derivative Litigation), C.A. No. 4140-VCL (Del. Ch.), we prevailed in defeating defendants' motion to dismiss in a case seeking disgorgement of profits that company insiders reaped through a pattern of insider-trading. After extensive discovery, we secured a settlement returning \$16.25 million in cash to the company, including a significant contribution from the individuals who traded on inside information.

In **Rux v. Meyer**, C.A. No. 11577-CB (Del. Ch.), we challenged the re-purchase by Sirius XM of its stock from its controlling stockholder, Liberty Media, at an inflated, above-market price. After defeating a motion to dismiss and discovery, we obtained a settlement where SiriusXM recovered \$8.25 million, a substantial percentage of its over-payment.

In **In re EZCorp Inc. Consulting Agreement Derivative Litig.**, C.A. No. 9962-VCL (Del. Ch.), we challenged lucrative consulting agreements between EZCorp and its controlling stockholders. After surviving multiple motions to dismiss, we obtained a settlement where EZCorp was repaid \$6.5 million it had paid in consulting fees, or approximately 33% of the total at issue and the consulting agreements were discontinued.



Derivative, Corporate Governance & Executive Compensation

In **Scherer v. Lu** (Diodes Incorporated), Case No. 13-358-GMS (D. Del.), we secured the cancellation of \$4.9 million worth of stock options granted to the company's CEO in violation of a shareholder-approved plan, and obtained additional disclosures to enable shareholders to cast a fully informed vote on the adoption of a new compensation plan at the company's annual meeting.

In **MacCormack v. Groupon, Inc.**, Case No. 13-940-GMS (D. Del.), we caused the cancellation of \$2.3 million worth of restricted stock units granted to a company executive in violation of a shareholder-approved plan, as well as the adoption of enhanced corporate governance procedures designed to ensure that the board of directors complies with the terms of the plan; we also obtained additional material disclosures to shareholders in connection with a shareholder vote on amendments to the plan.

In **Edwards v. Benson** (Headwaters Incorporated), Case No. 13-cv-330 (D. Utah), we caused the cancellation of \$3.2 million worth of stock appreciation rights granted to the company's CEO in violation of a shareholder-approved plan and the adoption of enhanced corporate governance procedures designed to ensure that the board of directors complies with the terms of the plan.

In **Pfeiffer v. Begley** (DeVry, Inc.), Case No. 12-CH-5105 (Ill. Cir. Ct. DuPage Cty.), we secured the cancellation of \$2.1 million worth of stock options granted to the company's CEO in 2008-2012 in violation of a shareholder-approved incentive plan.

In **Basch v. Healy** (EnerNOC), Case No. 13-cv-766 (D. Del.), we obtained a cash payment to the company to compensate for equity awards issued to officers in violation of the company's compensation plan and caused significant changes in the company's compensation policies and procedures designed to ensure that future compensation decisions are made consistent with the company's plans, charters and policies. We also impacted the board's creation of a new compensation plan and obtained additional disclosures to stockholders concerning the board's administration of the company's plan and the excess compensation.

In **Kleba v. Dees**, C.A. 3-1-13 (Tenn. Cir. Ct. Knox Cty.), we recovered approximately \$9 million in excess compensation given to insiders and the cancellation of millions of shares of stock options issued in violation of a shareholder-approved compensation plan. In addition, we obtained the adoption of formal corporate governance procedures designed to ensure that future compensation decisions are made independently and consistent with the plan.



Derivative, Corporate Governance & Executive Compensation

In **Lopez v. Nudelman** (CTI BioPharma Corp.), 14-2-18941-9 SEA (Wash. Super. Ct. King Cty.), we recovered approximately \$3.5 million in excess compensation given to directors and obtained the adoption of a cap on director compensation, as well as other formal corporate governance procedures designed to implement best practices with regard to director and executive compensation.

In **In re i2 Technologies, Inc. Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 4003-CC (Del. Ch.), as Counsel for the Lead Plaintiff, we challenged the fairness of certain asset sales made by the company and secured a \$4 million recovery.

In **In re Corinthian Colleges, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation**, Case No. 06-cv-777-AHS (C.D. Cal.), we were Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a \$2 million benefit for the company, resulting in the repricing of executive stock options and the establishment of extensive corporate governance changes.

In **In re Corinthian Colleges, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation**, Case No. 06-cv-777-AHS (C.D. Cal.), we were Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a \$2 million benefit for the company, resulting in the repricing of executive stock options and the establishment of extensive corporate governance changes.

In **Pfeiffer v. Alpert (Beazer Homes Derivative Litigation)**, Case No. 10-cv-1063-PD (D. Del.), we successfully challenged certain aspects of the company's executive compensation structure, ultimately forcing the company to improve its compensation practices.

In **In re Cincinnati Bell, Inc., Derivative Litigation**, Case No. A1105305 (Ohio, Hamilton Cty. C.P.), we achieved significant corporate governance changes and enhancements related to the company's compensation policies and practices in order to better align executive compensation with company performance. Reforms included the formation of an entirely independent compensation committee with staggered terms and term limits for service.

In **Woodford v. Mizel** (M.D.C. Holdings, Inc.), Case No. 1:11-cv-879 (D. Del.), we challenged excessive executive compensation, ultimately obtaining millions of dollars in reductions of that compensation, as well as corporate governance enhancements designed to implement best practices with regard to executive compensation and increased shareholder input.



Mergers & Acquisitions

Levi & Korsinsky has achieved an impressive record in obtaining injunctive relief for shareholders, and we are one of the premier law firms engaged in mergers & acquisitions and takeover litigation, consistently striving to maximize shareholder value. In these cases, we regularly fight to obtain settlements that enable the submission of competing buyout bid proposals, thereby increasing consideration for shareholders.

We have litigated landmark cases that have altered the landscape of mergers & acquisitions law and resulted in multi-million dollar awards to aggrieved shareholders.

In **In re Schuff International, Inc. Stockholders Litigation**, C.A. No. 10323-VCZ (Del. Ch.), we served as Co-Lead Counsel for the plaintiff class in achieving the largest recovery as a percentage of the underlying transaction consideration in Delaware Chancery Court merger class action history, obtaining an aggregate recovery of more than \$22 million -- a gross increase from \$31.50 to \$67.45 in total consideration per share (a 114% increase) for tendering stockholders.

In **In re Bluegreen Corp. Shareholder Litigation**, Case No. 502011CA018111 (Cir. Ct. for Palm Beach Cty., FL), as Co-Lead Counsel, we achieved a common fund recovery of \$36.5 million for minority shareholders in connection with a management-led buyout, increasing gross consideration to shareholders in connection with the transaction by 25% after three years of intense litigation.

In **In re CNX Gas Corp. Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 5377-VCL (Del. Ch.), as Plaintiffs' Executive Committee Counsel, we obtained a landmark ruling from the Delaware Chancery Court that set forth a unified standard for assessing the rights of shareholders in the context of freeze-out transactions and ultimately led to a common fund recovery of over \$42.7 million for the company's shareholders.

In **Chen v. Howard-Anderson**, C.A. No 5878-VCL (Del. Ch.), we represented shareholders in challenging the merger between Occam Networks, Inc. and Calix, Inc., obtaining a preliminary injunction against the merger after showing that the proxy statement by which the shareholders were solicited to vote for the merger was materially false and misleading. Post-closing, we took the case to trial and recovered an additional \$35 million for the shareholders.

Mergers & Acquisitions

In **In re Sauer-Danfoss Stockholder Litig.**, C.A. No. 8396 (Del. Ch.), as one of plaintiffs' co-lead counsel, we recovered a \$10 million common fund settlement in connection with a controlling stockholder merger transaction.

In **In re Yongye International, Inc. Shareholders' Litigation**, Consolidated Case No.: A-12-670468-B (District Court, Clark County, Nevada), as one of plaintiffs' co-lead counsel, we recovered a \$6 million common fund settlement in connection with a management-led buyout of minority stockholders in a China-based company incorporated under Nevada law.

In **In re Great Wolf Resorts, Inc. Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 7328-VCN (Del. Ch.), we achieved tremendous results for shareholders, including partial responsibility for a \$93 million (57%) increase in merger consideration and the waiver of several "don't-ask-don't-waive" standstill agreements that were restricting certain potential bidders from making a topping bid for the company.

In **In re Talecris Biotherapeutics Holdings Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 5614-VCL (Del. Ch.), we served as counsel for one of the Lead Plaintiffs, achieving a settlement that increased the merger consideration to Talecris shareholders by an additional 500,000 shares of the acquiring company's stock and providing shareholders with appraisal rights.

In **In re Minerva Group LP v. Mod-Pac Corp.**, Index No. 800621/2013 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Erie Cty.), we obtained a settlement in which defendants increased the price of an insider buyout from \$8.40 to \$9.25 per share, representing a recovery of \$2.4 million for shareholders.

In **Stephen J. Dannis v. J.D. Nichols**, C.A. No. 13-CI-00452 (Ky. Cir. Ct. Jefferson Cty.), as Co-Lead Counsel, we obtained a 23% increase in the merger consideration (from \$7.50 to \$9.25 per unit) for shareholders of NTS Realty Holdings Limited Partnership. The total benefit of \$7.4 million was achieved after two years of hard-fought litigation, challenging the fairness of the going-private, squeeze-out merger by NTS's controlling unitholder and Chairman, Defendant Jack Nichols. The unitholders bringing the action alleged that Nichols' proposed transaction grossly undervalued NTS's units. The 23% increase in consideration was a remarkable result given that on October 18, 2013, the Special Committee appointed by the Board of Directors had terminated the existing merger agreement with Nichols. Through counsel's tenacious efforts the transaction was resurrected and improved.



Mergers & Acquisitions

In **Dias v. Purches**, C.A. No. 7199-VCG (Del. Ch.), Vice Chancellor Sam Glasscock, III of the Delaware Chancery Court partially granted shareholders' motion for preliminary injunction and ordered that defendants correct a material misrepresentation in the proxy statement related to the acquisition of Parlux Fragrances, Inc. by Perfumania Holding, Inc.

In **In re Complete Genomics, Inc. Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 7888-VCL (Del. Ch.), we obtained preliminary injunctions of corporate merger and acquisition transactions, and Plaintiffs successfully enjoined a "don't-ask-don't-waive" standstill agreement.

In **Forgo v. Health Grades, Inc.**, C.A. No. 5716-VCS (Del. Ch.), as Co-Lead Counsel, our attorneys established that defendants had likely breached their fiduciary duties to Health Grades' shareholders by failing to maximize value as required under *Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.*, 506 A.2d 173 (Del. 1986). We secured an agreement with defendants to take numerous steps to seek a superior offer for the company, including making key modifications to the merger agreement, creating an independent committee to evaluate potential offers, extending the tender offer period, and issuing a "Fort Howard" release affirmatively stating that the company would participate in good faith discussions with any party making a bona fide acquisition proposal.

In **In re Pamrapo Bancorp Shareholder Litigation**, Docket C-89-09 (N.J. Ch. Hudson Cty.) & HUD-L-3608-12 (N.J. Law Div. Hudson Cty.), we defeated defendants' motion to dismiss shareholders' class action claims for money damages arising from the sale of Pamrapo Bancorp to BCB Bancorp at an allegedly unfair price through an unfair process. We then survived a motion for summary judgment, ultimately securing a settlement recovering \$1.95 million for the Class plus the Class's legal fees and expenses up to \$1 million (representing an increase in consideration of 15-23% for the members of the Class).

In **In re Integrated Silicon Solution, Inc. Stockholder Litigation**, Lead Case No. 115CV279142 (Super. Ct. Santa Clara, Cal.), we won an injunction requiring corrective disclosures concerning "don't-ask-don't-waive" standstill agreements and certain financial advisor conflicts of interests, and contributed to the integrity of a post-agreement bidding contest that led to an increase in consideration from \$19.25 to \$23 per share, a bump of almost 25 percent.

“I think you've done a superb job and I really appreciate the way this case was handled.”

Justice Timothy S. Driscoll in *Grossman v. State Bancorp, Inc.*, Index No. 600469/2011 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Nassau Cnty, Nov. 29, 2011)



Consumer Litigation

Levi & Korsinsky works hard to protect consumers by holding corporations accountable for defective products, false and misleading advertising, unfair or deceptive business practices, antitrust violations, and privacy right violations.

Our litigation and class action expertise combined with our in-depth understanding of federal and state laws enable us to fight for consumers who have been aggrieved by deceptive and unfair business practices and who purchased defective products, including automobiles, appliances, electronic goods, and other consumer products. The Firm also represents consumers in cases involving data breaches and privacy right violations. The Firm's attorneys have received a number of leadership appointments in consumer class action cases, including multidistrict litigation ("MDL"). Recently, Law.com identified the Firm as one of the top firms with MDL leadership appointments in the article titled, "There Are New Faces Leading MDLs. And They Aren't All Men" (July 6, 2020). Representative settled and ongoing cases include:

In **NV Security, Inc. v. Fluke Networks**, Case No. CV05-4217 GW (SSx) (C.D. Cal. 2005), we negotiated a settlement on behalf of purchasers of Test Set telephones in an action alleging that the Test Sets contained a defective 3-volt battery. We benefited the consumer class by obtaining the following relief: free repair of the 3-volt battery, reimbursement for certain prior repair, an advisory concerning the 3-volt battery on the outside of packages of new Test Sets, an agreement that defendants would cease to market and/or sell certain Test Sets, and a 42-month warranty on the 3-volt battery contained in certain devices sold in the future.

In **Re: Apple Inc. Device Performance Litig.**, Case No. 5:18-md-02827-EJD (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs' Executive Committee Counsel in proposed nationwide class action alleging that Apple purposefully throttled iPhone; Apple has agreed to pay up to \$310 million in cash (proposed settlement pending).



Consumer Litigation

In **Re: Intel Corp. CPU Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litig.**, Case No. 3:18-MD-02828 (D. Or.): Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel in proposed nationwide class action alleging that Intel manufactured and sold defective central processing units that allowed unauthorized access to consumer stored confidential information.

In **Re: ZF-TRW Airbag Control Units Products Liability Litig.**, Case No. 2:19-ML-02905-JAK-FFM (C.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Counsel in proposed nationwide class action alleging that defendant auto manufacturers sold vehicles with defective airbags.

In **Re: EpiPen (Epinephrine Injection, USP) Marketing, Sales Practices and Antitrust Litig.**, Case No. 2:17-MD-02785 (D. Kan.): Plaintiffs' Executive Committee Counsel in action alleging that Mylan and Pfizer violated antitrust laws and committed other violations relating to the sale of EpiPens. Nationwide class and multistate classes certified.

Sung, et al. v. Schurman Retail Group, Case No. 3:17-cv-02760-LB (N.D. Cal.): Co-Lead Class Counsel in nationwide class action alleging unauthorized disclosure of employee financial information; obtained final approval of nationwide class action settlement providing credit monitoring and identity theft restoration services through 2022 and cash payments of up to \$400.

Scott, et al. v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., Case No. 1:17-cv-00249-APM (D.D.C.): Co-Lead Class Counsel in nationwide class action settlement of claims alleging improper fees deducted from payments awarded to jurors; 100% direct refund of improper fees collected.

In **Re: Citrix Data Breach Litig.**, Case No. 19-cv-61350-RKA-PMH (S.D. Fla.): Interim Class Counsel in action alleging company failed to implement reasonable security measures to protect employee financial information; common fund settlement of \$2.25 million pending.

Bustos v. Vonage America, Inc., Case No. 2:06-cv-2308-HAA-ES (D.N.J.): Common fund settlement of \$1.75 million on behalf of class members who purchased Vonage Fax Service in an action alleging that Vonage made false and misleading statements in the marketing, advertising, and sale of Vonage Fax Service by failing to inform consumers that the protocol defendant used for the Vonage Fax Service was unreliable and unsuitable for facsimile communications.

Masterson v. Canon U.S.A., Case No. BC340740 (Cal. Super. Ct. L.A. Cty.): Settlement providing refunds to Canon SD camera purchasers for certain broken LCD repair charges and important changes to the product warranty.

A close-up photograph of a person's hand holding a fountain pen, poised to write on a document. The hand is in the foreground, and the background is blurred, showing other people in business attire.

Our Attorneys

Managing Partners

- EDUARD KORSINSKY
- JOSEPH E. LEVI

EDUARD KORSINSKY

Managing Partner



Eduard Korsinsky is the Managing Partner and Co-Founder of Levi & Korsinsky LLP, a national securities firm that has recovered billions of dollars for investors since its formation in 2003. For more than 24 years Mr. Korsinsky has represented investors and institutional shareholders in complex securities matters. He has achieved significant recoveries for stockholders, including a \$79 million recovery for investors of E-Trade Financial Corporation and a payment ladder indemnifying investors of Google, Inc. up to \$8 billion in losses on a ground-breaking corporate governance case. His firm serves as lead counsel in some of the largest securities matters involving Tesla, US Steel, Kraft Heinz and others. He has been named a New York "Super Lawyer" by Thomson Reuters and is recognized as one of the country's leading practitioners in class action and derivative matters.

Mr. Korsinsky is also a co-founder of CORE Monitoring Systems LLC, a technology platform designed to assist institutional clients more effectively monitor their investment portfolios and maximize recoveries on securities litigation.

Cases he has litigated include:

- **E-Trade Financial Corp. Sec. Litig.**, No. 07-cv-8538 (S.D.N.Y. 2007), \$79 million recovery
- **In re Activision, Inc. S'holder Derivative Litig.**, No. 06-cv-04771-MRP (JTLX)(C.D. Cal. 2006), recovered \$24 million in excess compensation
- **Corinthian Colleges, Inc., S'holder Derivative Litig.**, SACV-06-0777-AHS (C.D. Cal. 2009), obtained repricing of executive stock options providing more than \$2 million in benefits to the company

- **Pfeiffer v. Toll**, C.A. No. 4140-VCL (Del. Ch. 2010), \$16.25 million in insider trading profits recovered
- **In re Net2Phone, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, Case No. 1467-N (Del. Ch. 2005), obtained increase in tender offer price from \$1.70 per share to \$2.05 per share
- **In re Pamrapo Bancorp S'holder Litig.**, C-89-09 (N.J. Ch. Hudson Cty. 2011) & HUD-L-3608-12 (N.J. Law Div. Hudson Cty. 2015), obtained supplemental disclosures following the filing of a motion for preliminary injunction, pursued case post-closing, secured key rulings on issues of first impression in New Jersey and defeated motion for summary judgment

EDUARD KORSINSKY

Managing Partner

Cases he has litigated include:

- **In re Google Inc. Class C S'holder Litig.**, C.A. No. 19786 (Del. Ch. 2012), obtained payment ladder indemnifying investors up to \$8 billion in losses stemming from trading discounts expected to affect the new stock
- **Woodford v. M.D.C. Holdings, Inc.**, 1:2011cv00879 (D. Del. 2012), one of a few successful challenges to say on pay voting, recovered millions of dollars in reductions to compensation
- **iz Technologies, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, C.A. No. 4003-CC (Del. Ch. 2008), \$4 million recovered, challenging fairness of certain asset sales made by the company

PUBLICATIONS

- "Board Diversity: The Time for Change is Now, Will Shareholders Step Up?," *National Council on Teacher Retirement. FYI Newsletter* May 2021
- "The Dangers of Relying on Custodians to Collect Class Action Settlements.", *The Texas Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (TEXPERS) Investment Insights* April-May Edition (2021)
- "The Dangers of Relying on Custodians to Collect Class Action Settlements.", *Michigan Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (MAPERS) Newsletter* (2021)
- "The Dangers of Relying on Custodians to Collect Class Action Settlements.", *Florida Public Pension Trustees Association (FPPTA)* (2021)
- "NY Securities Rulings Don't Constitute Cyan Backlash", *Law360* (March 8, 2021)
- "Best Practices for Monitoring Your Securities Portfolio in 2021.", *Building Trades News Newsletter* (2020-2021)

- **Pfeiffer v. Alpert (Beazer Homes)**, C.A. No. 10-cv-1063-PD (D. Del. 2011), obtained substantial revisions to an unlawful executive compensation structure
- **In re NCS Healthcare, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, C.A. CA 19786, (Del. Ch. 2002), case settled for approximately \$100 million
- **Paraschos v. YBM Magnex Int'l, Inc.**, No. 98-CV-6444 (E.D. Pa.), United States and Canadian cases settled for \$85 million Canadian



- "Best Practices for Monitoring Your Securities Portfolio in 2021.", *The Texas Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (TEXPERS) Monitor* (2021)
- "Best Practices for Monitoring Your Securities Portfolio in 2021.", *Michigan Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (MAPERS) Newsletter* (2021)
- "Best Practices for Monitoring Your Securities Portfolio in 2021.", *Florida Public Pension Trustees Association (FPPTA)* (2021)
- Delaware Court Dismisses Compensation Case Against Goldman Sachs. ABA Section of Securities Litigation News & Developments (Nov. 7, 2011)
- SDNY Questions SEC Settlement Practices in Citigroup Settlement, ABA Section of Securities Litigation News & Developments (Nov. 7, 2011)
- New York Court Dismisses Shareholder Suit Against Goldman Sachs, ABA Section of Securities Litigation News & Developments (Oct. 31, 2011)

EDUARD KORSINSKY Managing Partner

EDUCATION

- New York University School of Law, LL.M. Master of Law(s) Taxation (1997)
- Brooklyn Law School, J.D. (1995)
- Brooklyn College, B.S., Accounting, *summa cum laude* (1992)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New York (1996)
- New Jersey (1996)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (1998)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (1998)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2006)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2010)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of New York (2011)
- United States District Court of New Jersey (2012)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (2013)

JOSEPH E. LEVI Managing Partner



Joseph E. Levi is a central figure in shaping and managing the Firm's securities litigation practice. Mr. Levi has been lead or co-lead in dozens of cases involving the enforcement of shareholder rights in the context of mergers & acquisitions and securities fraud. In addition to his involvement in class action litigation, he has represented numerous patent holders in enforcing their patent rights in areas including computer hardware, software, communications, and information processing, and has been instrumental in obtaining substantial awards and settlements.

Mr. Levi and the Firm achieved success on behalf of the former shareholders of Occam Networks in litigation challenging the Company's merger with Calix, Inc., obtaining a preliminary injunction against the merger due to material representations and omissions in the proxy solicitation. **Chen v. Howard-Anderson**, No. 5878-VCL (Del. Ch.). Vigorous litigation efforts continued to trial, resulting in a \$35 million recovery for shareholders.

Mr. Levi and the Firm served as lead counsel in **Weigard v. Hicks**, No. 5732-VCS (Del. Ch.), which challenged the acquisition of Health Grades by affiliates of Vestar Capital Partners. Mr. Levi successfully demonstrated to the Court of Chancery that the defendants had likely breached their fiduciary duties to Health Grades' shareholders by failing to maximize shareholder value. This ruling was used to reach a favorable settlement where defendants agreed to a host of measures designed to increase the likelihood of superior bid. Vice Chancellor Strine "applauded!" the litigation team for their preparation and the extraordinary high-quality of the briefing.

“ [The court] appreciated very much the quality of the argument..., the obvious preparation that went into it, and the ability of counsel...”



Vice Chancellor Sam Glasscock, III In *Dias V. Purches*, C.A. No. 7199-VCG (Del. Ch. Apr. 5, 2012)

JOSEPH E. LEVI Managing Partner

EDUCATION

- Brooklyn Law School, J.D., *magna cum laude* (1995)
- Polytechnic University, B.S., Electrical Engineering, *summa cum laude* (1984); M.S. Systems Engineering (1986)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New York (1996)
- New Jersey (1996)
- United States Patent and Trademark Office (1997)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (1997)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (1997)

A close-up photograph of two people in business attire shaking hands. One person is wearing a black watch with a dark face and a black strap. The background is blurred, showing an office setting with other people and papers.

Our Attorneys

Partners

- ADAM M. APTON
- DONALD J. ENRIGHT
- SHANNON L. HOPKINS
- GREGORY M. NESPOLE
- GREGORY M. POTREPKA
- NICHOLAS I. PORRITT
- MARK S. REICH
- DANIEL TEPPER
- ELIZABETH K. TRIPODI

ADAM M. APTON

Partner



Adam M. Apton focuses his practice on investor protection. He represents institutional investors and high net worth individuals in securities fraud, corporate governance, and shareholder rights litigation. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Apton defended corporate clients against complex mass tort, commercial, and products liability lawsuits. Thomson Reuters has selected Mr. Apton to the Super Lawyers "Rising Stars" list every year since 2016, a distinction given to only the top 2.5% of lawyers. He has also been awarded membership to the prestigious Lawyers of Distinction for his excellence in the practice of law and named to the "Lawdragon 500 X" list out of thousands of candidates in recognition of his place at the forefront of the legal profession.

Mr. Apton's past representations and successes include:

- **In re Tesla, Inc. Securities Litigation**, No. 3:18-cv-04865-EMC (N.D. Cal.) (trial counsel in class action representing Tesla investors who were harmed by Elon Musk's "funding secured" tweet from August 7, 2018)
- **In re Navient Corp. Securities Litigation**, 17-8373 (RBK/AMD) (D.N.J.) (lead counsel in class action against leading provider of student loans for alleged false and misleading statements about compliance with consumer protection laws)
- **In re Prothena Corporation Plc Securities Litigation**, 1:18-cv-06425-ALC (S.D.N.Y.) (\$15.75 million settlement fund against international drug company for false statements about development of lead biopharmaceutical product)
- **Martin v. Altisource Residential Corporation**, et al., 15-00024 (AET) (GWC) (D.V.I.) (\$15.5 million settlement fund against residential mortgage company for false statements about compliance with consumer regulations and corporate governance protocols)
- **Levin v. Resource Capital Corp., et al.**, 1:15-cv-07081-LLS (S.D.N.Y.) (\$9.5 million settlement in class action over fraudulent statements about toxic mezzanine loan assets)

ADAM M. APTON

Partner

- **Rux v. Meyer (Sirius XM Holdings Inc.)**, No. 11577 (Del. Ch.) (recovery of \$8.25 million against SiriusXM's Board of Directors for engaging in harmful related-party transactions with controlling stockholder, John C. Malone and Liberty Media Corp.)


PUBLICATIONS

- "Pleading Section 11 Liability for Secondary Offerings" *American Bar Association: Practice Points* (Jan. 4, 2017)
- "Second Circuit Rules in Indiana Public Retirement System v. SAIC, Inc." *American Bar Association: Practice Points* (Apr. 4, 2016)
- "Second Circuit Applies Omnicare to Statements of Opinion in Sanofi" *American Bar Association: Practice Points* (Mar. 30, 2016)
- "Second Circuit Rules in Action AG v. China North" *American Bar Association: Practice Points* (Sept. 14, 2015)

EDUCATION

- New York Law School, J.D., *cum laude* (2009), where he served as Articles Editor of the New York Law School Law Review and interned for the New York State Supreme Court, Commercial Division
- University of Minnesota, B.A., Entrepreneurial Management & Psychology, With Distinction (2006)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New York (2010)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2010)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2010)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (2015)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2016)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2016)
- California (2017)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of California (2017)
- United States District Court for the Central District of California (2017)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of California (2017)
- New Jersey (2020)
- United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (2020)

DONALD J. ENRIGHT

Partner



During his 26 years as a litigator and trial lawyer, Mr. Enright has handled matters in the fields of securities, commodities, consumer fraud and commercial litigation, with a particular emphasis on shareholder M&A and securities fraud class action litigation. He has been named as one of the leading financial litigators in the nation by Lawdragon, as a Washington, DC "Super Lawyer" by Thomson Reuters, and as one of the city's "Top Lawyers" by Washingtonian magazine.

Mr. Enright has shown a track record of achieving victories in federal trials and appeals, including:

- **Nathenson v. Zonagen**, Inc., 267 F. 3d 400, 413 (5th Cir. 2001)
- **SEC v. Butler**, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7194 (W.D. Pa. April 18, 2005)
- **Belizan v. Hershon**, 434 F. 3d 579 (D.C. Cir. 2006)
- **Rensel v. Centra Tech, Inc.**, 2021 WL 2659784 (11th Cir. June 29, 2021)

Most recently, in **In re Schuff International, Inc. Stockholders Litigation**, Case No. 10323-VCZ, Mr. Enright served as Co-Lead Counsel for the plaintiff class in achieving the largest recovery as a percentage of the underlying transaction consideration in Delaware Chancery Court merger class action history, obtaining an aggregate recovery of more than \$22 million -- a gross increase from \$31.50 to \$67.45 in total consideration per share (a 114% increase) for tendering stockholders.

Similarly, as Co-Lead Counsel in **In re Bluegreen Corp. Shareholder Litigation**, Case No. 502011CA018111 (Cir. Ct. for Palm Beach Cnty., Fla.), Mr. Enright achieved a \$36.5 million common fund settlement in the wake of a majority shareholder buyout, representing a 25% increase in total consideration to the minority stockholders.

DONALD J. ENRIGHT

Partner

Also, in **In re CNX Gas Corp. Shareholders Litigation**, C.A. No. 53377-VCL (Del. Ch. 2010), in which Levi & Korsinsky served upon plaintiffs' Executive Committee, Mr. Enright helped obtain the recovery of a common fund of over \$42.7 million for stockholders.

Mr. Enright has also played a leadership role in numerous securities and shareholder class actions from inception to conclusion. Most recently, he has served as lead counsel in several cryptocurrency-related securities class actions. His leadership has produced multi-million-dollar recoveries in shareholder class actions involving such companies as:

- Allied Irish Banks PLC
- Iridium World Communications, Ltd.
- En Pointe Technologies, Inc.
- PriceSmart, Inc.
- Polk Audio, Inc.
- Meade Instruments Corp.
- Xicor, Inc.
- Streamlogic Corp.
- Interbank Funding Corp.
- Riggs National Corp.
- UTStarcom, Inc.
- Manugistics Group, Inc.

Mr. Enright also has a successful track record of obtaining injunctive relief in connection with shareholder M&A litigation, having won preliminary injunctions or other injunctive relief in the cases of:

- **In re Portec Rail Products, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, G.D. 10-3547 (Ct. Com. Pleas Pa. 2010)
- **In re Craftmade International, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, C.A. No. 6950-VCL (Del. Ch. 2011)
- **Dias v. Purches**, C.A. No. 7199-VCG (Del. Ch. 2012)
- **In re Complete Genomics, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, C.A. No. 7888-VCL (Del. Ch. 2012)
- **In re Integrated Silicon Solution, Inc. Stockholder Litig.**, Lead Case No. 115CV279142 (Sup. Ct. Santa Clara, CA 2015)

DONALD J. ENRIGHT

Partner

Mr. Enright has also demonstrated considerable success in obtaining deal price increases for shareholders in M&A litigation. As Co-Lead Counsel in the matter of **In re Great Wolf Resorts, Inc. Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 7328-VCN (Del. Ch. 2012), Mr. Enright was partially responsible for a \$93 million (57%) increase in merger consideration and waiver of several "don't-ask-don't-waive" standstill agreements that were precluding certain potential bidders from making a topping bid for the company.

Similarly, Mr. Enright served as Co-Lead Counsel in the case of **Berger v. Life Sciences Research, Inc.**, No. SOM-C-12006-09 (NJ Sup. Ct. 2009), which caused a significant increase in the transaction price from \$7.50 to \$8.50 per share, representing additional consideration for shareholders of approximately \$11.5 million.

Mr. Enright also served as Co-Lead Counsel in **Minerva Group, LP v. Keane**, Index No. 800621/2013 (NY Sup. Ct. of Erie Cnty.) and obtained a settlement in which Defendants increased the price of an insider buyout from \$8.40 to \$9.25 per share.

The courts have consistently recognized and praised the quality of Mr. Enright's work. In **In re Interbank Funding Corp. Securities Litigation** (D.D.C. 02-1490), Judge Bates of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia observed that Mr. Enright had "...skillfully, efficiently, and zealously represented the class, and... worked relentlessly throughout the course of the case."

Similarly, in **Freeland v. Iridium World Communications, LTD**, (D.D.C. 99-1002), Judge Nanette Laughrey stated that Mr. Enright had done "an outstanding job" in connection with the recovery of \$43.1 million for the shareholder class.

And, in the matter of **Osieczanek v. Thomas Properties Group**, C.A. No. 9029-VCG (Del. Ch. 2013), Vice Chancellor Sam Glasscock of the Chancery Court of Delaware observed that "it's always a pleasure to have counsel [like Mr. Enright] who are articulate and exuberant in presenting their position," and that Mr. Enright's prosecution of a merger case was "wholesome" and served as "a model of . . . plaintiffs' litigation in the merger arena."

DONALD J. ENRIGHT Partner

PUBLICATIONS

- "SEC Enforcement Actions and Investigations in Private and Public Offerings," Securities: Public and Private Offerings, Second Edition, West Publishing 2007
- "Dura Pharmaceuticals: Loss Causation Redefined or Merely Clarified?" J. Tax'n & Reg. Fin. Inst. September/October 2007, Page 5

EDUCATION

- George Washington University School of Law, J.D. (1996), where he was a Member Editor of The George Washington University Journal of International Law and Economics from 1994 to 1996
- Drew University, B.A., Political Science and Economics, *cum laude* (1993)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- Maryland (1996)
- New Jersey (1996)
- United States District Court for the District of Maryland (1997)
- United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (1997)
- District of Columbia (1999)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (1999)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (1999)
- United States District Court for the District of Columbia (1999)
- United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (2004)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2005)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2006)
- United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2017)

SHANNON L. HOPKINS

Partner



Shannon L. Hopkins manages the Firm's Connecticut office. She was selected in 2013 as a New York "Super Lawyer" by Thomson Reuters. For more than a decade Ms. Hopkins has been prosecuting a wide range of complex class action matters in securities fraud, mergers and acquisitions, and consumer fraud litigation on behalf of individuals and large institutional clients. Ms. Hopkins has played a lead role in numerous shareholder securities fraud and merger and acquisition matters and has been involved in recovering multimillion-dollar settlements on behalf of shareholders, including:

- **E-Trade Financial Corp. S'holder Litig.**, No. 07-cv-8538 (S.D.N.Y. 2007), \$79 million recovery for the shareholder class
- **In re U.S. Steel Consolidated Cases**, Case No. 17-559-CB (W.D. Pa.), \$40 million recovery for shareholder class
- **In re Nutanix, Inc. Securities Litigation**, Case No. 3:19-cv-01651-WHO (the "Stock Case"), \$71 million for shareholder class
- **Rougier v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.**, Case No. 17-cv-2399 (S.D. Tex.), \$15.5 million recovery for shareholder class
- **In Re Helios and Matheson Analytics, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, Case No. 18-cv-6965-JGK (S.D.N.Y.), \$8.25 Million shareholder recovery
- **In re Restoration Robotics, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, Case No. 18-cv-03712-EJD (N.D. Cal.), \$4.175 million shareholder recovery
- **In Stein v. U.S. Xpress Enterprises, Inc.**, et al., Case No. 1:19-cv-98-TRM-CHS (E.D. Tenn.), \$4.3 million shareholder recovery
- **Kirkland, et al. v. WideOpenWest, Inc.**, et al., Index No. 653248/2018, \$7.025 million recovery for shareholder class

SHANNON L. HOPKINS

Partner

“Plaintiffs’ selected Class Counsel, the law firm of Levi & Korsinsky, LLP, has demonstrated the zeal and competence required to adequately represent the interests of the Class. The attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky have experience in securities and class actions issues and have been appointed lead counsel in a significant number of securities class actions across the country.”

The Honorable Christina Bryan In Rougier V. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc., No. 4:17-CV-02399 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2019)

In addition to her legal practice, Ms. Hopkins is a Certified Public Accountant (1998 Massachusetts). Prior to becoming an attorney, Ms. Hopkins was a senior auditor with PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, where she led audit engagements for large publicly held companies in a variety of industries.

“In appointing the Firm Lead Counsel, the Honorable Gary Allen Feess noted our “significant prior experience in securities litigation and complex class actions.”

Zaghian V. THQ, Inc., 2:12-Cv-05227-GAF-JEM (C.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 2012)

SHANNON L. HOPKINS

Partner

PUBLICATIONS

- "Cybercrime Convention: A Positive Beginning to a Long Road Ahead," 2 J. High Tech. L. 101 (2003)

EDUCATION

- Suffolk University Law School, J.D., *magna cum laude* (2003), where she served on the Journal for High Technology and as Vice Magister of the Phi Delta Phi International Honors Fraternity
- Bryant University, B.S.B.A., Accounting and Finance, *cum laude* (1995), where she was elected to the Beta Gamma Sigma Honor Society

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- Massachusetts (2003)
- United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (2004)
- New York (2004)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2004)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2004)
- United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2004)
- United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit (2008)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2010)
- Connecticut (2013)

GREGORY M. NESPOLE

Partner



Gregory Mark Nespole is a Partner of the Firm, having been previously a member of the management committee of one of the oldest firms in New York, as well as chair of that firm's investor protection practice. He specializes in complex class actions, derivative actions, and transactional litigation representing institutional investors such as public and labor pension funds, labor health and welfare benefit funds, and private institutions. Prior to practicing law, Mr. Nespole was a strategist on an arbitrage desk and an associate in a major international investment bank where he worked on structuring private placements and conducting transactional due diligence.

For over twenty years, Mr. Nespole has played a lead role in numerous shareholder securities fraud and merger and acquisition matters and has been involved in recovering multi-million-dollar settlements on behalf of shareholders, including:

- Served as co-chair of a Madoff Related Litigation Task Force that recovered over several hundred million dollars for wronged investors;
- Obtained a \$90 million award on behalf of a publicly listed company against a global bank arising out of fraudulently marketed auction rated securities;
- Successfully obtained multi-million-dollar securities litigation recoveries and/or corporate governance reforms from Cablevision, JP Morgan, American Pharmaceutical Partners, Sepracor, and MBIA, among many others.

Mr. Nespole is a member of The Federalist Society, the Federal Bar Council, and the FBC's Securities Litigation Committee. Mr. Nespole's peers have elected him a "Super Lawyer" in the class action field annually since 2009. He is active in his community as a youth sports coach.



GREGORY M. NESPOLE

Partner

EDUCATION

- Brooklyn Law School, J.D. (1993)
- Bates College, B.A. (1989)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New York (1994)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (1994)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (1994)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (1994)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (1994)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (1994)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of New York (2018)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (2019)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2020)

GREGORY M. POTREPKA

Partner



Gregory M. Potrepka is a partner of the Firm in its Connecticut office. Mr. Potrepka's practice specializes in vindicating investor rights, including the interests of shareholders of publicly traded companies. Specifically, Mr. Potrepka has considerable experience prosecuting complex class actions, securities fraud matters, and similar commercial litigation. Mr. Potrepka's role in the Firm's securities litigation practice has significantly contributed to many of the Firm's successes, including the following representative matters:

- **In re Nutanix, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, 3:19-01651-WHO (N.D. Cal.); Norton v. Nutanix, Inc., 3:21-cv-04080-WHO (N.D. Cal.) (\$71 million recovery)
- **In re U.S. Steel Consolidated Cases**, No. 17-579 (W.D. Pa.) (\$40 million recovery)
- **Rougier v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.**, No. 4:17-cv-2399 (S.D. Tex.) (\$15.5 million recovery)
- **In re Helios and Matheson Analytics, Inc. Securities Litigation**, No. 1:18-cv-06965 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$8.25 million recovery)
- **In re Aqua Metals Securities Litigation**, 17-cv-07142-HSG (N.D. Cal.) (\$7 million recovery)

ADMISSIONS

- Connecticut (2015)
- Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Court (2015)
- United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (2016)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2018)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2018)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2020)

EDUCATION

- University of Connecticut School of Law, J.D. (2015)
- University of Connecticut Department of Public Policy, M.P.A. (2015)
- University of Connecticut, B.A., Political Science (2010)

AWARD



NICHOLAS I. PORRITT

Partner



Nicholas Porritt prosecutes securities class actions, shareholder class actions, derivative actions, and mergers and acquisitions litigation. He has extensive experience representing plaintiffs and defendants in a wide variety of complex commercial litigation, including civil fraud, breach of contract, and professional malpractice, as well as defending SEC investigations and enforcement actions. Mr. Porritt has helped recover hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of shareholders. He was one of the Lead Counsel in **In re Google Inc. Class C Shareholder Litigation**, C.A. No. 7469-CS (Del. Ch.), which resulted in a payment of \$522 million to shareholders and overall benefit of over \$3 billion to Google's minority shareholders. He was one of the lead counsel in **Chen v. Howard-Anderson**, No. 5878-VCL (Del. Ch.) that settled during trial resulting in a \$35 million payment to the former shareholders of Occam Networks, Inc., one of the largest quasi-appraisal recoveries for shareholders. Amongst other cases, he is currently lead counsel in **In re Tesla, Inc. Securities Litigation**, No. 3:18-cv-04865-EMC (N.D. Cal.), representing Tesla investors who were harmed by Elon Musk's "funding secured" tweet from August 7, 2018 as well as lead counsel in **Ford v. TD Ameritrade Holding Corp.**, No. 14-cv-396 (D. Neb.), representing TD Ameritrade customers harmed by its improper routing of their orders. Both cases involve over \$1 billion in estimated damages.

Some of Mr. Porritt's recent cases include:

- **In re Tesla, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, 2020 WL 1873441 (N.D. Cal.2020)
- **In Re Aphria, Inc. Securities Litigation**, 2020 WL 5819548 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)
- **Voulgaris, v. Array Biopharma Inc.**, No. 17CV02789KLMCONSOLID, 2020 WL 8367829 (D. Colo.2020)
- **In Re Aphria, Inc. Securities Litigation**, No. 18 CIV. 11376 (GBD), 2020 WL 5819548 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)
- **In re Clovis Oncology, Inc. Deriv. Litig.**, 2019 WL 4850188 (Del. Ch. 2019)
- **Martin v. Altisource Residential Corp.**, 2019 WL 2762923 (D.V.I. 2019)
- **In re Navient Corp. Sec. Litig.**, 2019 WL 7288881 (D.N.J.2019)
- **In re Bridgestone Inv. Corp.**, 789 Fed. App'x 13 (9th Cir. 2019)
- **Klein v. TD Ameritrade Holding Corp.**, 327 F.R.D. 283 (D. Neb. 2018)

NICHOLAS I. PORRITT

Partner

Some of Mr. Porritt's recent cases include:

- **Beezley v. Fenix Parts, Inc.**, 2018 WL 3454490 (N.D. Ill. 2018)
- **In re PTC Therapeutics Sec. Litig.**, 2017 WL 3705801 (D.N.J. 2017)
- **Zaghian v. Farrell**, 675 Fed. Appx. 718. (9th Cir. 2017)
- **SEC v. Cuban**, 620 F.3d 551 (5th Cir. 2010)
- **Cozzarelli v. Inspire Pharmaceuticals, Inc.**, 549 F.3d 618 (4th Cir. 2008)
- **Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana v. Hunter**, 477 F.3d 162 (4th Cir. 2007)
- **In re PTC Therapeutics Sec. Litig.**, 2017 WL 3705801 (D.N.J. Aug. 28, 2017)

PUBLICATIONS

- "Current Trends in Securities Litigation: How Companies and Counsel Should Respond," *Inside the Minds. Recent Developments in Securities Law* (Aspatore Press 2010)

EDUCATION

- University of Chicago Law School, J.D., With Honors (1996)
- University of Chicago Law School, LL.M. (1993)
- Victoria University of Wellington, LL.B. (Hons.), With First Class Honors, Senior Scholarship (1990)

AWARDS



- **Gormley magicJack VocalTec Ltd.**, 220 F. Supp. 3d 510 (S.D.N.Y. 2016)
- **Carlton v. Cannon**, 184 F. Supp. 3d 428 (S.D. Tex. 2016)
- **Zola v. TD Ameritrade, Inc.**, 172 F. Supp. 3d 1055 (D. Neb. 2016)
- **In re Energy Recovery Sec. Litig.**, 2016 WL 324150 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2016)
- **In re EZCorp Inc. Consulting Agreement Deriv. Litig.**, 2016 WL 301245 (Del. Ch. Jan. 25, 2016)
- **In re Violin Memory Sec. Litig.**, 2014 WL 5525946 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2014)
- **Garnitschnig v. Horovitz**, 48 F. Supp. 3d 820 (D. Md. 2014)

ADMISSIONS

- New York (1997)
- District of Columbia (1998)
- United States District Court for the District of Columbia (1999) • United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2004)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (2004)
- United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (2006)
- United States Supreme Court (2006)
- United States District Court for the District of Maryland (2007) • United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2012)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2014)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (2015)
- United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2015) • United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit (2016)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit (2017) • United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (2019)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2019)

MARK S. REICH

Partner



Mark Samuel Reich is a Partner of the Firm. Mark's practice focuses on consumer class actions, including cases involving privacy and data breach issues, deceptive and unfair trade practices, advertising injury, product defect, and antitrust violations. Mark, who has experience and success outside the consumer arena, also supports the Firm's securities and derivative practices.

Mark is attentive to clients' interests and fosters their activism on behalf of class members. Clients he has worked with consistently and enthusiastically endorse Mark's work:

“ Mark attentively guided me through each stage of the litigation, prepared me for my deposition, and ensured that I and other wronged consumers were compensated and that purchasers in the future could not be duped by the appliance manufacturer's misleading marketing tactics.”

Katherine Danielkiewicz, Michigan

“ After my experience working with Mark and his colleague, any hesitancy I may have had in the past about leading or participating in a class action has gone away. Mark expertly countered every roadblock that the corporate defendant tried using to dismiss our case and we ultimately reached a resolution that exceeded my expectations”

Barry Garfinkle, Pennsylvania

MARK S. REICH

Partner

Before joining Levi Korsinsky, Mark practiced at the largest class action firm in the country for more than 15 years, including 8 years as a Partner. Prior to becoming a consumer and shareholder advocate, Mark practiced commercial litigation with an international law firm based in New York, where he defended litigations on behalf of a variety of corporate clients.

Mark has represented investors in securities litigation, devoted to protecting the rights of institutional and individual investors who were harmed by corporate misconduct. His case work involved **State Street Yield Plus Fund Litig.** (\$6.25 million recovery); **In re Doral Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig., SDNY** (\$129 million recovery); **Lockheed Martin Corp. Sec. Litig.** (\$19.5 million recovery); **Tile Shop Holdings, Inc.** (\$9.5 million settlement); **Curran v. Freshpet Inc.** (\$10.1 million settlement); **In re Jakks Pacific, Inc.** (\$3,925,000 settlement); **Fidelity Ultra Short Bond Fund Litig.** (\$7.5 million recovery); and **Cha v. Kinross Gold Corp.** (\$33 million settlement).

“ Never having been involved in a class action, I was uninformed and apprehensive. Mark and his colleagues not only explained the complexities, but maintained extensive ongoing, communications, involved us fully in all phases of the process; provided appropriate professional counsel and guidance to each participant, and achieved results that satisfied the original goals of the litigation”

Fred Sharp, New York

“ It was a pleasure being represented by Mark. Above all he was patient throughout the tedious process of litigation. He is a good listener and a good communicator, which enhanced my participation and understanding of the process. He also provided excellent follow up throughout, making the process feel more like a team effort.”

Louise Miljenovic, New Jersey

MARK S. REICH

Partner

At his prior firm, Mark achieved notable success challenging unfair mergers and acquisitions in courts throughout the country. Among the M&A litigation that Mark handled or participated in, his notable cases include: **In re Aramark Corp. S'holders Litig.**, where he attained a \$222 million increase in consideration paid to shareholders of Aramark and a substantial reduction to management's voting power – from 37% to 3.5% – in connection with the approval of the going-private transaction; **In re Delphi Fin. Grp. S'holders Litig.**, resulting in a \$49 million post-merger settlement for Class A Delphi shareholders; **In re TD Banknorth S'holders Litig.**, where Mark played a significant role in raising the inadequacy of the \$3 million initial settlement, which the court rejected as wholly inadequate, and later resulted in a vastly increased \$50 million recovery. Mark has also been part of ERISA litigation teams that led to meaningful results, including **In re Gen. Elec. Co. ERISA Litig.**, which resulting in structural changes to company's 401(k) plan valued at over \$100 million, benefiting current and future plan participants.

“ We contacted Mark about our concerns about our oven's failure to perform as advertised. He worked with us to formulate a strategy that ultimately led to a settlement that achieved our and others' goals and specific needs.”

Candace Oliarny, Idaho

“ My wife and I never having been involved with a law firm or Class Action had no idea what to expect. Within the first few phone meetings with Mark, we became assured as Mark explained in detail how the process worked, Mark is a great communicator. Mr. Reich is a true professional, his integrity through the years he worked with us was impeccable. Working with Mark was a truly positive experience, and have no reservations if we ever had to call on his services again.”

Louise Miljenovic, New Jersey

MARK S. REICH

Partner


Before joining the Firm, Mark graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree from Queens College in New York. He earned his Juris Doctor degree from Brooklyn Law School, where he served on the Moot Court Honor Society and The Journal of Law and Policy.

Mark regularly practices in federal and state courts throughout the country and is a member of the bar in New York. He has been recognized for his legal work by being named a New York Metro Super Lawyer by Super Lawyers Magazine every year since 2013. Mark is active in his local community and has been distinguished for his neighborhood support with a Certificate of Recognition by the Town of Hempstead.

EDUCATION

- Brooklyn Law School, J.D. (2000)
- Queens College, B.A., Psychology and Journalism (1997)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New York (2001)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2001)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2001)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of New York (2005)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (2017)

DANIEL TEPPER

Partner



Daniel Tepper is a Partner of the Firm with extensive experience in shareholder derivative suits, class actions and complex commercial litigation. Before he joined Levi & Korsinsky, Mr. Tepper was a partner in one of the oldest law firms in New York. He is an active member of the CPLR Committee of the New York State Bar Association and was an early member of its Electronic Discovery Committee. Mr. Tepper has been selected as a New York "Super Lawyer" in 2016 – 2023.

Some of the notable matters where Mr. Tepper had a leading role include:

- **Siegmund v. Bian**, Case No. 16-62506 (S.D. Fla.), achieving an estimated recovery of \$29.93 per share on behalf of a class of public shareholders of Linkwell Corp. who were forced to sell their stock at \$0.88 per share.
- **In re Platinum-Beechwood Litigation**, Case No. 18-06658 (S.D.N.Y.), achieved dismissal on behalf of an individual investor in Platinum Partners-affiliated investment fund.
- **Lakatamia Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Nobu Su**, Index No. 654860/2016 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Co. 2016), achieved dismissal on suit attempting to domesticate a \$40 million UK judgment in New York State.
- **Zelouf Int'l Corp. v. Zelouf**, 45 Misc.3d 1205(A) (Sup.Ct. N.Y. Co., 2014), representing the plaintiff in an appraisal proceeding triggered by freeze-out merger of closely-held corporation. Achieved a \$10 million verdict after eleven day trial, with the Court rejecting a discount for lack of marketability.
- **Sacher v. Beacon Assocs. Mgmt. Corp.**, 114 A.D.3d 655 (2d Dep't 2014), affirming denial of defendants' motion to dismiss shareholder derivative suit by Madoff feeder fund against fund's auditor for accounting malpractice.
- **In re Belzberg**, 95 A.D.3d 713 (1st Dep't 2012), compelling a non-signatory to arbitrate brokerage agreement dispute arising under doctrine of direct benefits estoppel.
- **Estate of DeLeo**, Case No. 353758/A (Surrog. Ct., Nassau Co. 2011), achieving a full plaintiff's verdict after a seven day trial which restored a multi-million dollar family business to its rightful owner.

DANIEL TEPPER


Partner

- **CMIA Partners Equity Ltd. v. O'Neill**, 2010 NY Slip Op 52068(U) (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co., 2010). Representing the independent directors of a Cayman Islands investment fund, won a dismissal on the pleadings in the first New York State case examining shareholder derivative suits under Cayman Islands law.
- **Hecht v. Andover Assocs. Mgmt. Corp.**, 27 Misc 3d 1202(A) (Sup. Ct. Nassau Co., 2010), aff'd, 114 A.D.3d 638 (2d Dep't 2014). Participated in a \$213 million global settlement in the first Madoff-related lawsuit in the country to defeat a motion to dismiss.

EDUCATION

- New York University School of Law, J.D. (2000)
- The University of Texas at Austin, B.A. with Honors (1997), National Merit Scholar

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- Massachusetts (2001)
- New York (2002)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2004)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2010)
- United States District Court for the Western District of New York (2019)

ELIZABETH K. TRIPODI

Partner



Elizabeth K. Tripodi focuses her practice on shareholder protection, representing investors in securities fraud litigation, corporate derivative litigation, and litigation involving mergers, acquisitions, tender offers, and change-in-control transactions. Ms. Tripodi has been named as a Washington, D.C. "Super Lawyer" in the securities field and was selected as a "Rising Star" by Thomson Reuters for several consecutive years.

Ms. Tripodi's current representations include:

- **In re Tesla, Inc. Securities Litigation**, No. 3:18-cv-04865-EMC (N.D. Cal.) (lead counsel in class action representing Tesla investors who were harmed by Elon Musk's "funding secured" tweet from August 7, 2018)

Ms. Tripodi has played a lead role in obtaining monetary recoveries for shareholders in M&A litigation:

- **In re Schuff International, Inc. Stockholders Litigation**, Case No. 10323-

VCZ, achieving the largest recovery as a percentage of the underlying transaction consideration in Delaware Chancery Court merger class action history, obtaining an aggregate recovery of more than \$22 million -- a gross increase from \$31.50 to \$67.45 in total consideration per share (a 114% increase) for tendering stockholders

- **In re Bluegreen Corp. S'holder Litig.**, Case No. 502011CA018111 (Circuit Ct. for Palm Beach Cty., FL), creation of a \$36.5 million common fund settlement in the wake of a majority shareholder buyout, representing a 25% increase in total consideration to the minority stockholders
- **In re Cybex International S'holder Litig**, Index No. 653794/2012 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2014), recovery of \$1.8 million common fund, which represented an 8% increase in stockholder consideration in connection with management-led cash-out merger
- **In re Great Wolf Resorts, Inc. S'holder Litig**, C.A. No. 7328-VCN (Del. Ch. 2012), where there was a \$93 million (57%) increase in merger consideration

ELIZABETH K. TRIPODI

Partner

- **Minerva Group, LP v. Keane**, Index No. 800621/2013 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2013), settlement in which Defendants increased the price of an insider buyout from \$8.40 to \$9.25 per share

Ms. Tripodi has played a key role in obtaining injunctive relief while representing shareholders in connection with M&A litigation, including obtaining preliminary injunctions or other injunctive relief in the following actions:

- **In re Portec Rail Products, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, G.D. 10-3547 (Ct. Com. Pleas Pa. 2010)
- **In re Craftmade International, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, C.A. No. 6950-VCL (Del. Ch. 2011) • **Dias v. Purches, et al.**, C.A. No. 7199-VCG (Del. Ch. 2012)
- **In re Complete Genomics, Inc. S'holder Litig.**, C.A. No. 7888-VCL (Del. Ch. 2012)
- **In re Integrated Silicon Solution, Inc. Stockholder Litig.**, Lead Case No. 115CV279142 (Sup. Ct. Santa Clara, CA 2015)

Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Ms. Tripodi was a member of the litigation team that served as Lead Counsel in, and was responsible for, the successful prosecution of numerous class actions, including: **Rudolph v. UTStarcom** (stock option backdating litigation obtaining a \$9.5 million settlement); **Grecian v. Meade Instruments** (stock option backdating litigation obtaining a \$3.5 million settlement).

ELIZABETH K. TRIPODI

Partner

EDUCATION

- American University Washington College of Law, *cum laude* (2006), where she served as Co-Editor in Chief of the Business Law Journal (f/k/a Business Law Brief), was a member of the National Environmental Moot Court team, and interned for Environmental Enforcement Section at the Department of Justice
- Davidson College, B.A., Art History (2000)

ADMISSIONS

- Virginia (2006)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia (2006)
- District of Columbia (2008)
- United States District Court for the District of Columbia (2010)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (2018)

AWARDS



A photograph of an attorney in a dark suit and tie, sitting at a desk. He is holding a black pen in his right hand, which has a gold ring on the ring finger. In front of him are several documents and a spiral-bound notebook. The background is softly blurred, showing what appears to be a modern office setting.

Our Attorneys

Counsel

- ANDREW E. LENCYK
- COURTNEY E. MACCARONE

ANDREW E. LENCYK Counsel



Andrew E. Lencyk is Counsel to the Firm. Prior to joining the Firm, Mr. Lencyk was a partner in an established boutique firm in New York specializing in securities litigation. He was graduated magna cum laude from Fordham College, New York, with a B.A. in Economics and History, where he was a member of the College's Honors Program, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. Mr. Lencyk received his J.D. from Fordham University School of Law, where he was a member of the Fordham Urban Law Journal. He was named to the 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 Super Lawyers®, New York Metro Edition.

Mr. Lencyk has co-authored the following articles for the Practicing Law Institute's Accountants' Liability Handbooks:

- *Liability in Forecast and Projection Engagements: Impact of Luce v. Edelstein*
 - *An Accountant's Duty to Disclose Internal Control Weaknesses*
 - *Whistle-blowing: An Accountants' Duty to Disclose A Client's Illegal Acts*
- *Pleading Motions under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995*
 - *Discovery Issues in Cases Involving Auditors (co-authored and appeared in the 2002 PLI Handbook on Accountants' Liability After Enron.)*

In addition, he co-authored the following article for the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Corporate & Securities Law Updates:

- *Safe Harbor Provisions for Forward-Looking Statements (co-authored and published by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Corporate & Securities Law Updates, Vol. II, May 12, 2000)*

ANDREW E. LENCYK Counsel

Cases in which Mr. Lencyk actively represented plaintiffs include:

- **Kirkland et al. v. WideOpenWest, Inc.**, Index No. 653248/2018 (Sup. Ct, NY County) (substantially denying defendants' motion to dismiss Section 11 and 12(a)(2) claims)
- **In re Community Psychiatric Centers Securities Litigation**, SA CV-91-533-AHS (Eex) (C.D. Cal.) and **McGann v. Ernst & Young**, SA CV-93-0814-AHS (Eex) (C.D. Cal.) (recovery of \$54.5 million against company and its outside auditors)
- **In re Danskin Securities Litigation**, Master File No. 92 CIV. 8753 (JSM) (S.D.N.Y.);
- **In re JWP Securities Litigation**, Master File No. 92 Civ. 5815 (WCC) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovery of approximately \$36 million)
- **In re Porta Systems Securities Litigation**, Master File No. 93 Civ. 1453 (TCP) (E.D.N.Y.);
- **In re Leslie Fay Cos. Securities Litigation**, No. 92 Civ. 8036 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$35 million recovery)
- **Berke v. Presstek, Inc.**, Civ. No. 96-347-M (MDL Docket No. 1140) (D.N.H.) (\$22 million recovery)
- **In re Micro Focus Securities Litigation**, No. C-01-01352-SBA-WDB (N.D. Cal.)
- **Dusek v. Mattel, Inc., et al.**, CV99-10864 MRP (C.D. Cal.) (\$122 million global settlement)
- **In re Sonus Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation-II**, No. 06-CV-10040 (MLW) (D. Mass.)
- **In re AIG ERISA Litigation**, No. 04 Civ. 9387 (JES) (S.D.N.Y.) (\$24.2 million recovery)
- **In re Mutual Funds Investment Litigation**, MDL No. 1586 (D. Md.)
- **In re Alger, Columbia, Janus, MFS, One Group, Putnam, Allianz Dresdner**, MDL No. 15863-JFM - Allianz Dresdner subtrack (D. Md.)
- **In re Alliance, Franklin/Templeton, Bank of America/Nations Funds and Pilgrim Baxter**, MDL No. 15862-AMD – Franklin/Templeton subtrack (D. Md.)
- **In re AIG ERISA Litigation II**, No. 08 Civ. 5722 (LTS) (S.D.N.Y.) (\$40 million recovery); and
- **Flynn v. Sientra, Inc.**, CV-15-07548 SJO (RAOx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$10.9 million recovery) (co-lead counsel) Court decisions in which Mr. Lencyk played an active role on behalf of plaintiffs include:
- **Pub. Empls' Ret. Sys. of Miss. v. TreeHouse Foods**, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22717 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 12, 2018) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss in its entirety)

ANDREW E. LENCYK

Counsel

- **Flynn v. Sientra, Inc.**, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83409 (C.D. Cal. June 9, 2016) (denying in substantial part defendants' motions to dismiss Section 10(b), Section 11 and 12(b)(2) claims), motion for reconsideration denied, slip op. (C.D. Cal. Aug 12, 2016)
- **In re Principal U.S. Property Account ERISA Litigation**, 274 F.R.D. 649 (S.D. Iowa 2011) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss)
- **In re AIG ERISA Litigation II**, No. 08 Civ. 5722(LTS), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35717 (S.D.N.Y. May 31, 2011) (denying in substantial part defendants' motions to dismiss), renewed motion to dismiss denied, slip op. (S.D.N.Y. June 26, 2014)
- **In re Mutual Funds Investment Litigation**, 384 F. Supp. 2d 845 (D. Md. 2005) (denying in substantial part defendants' motions to dismiss), *In re Alger, Columbia, Janus, MFS, One Group, Putnam, Allianz Dresdner*, MDL No. 15863-JFM - Allianz Dresdner subtrack (D. Md. Nov. 3, 2005) (denying in substantial part defendants' motions to dismiss), and *In re Alliance, Franklin/Templeton, Bank of America/Nations Funds and Pilgrim Baxter*, MDL No. 15862-AMD - Franklin/Templeton subtrack (D. Md. June 27, 2008) (same)
- **In re AIG ERISA Litigation**, No. 04 Civ. 9387 (JES) (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 12, 2006) (denying defendants' motions to dismiss in their entirety)
- **Dusek v. Mattel, Inc., et al.**, CV99-10864 MRP (C.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2001) (denying defendants' motions to dismiss Section 14(a) complaint in their entirety) • *In re Micro Focus Sec. Litig.*, Case No. C-00-20055 SW (N.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2000) (denying motion to dismiss Section 11 complaint);
- **Zuckerman v. FoxMeyer Health Corp.**, 4 F. Supp.2d 618 (N.D. Tex. 1998) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss in its entirety in one of the first cases decided in the Fifth Circuit under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995)
- **In re U.S. Liquids Securities Litigation**, Master File No. H-99-2785 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2001) (denying motion to dismiss Section 11 claims)
- **Sands Point Partners, L.P., et al. v. Pediatrix Medical Group, Inc., et al.**, Case No. 99-6181-CIV-Zloch (S.D. Fla. June 6, 2000) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss in its entirety)
- **Berke v. Presstek, Inc.**, Civ. No. 96-347-M (MDL Docket No. 1140) (D.N.H. Mar. 30, 1999) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss)
- **Chalverus v. Pegasystems, Inc.**, 59 F. Supp. 2d 226 (D. Mass. 1999) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss);

ANDREW E. LENCYK Counsel

- **Danis v. USN Communications, Inc.**, 73 F. Supp. 2d 923 (N.D. Ill. 1999) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss)

EDUCATION

- Fordham University School of Law, J.D. (1992)
- Fordham College, B.A. *magna cum laude*, 1988)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- Connecticut (1992)
- New York (1993)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2004)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2004)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2015)

COURTNEY E. MACCRONE Counsel




Courtney E. MacCarone focuses her practice on prosecuting consumer class actions. Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Ms. MacCarone was an associate at a boutique firm in New York specializing in class action litigation. While attending Brooklyn Law School, Ms. MacCarone served as the Executive Symposium Editor of the Brooklyn Journal of International Law and was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society. Her note, "Crossing Borders: A TRIPS-Like Treaty on Quarantines and Human Rights" was published in the Spring 2011 edition of the Brooklyn Journal of International Law.

Ms. MacCarone also gained experience in law school as an intern to the Honorable Martin Glenn of the Southern District of New York Bankruptcy Court and as a law clerk at a New York City-based class action firm. Ms. MacCarone has been recognized as a Super Lawyer "Rising Star" for the New York Metro area every year since 2014.

EDUCATION

- Brooklyn Law School, J.D., *magna cum laude* (2011)
- New York University, B.A., *magna cum laude* (2008)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New Jersey (2011)
- New York (2012)
- United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (2012)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2012)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2012)



Our Attorneys

Associates

- RACHEL BERGER
- JORDAN A. CAFRITZ
- MORGAN EMBLETON
- NOAH GEMMA
- DEVYN R. GLASS
- GARY ISHIMOTO
- DAVID C. JAYNES
- ALEXANDER KROT
- NICHOLAS R. LANGE
- ADAM C. MCCALL
- AMANDA MILLER
- MELISSA MULLER
- CINAR ONEY
- BRIAN STEWART
- CORREY A. SUK
- COLE VON RICHTHOEFEN
- MAX WEISS

RACHEL BERGER

Associate



Rachel Berger is an Associate with the Firm's Connecticut office. Her practice focuses on prosecuting securities fraud class actions on behalf of aggrieved investors.

Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Ms. Berger practiced securities litigation with another top New York class action firm, where she represented classes of aggrieved shareholders and cryptocurrency purchasers against prominent defendants, including multiple Fortune 500 companies.

While in law school, Ms. Berger interned with a leading ESG institute, focusing on the intersection of ESG and securities law. She was also a member of the Fordham Urban Law Journal, the Fordham Mediation and Tax Clinics, and the Immigration Advocacy Project. Ms. Berger received the Paul R. Brenner Scholarship Award, as well as the Archibald R. Murray Public Service Award, cum laude, in recognition of her significant pro bono work.

Ms. Berger practices remotely from her home in St. Louis, Missouri.

EDUCATION

- Fordham University School of Law, J.D. (2019)
- Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University, B.A. Economics (2015)

ADMISSIONS

- New York (2020)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2020)
- District of Colorado (2023)

JORDAN A. CAFRITZ

Associate



Jordan Cafritz is an Associate with the Firm's Washington, D.C. office. While attending law school at American University he was an active member of the American University Business Law Review and worked as a Rule 16 attorney in the Criminal Justice Defense Clinic. After graduating from law school, Mr. Cafritz clerked for the Honorable Paul W. Grimm in the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

EDUCATION

- American University Washington College of Law, J.D. (2014)
- University of Wisconsin-Madison, B.A., Economics & History (2010)

ADMISSIONS

- Maryland (2014)
- District of Columbia (2018)

MORGAN EMBLETON

Associate



Morgan M. Embleton is an associate in the Firm's Connecticut office. Since 2018, Ms. Embleton has focused her practice on federal securities class actions and protecting the interests of shareholders of publicly traded companies.

Prior to that, Ms. Embleton litigated matters arising under the False Claims Act, Jones Act, Longshore Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Louisiana Whistleblower Act, and Louisiana Environmental Whistleblower Act, as well as pharmaceutical mass torts and products liability claims. Ms. Embleton has extensive experience prosecuting securities fraud matters, complex class actions, and multidistrict litigations.

Ms. Embleton received her J.D. and Environmental Law Certificate from Tulane University Law School in 2014. During her time in law school, Ms. Embleton was a student attorney in the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic, a member of the Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property, and the Assistant Director of Research and Development for the Durationator.

EDUCATION

- Tulane University Law School, J.D. and Environmental Law Certificate (2014)
- University of Colorado at Boulder, B.A., *cum laude*, Sociology (2010)

ADMISSIONS

- Louisiana (2014)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana (2015)
- United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana (2016)
- United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana (2016)
- United States Court of Federal Claims (2016)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (2016)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (2017)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (2020)

NOAH GEMMA

Associate



Noah Gemma worked previously as a summer associate at a boutique commercial litigation firm. There, Mr. Gemma drafted briefs and other legal memoranda on behalf of national and closely held corporations in complex federal and state court litigation. In particular, Mr. Gemma helped the firm: (i) win multiple motions to dismiss on behalf of a national bank and a national bonding company in federal court cases involving alleged fraud and other alleged improprieties; (ii) settle an avoidable preference action on behalf of a national hauling company in a federal bankruptcy proceeding for a small fraction of the alleged damages; (iii) settle a negligence action on behalf of a court appointed fiduciary against officers of a defunct company and its insurance carrier on advantageous terms; and (iv) secure a favorable decision on behalf of a national bonding company before the state supreme court.

Mr. Gemma also served as a judicial intern for the Honorable Judge Bruce M. Selya in the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and for the Honorable Judge Virginia M. Hernandez Covington in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida. Using his experience representing the interests of national and closely held corporations to analyze and assess potential cases of corporate impropriety, Mr. Gemma currently prosecutes corporate and director malfeasance through the preparation and filing of shareholder mergers and acquisitions actions and corporate governance litigation.

EDUCATION

- Georgetown University Law Center, J.D., Editor for *The Georgetown Law Journal* (2021)
- Providence College, B.A. (2018)

ADMISSIONS

- Rhode Island (2021)
- District of Columbia (2022)

DEVYN R. GLASS

Associate



Devyn R. Glass currently focuses her practice on representing investors in federal securities fraud litigation.

Prior to joining the firm, Ms. Glass gained substantial experience at a national boutique firm specializing in complex litigation across a variety of practice areas representing both plaintiffs and defendants. Since 2017, Ms. Glass has focused her practice on consumer and shareholder protection, litigating numerous class action lawsuits across the country that involved data privacy and data breach, deceptive and unfair trade practices, and securities fraud.

At her prior firms, Ms. Glass played a pivotal role in obtaining monetary recoveries and/or injunctive relief on behalf of shareholders and consumers. Notable cases include: *Lowry v. RTI Surgical Holdings, Inc. et al.*, (D. Ill.) (obtaining \$10.5 million on behalf of a shareholder class alleging violations of the federal securities laws); *In re Google Plus Profile Litigation*, (N.D. Cal.) (obtaining \$7.5 million on behalf of a consumer class exposed to a years-long data breach); and *Barrett v. Pioneer Natural Resources USA, Inc.*, (D. Colo.) (obtaining \$500,000 on behalf of more than 8,000 current and former 401(k) plan participants alleging violations of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act).

EDUCATION

- Loyola University College of Law, New Orleans, J.D., *cum laude* (2016), where she received a Certificate of Concentration in Law, Technology and Entrepreneurship, served as a member of the *Loyola Journal of Public Interest Law*, and interned for the Louisiana Second Circuit Court of Appeals
- Louisiana Tech University, B.A., *cum laude* (2013), Political Science, minor in English

ADMISSIONS

- New York (2017)
- District of Columbia (2017)
- United States District Court District of Columbia (2018)
- United States District Court District of Colorado (2018)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (2022)

GARY ISHIMOTO

Associate



Gary Ishimoto is an Associate working remotely with Levi and Korsinsky's Consumer Litigation Team. During law school, he worked at the Small Business Law Clinic helping to draft incorporation papers, non-compete clauses, IP assignments, board consent, and stock purchase agreements for start-up businesses. He also interned for the Rossi Law Group.

EDUCATION

- Pepperdine School of Law, J.D. (2020)
- California State University, Northridge, B.S. (2013)

ADMISSIONS

- Massachusetts (2021)
- New Hampshire (2022)

DAVID C. JAYNES

Associate



David C. Jaynes focuses his practice on investor protection and securities fraud litigation. In addition to his law degree, Mr. Jaynes has graduate degrees in business administration and finance. Prior to joining the firm, David worked in the Enforcement Division of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission in the Salt Lake Regional Office as part of the Student Honors Program. Mr. Jaynes began his career as a prosecutor and has significant trial experience.

While at Levi & Korsinsky, Mr. Jaynes has actively represented plaintiffs in the following securities class actions:

- **In re U. S. Steel Consolidated Cases**, Civil Action No. 17-579 (W.D. Pa.)
- **Stein v. U.S. Xpress Enterprises, Inc.**, et al., 1:19-cv-98-TRM-CHS (E.D. Tenn.)
- **John P. Norton, On Behalf Of The Norton Family Living Trust** UAD 11/15/2002 v. Nutanix, Inc. et al, 3:21-cv-04080 (N.D. Cal.)

Mr. Jaynes has also had a role in litigating the following securities actions:

- **Ferraro Family Foundation, Inc. v. Corcept Therapeutics Incorporated**, 5:19-cv-1372-LHK (N.D. Cal.)
- **The Daniels Family 2001 Revocable Trust v. Las Vegas Sands Corp.**, et al., 1:20-cv-08062-JMF (D. Nev.)
- **Dan Kohl v. Loma Negra Compania Industrial Argentina Sociedad Anonima**, et al., Index No. 653114/2018 (Sup. Ct., County of New York)

EDUCATION

- University of Utah, M.S., Finance (2020)
- University of Utah, M.B.A (2020)
- The George Washington University Law School, J.D. (2015)
- Brigham Young University, B.A., Middle East Studies and Arabic (2009)

ADMISSIONS

- Maryland (2015)
- Utah (2016)
- United States District Court for the District of Utah (2016)
- California (2021)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of California (2022)
- United States District Court for the Central District of California (2023)
- District of Colorado (2023)

ALEXANDER KROT

Associate



EDUCATION

- American University, Kogod School of Business, M.B.A. (2012)
- Georgetown University Law Center, LL.M., Securities and Financial Regulation, With Distinction (2011)
- American University Washington College of Law, J.D. (2010)
- The George Washington University, B.B.A., concentrations in Finance and International Business (2003)

ADMISSIONS

- Maryland (2011)
- District of Columbia (2014)
- United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2015)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit (2016)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin (2017)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (2018)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (2020)

NICHOLAS R. LANGE

Associate





Based in Chicago, Illinois, Nicholas R. Lange is a remote member of the Firm's Connecticut office, where he focuses his practice in investor fraud and federal securities litigation. Prior to joining the Firm, Nicholas specialized in complex class action litigation and multi-district proceedings, including participation in some of the country's largest actions, with a focus in technology and consumer privacy.

As recognition for his class action work, Nicholas R. Lange received the Super Lawyers Rising Star award for 2023 (Class Action/Mass Torts).

EDUCATION

- DePaul University College of Law, J.D. (2014)
- University of Illinois and Urbana/Champaign, B.A. (2011)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- Illinois (2014)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (2016)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois (2020)
- United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2020)

ADAM C. MCCALL

Associate



Mr. McCall is an Associate with the Firm. Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Mr. McCall was an extern at the Securities and Exchange Commission's Division of Corporate Finance.

EDUCATION

- Georgetown University Law Center, LL.M., Securities and Financial Regulation (2015)
- California Western School of Law, J.D., *cum laude* (2013)
- Santa Clara University, Certificate of Advanced Accounting Proficiency (2010)
- University of Southern California, B.A. Economics (2008)

ADMISSIONS

- California (2014)
- United States District Court for the Central District of California (2015)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (2015)
- United States District Court for the Northern District of California (2015)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of California (2015)
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (2016)
- District of Columbia (2017)

AMANDA MILLER

Associate



Amanda Miller is an Associate in Levi and Korsinsky's Stamford office where she focuses her practice on federal securities litigation.

Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Amanda gained substantial experience at a boutique Boston firm where she was trained in securities and business litigation.

Amanda received her Juris Doctorate degree from Suffolk University Law School with an International Law concentration with Distinction and was selected to join the International Legal Honor Society of Phi Delta Phi. While in law school, Amanda focused her legal education on securities law & regulation, international investment law & arbitration, and business law.

EDUCATION

- Suffolk University Law School, J.D. (2021)
- Colorado State University, B.S. (2011)

ADMISSIONS

- Massachusetts (2021)
- United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (2022)

MELISSA MULLER

Associate



Melissa Muller is an Associate with the Firm's New York Office focusing on federal securities litigation. Ms. Muller previously worked as a paralegal for the New York office while attending law school.

EDUCATION

- New York Law School, J.D., Dean's Scholar Award, member of the Dean's Leadership Council (2018)
- John Jay College of Criminal Justice, B.A. (2013), *magna cum laude*

ADMISSIONS

- New York (2019)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2020)

CINAR ONEY

Associate



Cinar Oney is an Associate in Levi & Korsinsky's New York office. His practice focuses on investigation and analysis of various forms of corporate misconduct, including excessive compensation, insider trading, unfair self-dealing, and corporate waste. He develops litigation strategies through which shareholders can pursue recoveries.

Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Mr. Oney practiced with top firms in Turkey, where he represented shareholders, corporations, and governmental entities in commercial disputes and transactional matters.

PUBLICATIONS

- *FinTech Industrial Banks and Beyond: How Banking Innovations Affect the Federal Safety Net*, 23 FORDHAM J. CORP. & FIN. L. 541 (2018)

EDUCATION

- Fordham University School of Law, J.D. (2019)
- International University College of Turin, LL.M. (2014)
- Istanbul University Faculty of Law, Undergraduate Degree in Law (2011)

ADMISSIONS

- New York (2020)

BRIAN STEWART

Associate



Brian Stewart is an Associate with the Firm practicing in the Washington, D.C. office. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Stewart was an associate at a small litigation firm in Washington D.C. and a regulatory analyst at the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA). During law school, he interned for the Enforcement Divisions of the SEC and CFPB.

EDUCATION

- American University Washington College of Law, J.D. (2012)
- University of Washington, B.S., Economics and Mathematics (2008)

ADMISSIONS

- Maryland (2012)
- District of Columbia (2014)
- United States District Court for the District of Maryland (2017)
- United States District Court for the District of Colorado (2017)

CORREY A. SUK

Associate



Correy A. Suk is an experienced litigator with a focus on shareholder derivative suits, class actions, and complex commercial litigation. Correy began her career with the Investor Protection Bureau of the Office of the New York State Attorney General and spent four years prosecuting shareholder derivative actions and securities fraud litigation at one of the oldest firms in the country. Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Correy represented both individuals and corporations in complex business disputes at a New York litigation boutique. Correy's unflappable disposition and composure reflect a pragmatic approach to both litigation and negotiation. She thrives under pressure and serves as an aggressive advocate for her clients in the most high-stakes situations. Correy has been recognized as a Super Lawyers Rising Star every year since 2017.


PUBLICATIONS

- "Unsafe Sexting: The Dangerous New Trend and the Need for Comprehensive Legal Reform," 9 Ohio St. J. Crim. L. 405 (2011)

EDUCATION

- The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, J.D. (2011)
- Georgetown University, B.S.B.A. (2008)

AWARDS



ADMISSIONS

- New Jersey (2011)
- New York (2012)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2015)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2015)
- United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (2016)

COLE VON RICHTHOFEN

Associate



Cole von Richthofen is an Associate in Levi & Korsinsky's Connecticut office. As a law student, he interned with the honorable Judge Thomas Farrish in the District of Connecticut's Hartford courthouse with an emphasis on settlements. He has also interned with the Office of the Attorney General for the State of Connecticut in the Employment Rights Division. While attending law school, Cole served as an Executive Editor of the Connecticut Public Interest Law Journal and as a member of the Connecticut Moot Court Board.

EDUCATION

- University of Connecticut School of Law, J.D. (2022)
- University of Connecticut, B.S., Business & Marketing (2015)

ADMISSIONS

- Connecticut (2022)

MAX WEISS

Associate



Max Weiss focuses his practice on investor protection and securities fraud litigation. He is proficient in litigation, legal research, motion practice, case evaluation and settlement negotiation. Prior to joining the firm, Max practiced in the general liability area and has extensive experience litigating high-exposure personal injury claims in New York State and federal trial and appellate courts. While in law school, Max gained experience helping pro se debtors prepare and file Chapter 7 and Chapter 13 petitions with the New York Legal Assistance Group (**NYLAG**) Bankruptcy Project and served as an intern to the Honorable Sean Lane of the Southern District of New York Bankruptcy Court.

EDUCATION

- St. John's School of Law, J.D. (2018), where he served as the Senior Executive Editor of the Journal of Civil Rights & Economic Development
- Colgate University, B.A., Political Science (2011)

ADMISSIONS

- New York (2019)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2019)
- United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2019)

A green rectangular box containing the text "Our Attorneys" in white, bold, sans-serif font.A dark blue rectangular box containing the text "Law Clerks" in white, bold, sans-serif font.

• AARON PARNAS

AARON PARNAS

Law Clerk



Aaron Parnas is a law clerk in the firm's Washington, D.C. office. Prior to joining Levi & Korsinsky, Aaron served as a law clerk for the Honorable Sheri Polster Chappell in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida.

While in law school, Aaron was a student attorney for the Criminal Appeals and Post-Conviction Series Clinic along with the Vaccine Injury Litigation Clinic, where he litigated matters in front of the Maryland Court of Special Appeals and the Court of Federal Claims, respectively. As a result of his successes, Aaron was named the top advocate in his graduating class and received the Graduation Award for Excellence in Pre-Trial and Trial Advocacy.

EDUCATION

- The George Washington University Law School, with Honors (2020), where he served as the Managing Editor, Vol. 52 of The George Washington International Law Review
- Florida Atlantic University, B.A., Political Science and Criminal Justice, with Honors (2017)

ADMISSIONS

- Florida (2020)
- United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida (2021)

EXHIBIT “C”

POMERANTZLLP

History Pomerantz LLP is one of the most respected law firms in the United States dedicated to representing investors. The Firm was founded in 1936 by the late Abraham L. Pomerantz, widely regarded as a legal pioneer and “dean” of the plaintiffs’ securities bar, who helped secure the right of investors to bring class and derivative actions.

Leadership Today, led by Managing Partner Jeremy A. Lieberman, the Firm maintains the commitments to excellence and integrity passed down by Abe Pomerantz.

Results Pomerantz achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement for defrauded investors in 2018 as well as precedent-setting legal rulings, in *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation*. Pomerantz consistently shapes the law, winning landmark decisions that expand and protect investor rights and initiating historic corporate governance reforms.

Global Expertise The Firm has offices in Paris, France, London, the UK, and Tel Aviv, Israel. Pomerantz also partners with an extensive network of prominent law firms across the globe to assist clients, wherever they are situated, in recovering monies lost due to corporate misconduct and securities fraud. Our team of attorneys is collectively fluent in English, Arabic, Cantonese, Mandarin, French, Hebrew, Italian, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, and Ukrainian.

Practice Pomerantz protects, expands, and vindicates shareholder rights through our securities litigation services and portfolio monitoring service. The Firm represents some of the largest pension funds, asset managers and institutional investors around the globe, monitoring assets of over \$9 trillion. Pomerantz’s practice includes corporate governance, antitrust, and strategic consumer litigation.

Recognition Pomerantz has been a Legal 500 Tier 1 Firm since 2021. In 2020 Pomerantz was named Plaintiff Firm of the Year by Benchmark Litigation, ranked a top plaintiff firm by Chambers USA and The Legal 500, and honored with European Pensions’ Thought Leadership Award. In 2019, Jeremy Lieberman was named Plaintiff Attorney of the Year by Benchmark Litigation, and Pomerantz received Benchmark Litigation’s National Case Impact Award for *In re Petrobras Securities Litig.* In 2018, Pomerantz was a Law360 Securities Practice Group of the Year and a finalist for the *National Law Journal’s* Elite Trial Lawyers award; Jeremy Lieberman was named a Law360 Titan of the Plaintiffs’ Bar and a Benchmark Litigation Star. Among other accolades, many of our attorneys have been chosen by their peers, year after year, as Super Lawyers® Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorneys and Rising Stars.

Pomerantz is headquartered in New York City, with offices in Chicago, Los Angeles, London, Paris, and Tel Aviv.

Securities Litigation

Significant Landmarks

In re Petrobras Sec. Litig., No. 14-cv-9662 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)

On January 3, 2018, in a significant victory for investors, Pomerantz, as sole Lead Counsel for the class, along with Lead Plaintiff Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (“USS”), achieved a historic \$2.95 billion settlement with Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. (“Petrobras”) and its related entity, Petrobras International Finance Company, as well as certain of Petrobras’ former executives and directors. On February 2, 2018, Pomerantz and USS reached a \$50 million settlement with Petrobras’ auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers Auditores Independentes, bringing the total recovery for Petrobras investors to \$3 billion.

This is not only the largest securities class action settlement in a decade but is the largest settlement ever in a securities class action involving a foreign issuer, the fifth-largest securities class action settlement ever achieved in the United States, the largest securities class action settlement achieved by a foreign Lead Plaintiff, and the largest securities class action settlement in history not involving a restatement of financial reports.

The class action, brought on behalf of all purchasers of common and preferred American Depositary Shares (“ADSs”) on the New York Stock Exchange, as well as purchasers of certain Petrobras debt, principally alleged that Petrobras and its senior executives engaged in a multi-year, multi-billion-dollar money-laundering and bribery scheme, which was concealed from investors.

In addition to the multi-billion-dollar recovery for defrauded investors, Pomerantz secured precedent-setting decisions when the Second Circuit Court of Appeals squarely rejected defendants’ invitation to adopt the heightened ascertainability requirement promulgated by the Third Circuit, which would have required plaintiffs to demonstrate that determining membership in a class is “administratively feasible.” The Second Circuit’s rejection of this standard is not only a victory for bondholders in securities class actions, but also for plaintiffs in consumer fraud class actions and other class actions where documentation regarding Class membership is not readily attainable. The Second Circuit also refused to adopt a requirement, urged by defendants, that all securities class action plaintiffs seeking class certification prove through direct evidence (i.e., an event study) that the prices of the relevant securities moved in a particular direction in response to new information.

Pirnik v. Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V. et al., No. 1:15-cv-07199-JMF (S.D.N.Y)

In August 2019, Pomerantz, as Lead Counsel, achieved final approval of a \$110 million settlement for the Class in this high-profile securities class action. Plaintiffs alleged that Fiat Chrysler concealed from investors that it improperly outfitted its diesel vehicles with “defeat device” software designed to cheat NOx emissions regulations in the U.S. and Europe, and that regulators had accused Fiat Chrysler of violating the emissions regulations. The *Fiat Chrysler* recovery provides the class of investors with as much as 20% of recoverable damages—an excellent result when compared to historical statistics in class action settlements, where typical recoveries for cases of this size are between 1.6% and 3.3%.

In addition to creating precedent-setting case law in successfully defending the various motions to dismiss the *Fiat Chrysler* litigation, Pomerantz also significantly advanced investors' ability to obtain critically important discovery from regulators that are often at the center of securities actions. During the litigation, Pomerantz sought the deposition of a former employee of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration ("NHTSA"). The United States Department of Transportation ("USDOT"), like most federal agencies, has enacted a set of regulations — known as "Touhy regulations" — governing when its employees may be called by private parties to testify in court. On their face, USDOT's regulations apply to both "current" and "former" employees. In response to Pomerantz's request to depose a former employee of NHTSA that interacted with Fiat Chrysler, NHTSA denied the request, citing the Touhy regulation. Despite the widespread application, and assumed appropriateness, of applying these regulations to former employees throughout the case law, Pomerantz filed an action against USDOT and NHTSA, arguing that the statute pursuant to which the Touhy regulations were enacted speaks only of "employees," which should be interpreted to apply only to current employees. The court granted summary judgment in favor of Pomerantz's clients, holding that "USDOT's Touhy regulations are unlawful to the extent that they apply to former employees." This victory will greatly shift the discovery tools available, so that investor plaintiffs in securities class actions against highly regulated entities (for example, companies subject to FDA regulations) will now be able to depose former employees of the regulators that interacted with the defendants during the class period to get critical testimony concerning the company's violations and misdeeds.

Strougo v. Barclays PLC, No. 14-cv-5797 (S.D.N.Y.)

Pomerantz, as sole Lead Counsel in this high-profile securities class action, achieved a \$27 million settlement for defrauded investors in 2019. Plaintiffs alleged that defendants concealed information and misled investors regarding its management of its "LX" dark pool, a private trading platform where the size and price of the orders are not revealed to other participants. On November 6, 2017, the Second Circuit affirmed former District Court Judge Shira S. Scheindlin's February 2, 2016, Opinion and Order granting plaintiffs' motion for class certification in the case.

The Court of Appeals in *Barclays* held that direct evidence of price impact is not always necessary to demonstrate market efficiency, as required to invoke the *Basic* presumption of reliance, and was not required here. Significantly, when handing down its decision, the Second Circuit cited its own *Petrobras* decision, stating, "We have repeatedly—and recently—declined to adopt a particular test for market efficiency." *Wagoner v. Barclays PLC*, 875 F.3d 79, 94 (2d Cir. 2017).

The court held that defendants seeking to rebut the *Basic* presumption of reliance on an efficient market must do so by a preponderance of the evidence. The court further held that it would be inconsistent with *Halliburton II* to "allow [] defendants to rebut the *Basic* presumption by simply producing *some* evidence of market inefficiency, but not demonstrating its inefficiency to the district court." *Id.* at 100. The court rejected defendants' contention that Federal Rule of Evidence 301 applies and made clear that the *Basic* presumption is a judicially created doctrine and thus the burden of persuasion properly shifts to defendants. The court thus confirmed that plaintiffs have no burden to show price impact at the class certification stage—a significant victory for investors.

In re Yahoo! Inc. Sec. Litig., No. 17-cv-00373 (N.D. Cal.)

On September 10, 2018, Pomerantz, as Co-Lead Counsel, achieved final approval of a historic \$80 million settlement for the Class in this ground-breaking litigation. The complaint, filed in January 2017, alleged

that the internet giant intentionally misled investors about its cybersecurity practices in the wake of massive data breaches in 2013 and 2014 that compromised the personal information of all 3 billion Yahoo customers. Plaintiffs allege that Yahoo violated federal securities laws by failing to disclose the breaches, which caused a subsequent stock price dive. This represents the first significant settlement to date of a securities fraud class action filed in response to a data breach.

As part of due diligence, Pomerantz located critical evidence showing that Yahoo's management had concurrent knowledge of at least one of the data breaches. Importantly, these records showed that Yahoo's Board of Directors, including Defendant CEO Marissa Mayer, had knowledge of and received repeated updates regarding the breach. In its public filings, Yahoo denied that the CEO knew about the breach, and the CEO's knowledge was a key issue in the case.

After receiving Plaintiffs' opposition to the motion to dismiss, but before the federal District Court ruled on the motion, the case settled for \$80 million. This early and large settlement reflects the strength of the complaint's allegations.

Kaplan v. S.A.C. Capital Advisors, L.P., No. 12-cv-9350 (S.D.N.Y.)

In May 2017, Pomerantz, as Co-Lead Counsel, achieved final approval of a \$135 million recovery for the Class in this securities class action that stemmed from what has been called the most profitable insider trading scheme in U.S. history. After years of vigorous litigation, billionaire Steven A. Cohen's former hedge fund, S.A.C. Capital Advisors LP, agreed to settle the lawsuit by investors in the drug maker Elan Corp, who said they lost money because of insider trading by one of his portfolio managers.

In re BP p.l.c. Securities Litigation, MDL No. 2185 (S.D. Tex.)

Beginning in 2012, Pomerantz pursued ground-breaking individual lawsuits for institutional investors to recover losses in BP p.l.c.'s London-traded common stock and NYSE-traded American Depositary Shares (ADSs) arising from its 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil spill. Over nine years, Pomerantz briefed and argued every significant dispute on behalf of 125+ institutional plaintiffs, successfully opposed three motions to dismiss, won other contested motions, oversaw e-discovery of 1.75 million party and non-party documents, led the Individual Action Plaintiffs Steering Committee, served as sole Liaison with BP and the Court, and worked tirelessly with our clients' outside investment management firms to develop crucial case evidence.

A threshold challenge was how to litigate in U.S. court given the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Morrison v. National Australia Bank*, 130 S. Ct. 2869 (2010), which barred recovery for losses in foreign-traded securities under the U.S. federal securities laws. In 2013 and 2014, Pomerantz won significant victories in defeating BP's *forum non conveniens* arguments, which sought to force dismissal of the English common law claims from U.S. courts for refiling in English courts, first as regards U.S. institutions and, later, foreign institutions. Pomerantz also defeated BP's attempt to extend the U.S. federal Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998 to reach, and dismiss, these foreign law claims in deference to non-existent remedies under the U.S. federal securities laws. These rulings paved the way for 125+ global institutional investors to pursue their claims and marked the first time, post-*Morrison*, that U.S. and foreign investors, pursuing foreign claims seeking recovery for losses in a foreign company's foreign-traded securities, did so in a U.S. court. In 2017, Pomerantz earned an important victory that expanded investor rights under English law, permitting certain BP investors to pursue a

“holder claim” theory seeking to recover losses in securities held, rather than purchased anew, in reliance on the alleged fraud - a theory barred under the U.S. federal securities laws since *Blue Chip Stamps v. Manor Drug Stores*, 421 U.S. 723 (1975). This win was significant, given the dearth of precedent from anywhere recognizing the viability of a “holder claim” under any non-U.S. law and holding that a given plaintiff alleged facts sufficiently evidencing reliance and documenting the resulting retention of an identifiable amount of shares on a date certain.

In Q1 2021, Pomerantz secured confidential, favorable monetary settlements from BP for our nearly three dozen clients, including public and private pension funds, money management firms, partnerships, and investment trusts from the U.S., Canada, the U.K., France, the Netherlands, and Australia.

In re Comverse Technology, Inc. Sec. Litig., No. 06-CV-1825 (E.D.N.Y.)

In June 2010, Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York granted final approval of a \$225 million settlement proposed by Pomerantz and Lead Plaintiff the Menora Group, with Comverse Technology and certain of Comverse’s former officers and directors, after four years of highly contested litigation. The *Comverse* settlement is one of the largest securities class action settlements reached since the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”).¹ It is the second-largest recovery in a securities litigation involving the backdating of options, as well as one of the largest recoveries – \$60 million – from an individual officer-defendant, Comverse’s founder and former CEO, Kobi Alexander.

Other significant settlements

Even before the enactment of the PSLRA, Pomerantz represented state agencies in securities class actions, including the Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (recovered \$100 million) against a major investment bank. *In re Salomon Brothers Treasury Litig.*, No. 91-cv-5471 (S.D.N.Y.).

Pomerantz recovered \$50 million for the Treasurer of the State of New Jersey and several New Jersey pension funds in an individual action. This was a substantially higher recovery than what our clients would have obtained had they remained in a related federal class action. *Treasurer of State of New Jersey v. AOL Time Warner, Inc.* (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div., Mercer Cty.).

Pomerantz has litigated numerous cases for the Louisiana School Employees’ Retirement System. For example, as Lead Counsel, Pomerantz recovered \$74.75 million in a securities fraud class action against Citigroup, its CEO Sanford Weill, and its now infamous telecommunications analyst Jack Grubman. *In re Salomon Analyst AT&T Litig.*, No. 02-cv-6801 (S.D.N.Y.) Also, the Firm played a major role in a complex antitrust and securities class action which settled for over \$1 billion. *In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1023 (S.D.N.Y.). Pomerantz was a member of the Executive Committee in *In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc. Securities Litigation*, C.A. No. 03-10165 (D. Mass.), helping to win a \$50 million settlement for the class.

In 2008, together with Co-Counsel, Pomerantz identified a substantial opportunity for recovery of losses in Countrywide mortgage-backed securities (“MBS”) for three large New Mexico funds (New Mexico State Investment Council, New Mexico Public Employees’ Retirement Association, and New Mexico

¹ Institutional Shareholder Services, *SCAS Top 100 Settlements Quarterly Report* (Sept. 30, 2010).

Educational Retirement Board), which had been overlooked by all of the firms then in their securities litigation pool. We then filed the first non-class lawsuit by a public institution with respect to Countrywide MBS. *See N.M. State Inv. Council v. Countrywide Fin. Corp.*, No. D-0101-CV-2008-02289 (N.M. 1st Dist. Ct.). In Fall 2010, we negotiated for our clients an extremely favorable but confidential settlement.

Over its long history, Pomerantz has achieved significant settlements in numerous cases, a sampling of which is listed below:

- *In re Petrobras Sec. Litig.*, No. 14-cv-9662 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)
\$3 billion settlement of securities class action in which Pomerantz was Lead Counsel.
- *Pirnik v. Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V. et al.*, No. 1:15-cv-07199-JMF (S.D.N.Y.)
\$110 million settlement of securities class action in which Pomerantz was Lead Counsel
- *In re Yahoo! Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 17-cv-00373 (N.D. Cal. 2018)
\$80 million settlement of securities class action in which Pomerantz was Co-Lead Counsel
- *In re Libor Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litig.*, 1:11-md-2262
\$31 million partial settlement with three defendants in this multi-district litigation in which Pomerantz represents the Berkshire Bank and the Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico
- *Kaplan v. S.A.C. Capital Advisors, L.P.*, No. 12-cv-9350 (S.D.N.Y. 2017)
\$135 million settlement of class action in which Pomerantz was Co-Lead Counsel.
- *In re Groupon, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 12-cv-02450 (N.D. Ill. 2015)
\$45 million settlement of class action in which Pomerantz was sole Lead Counsel.
- *In re Elan Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 05-cv-2860 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)
\$75 million settlement in class action arising out of alleged accounting manipulations.
- *In re Safety-Kleen Corp. Stockholders Litig.*, No. 00-cv-736-17 (D.S.C. 2004)
\$54.5 million in total settlements in class action alleging accounting manipulations by corporate officials and auditors; last settlement reached on eve of trial.
- *Duckworth v. Country Life Ins. Co.*, No. 1998-CH-01046 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty. 2000)
\$45 million recovery.
- *Snyder v. Nationwide Ins. Co.*, No. 97/0633 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Onondaga Cty. 1998)
Settlement valued at \$100 million in derivative case arising from injuries to consumers purchasing life insurance policies.
- *In re National Health Lab., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. CV 92-1949 (S.D. Cal. 1995)
\$64 million recovery.
- *In re First Executive Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 89-cv-07135 (C.D. Cal. 1994)
\$102 million recovery for the class, exposing a massive securities fraud arising out of the Michael Milken debacle.
- *In re Boardwalk Marketplace Sec. Litig.*, MDL No. 712 (D. Conn. 1994)
Over \$66 million benefit in securities fraud action.
- *In re Telerate, Inc. S'holders Litig.*, C.A. No. 1115 (Del. Ch. 1989)
\$95 million benefit in case alleging violation of fiduciary duty under state law.

Pomerantz has also obtained stellar results for private institutions and Taft-Hartley funds. Below are a few examples:

- *In re Charter Commc'ns, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 02-cv-1186 (E.D. Mo. 2005) (sole Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiff StoneRidge Investment Partners LLC); \$146.25 million class settlement, where Charter also agreed to enact substantive improvements in corporate governance.
- *In re Am. Italian Pasta Sec. Litig.*, No. 05-cv-865 (W.D. Mo. 2008) (sole Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiff Ironworkers Locals 40, 361 and 417; \$28.5 million aggregate settlements).
- *Richardson v. Gray*, No. 116880/1995 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty. 1999); and *In re Summit Metals*, No. 98-2870 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004) (two derivative actions where the Firm represented C.C. Partners Ltd. and obtained judgment of contempt against controlling shareholder for having made “extraordinary” payments to himself in violation of a preliminary injunction; persuaded the court to jail him for two years upon his refusal to pay; and, in a related action, won a \$43 million judgment after trial and obtained turnover of stock of two companies).

Shaping the Law

Not only has Pomerantz established a long track record of obtaining substantial monetary recoveries for our clients; whenever appropriate, we also pursue corporate governance reforms on their behalf. In *In re Chesapeake Shareholders Derivative Litigation*, No. CJ-2009-3983 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Okla. Cty. 2011), for example, the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel, representing a public pension client in a derivative case arising from an excessive compensation package granted to Chesapeake’s CEO and founder. This was a derivative action, not a class action. Yet it is illustrative of the results that can be obtained by an institutional investor in the corporate governance arena. There we obtained a settlement which called for the repayment of \$12.1 million and other consideration by the CEO. The Wall Street Journal (Nov. 3, 2011) characterized the settlement as “a rare concession for the 52-year-old executive, who has run the company largely by his own rules since he co-founded it in 1989.” The settlement also included comprehensive corporate governance reforms.

The Firm has won many landmark decisions that have enhanced shareholders’ rights and improved corporate governance. These include decisions that established that:

- defendants seeking to rebut the *Basic* presumption of reliance on an efficient market must do so by a preponderance of the evidence. *Waggoner v. Barclays PLC*, 875 F.3d 79 (2d Cir. 2017) (*Strougo v. Barclays PLC*, in the court below);
- plaintiffs have no burden to show price impact at the class certification stage. *Waggoner v. Barclays PLC*, 875 F.3d 79 (2d Cir. 2017) (*Strougo v. Barclays PLC*, in the court below);
- the ascertainability doctrine requires only that a class be defined using objective criteria that establish a membership with definite boundaries. *Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd. v. Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. Petrobras*, 862 F.3d 250 (2d Cir. 2017);
- companies cannot adopt bylaws to regulate the rights of former stockholders. *Strougo v. Hollander*, C.A. No. 9770-CB (Del. Ch. 2015);
- a temporary rise in share price above its purchase price in the aftermath of a corrective disclosure does not eviscerate an investor’s claim for damages. *Acticon AG v. China Ne. Petroleum Holdings Ltd.*, 692 F.3d 34 (2d Cir. 2012);
- an MBS holder may bring claims if the MBS price declines even if all payments of principal and interest have been made. Transcript of Proceedings, *N.M. State Inv. Council v. Countrywide Fin. Corp.*, No. D-0101-CV-2008-02289 (N.M. 1st Dist. Ct. Mar. 25, 2009);

- when a court selects a Lead Plaintiff under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”), the standard for calculating the “largest financial interest” must take into account sales as well as purchases. *In re Comverse Tech., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 06-cv-1825, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14878 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 2, 2007);
- a managing underwriter can owe fiduciary duties of loyalty and care to an issuer in connection with a public offering of the issuer stock, even in the absence of any contractual agreement. Professor John C. Coffee, a renowned Columbia University securities law professor, commenting on the ruling, stated: “It’s going to change the practice of all underwriting.” *EBC I, Inc. v. Goldman Sachs & Co.*, 5 N.Y. 3d 11 (2005);
- purchasers of options have standing to sue under federal securities laws. *In re Green Tree Fin. Corp. Options Litig.*, No. 97-2679, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13986 (D. Minn. July 29, 2002);
- shareholders have a right to a jury trial in derivative actions. *Ross v. Bernhard*, 396 U.S. 531 (1970);
- a company may have the obligation to disclose to shareholders its Board’s consideration of important corporate transactions, such as the possibility of a spin-off, even before any final decision has been made. *Kronfeld v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 832 F.2d 726 (2d Cir. 1987);
- specific standards for assessing whether mutual fund advisors breach fiduciary duties by charging excessive fees. *Gartenberg v. Merrill Lynch Asset Mgmt., Inc.*, 740 F.2d 190 (2d Cir. 1984);
- investment advisors to mutual funds are fiduciaries who cannot sell their trustee positions for a profit. *Rosenfeld v. Black*, 445 F.2d 1337 (2d Cir. 1971); and
- management directors of mutual funds have a duty to make full disclosure to outside directors “in every area where there was even a possible conflict of interest.” *Moses v. Burgin*, 445 F.2d 369 (1st Cir. 1971).

Comments from the Courts

Throughout its history, courts time and again have acknowledged the Firm’s ability to vigorously pursue and successfully litigate actions on behalf of investors.

U.S. District Judge Noel L. Hillman, in approving the *In re Toronto-Dominion Bank Securities Litigation* settlement in October 2019, stated:

I commend counsel on both sides for their hard work, their very comprehensive and thoughtful submissions during the motion practice aspect of this case. ... It’s clear to me that this was comprehensive, extensive, thoughtful, meaningful litigation leading up to the settlement. ... This settlement appears to have been obtained through the hard work of the Pomerantz firm. ... It was through their efforts and not piggybacking on any other work that resulted in this settlement.

In approving the settlement in *Strougo v. Barclays PLC* in June 2019, Judge Victor Marrero of the Southern District of New York wrote:

Let me thank counsel on both sides for the extraordinary work both sides did in bringing this matter to a reasonable conclusion. As the parties have indicated, the matter was intensely litigated, but it was done in the most extraordinary fashion with cooperation, collaboration, and high levels of professionalism on both sides, so I thank you.

In approving the \$3 billion settlement in *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation* in June 2018, Judge Jed S. Rakoff of the Southern District of New York wrote:

[T]he Court finds that Class Counsel's performance was in many respects exceptional, with the result that, as noted, the class is poised to enjoy a substantially larger per share recovery [65%] than the recovery enjoyed by numerous large and sophisticated plaintiffs who separately settled their claims.

At the hearing for preliminary approval of the settlement in *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation* in February 2018, Judge Rakoff stated:

[T]he lawyers in this case [are] some of the best lawyers in the United States, if not in the world.

Two years earlier, in certifying two Classes in *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation* in February 2016, Judge Rakoff wrote:

[O]n the basis not only of USS's counsel's prior experience but also the Court's observation of its advocacy over the many months since it was appointed Lead Counsel, the Court concludes that Pomerantz, the proposed class counsel, is "qualified, experienced and able to conduct the litigation." ... [T]he Pomerantz firm has both the skill and resources to represent the Classes adequately.

In approving the settlement in *Thorpe v. Walter Investment Management Corp.*, No. 14-cv-20880, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 144133 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 14, 2016) Judge Ursula Ungaro wrote:

Class Counsel has developed a reputation for zealous advocacy in securities class actions. ... The settlement amount of \$24 million is an outstanding result.

At the May 2015 hearing wherein the court approved the settlement in *Courtney v. Avid Technology, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-10686 (D. Mass. May 12, 2015), following oral argument by Jeremy A. Lieberman, Judge William G. Young stated:

This has been very well litigated. It is always a privilege. I don't just say that as a matter of form. And I thank you for the vigorous litigation that I've been permitted to be a part of. [Tr. at 8-9.]

At the January 2012 hearing wherein the court approved the settlement in *In re Chesapeake Energy Corp. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, No. CJ-2009-3983 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Okla. Cty. Jan. 30, 2012), following oral argument by Marc I. Gross, Judge Daniel L. Owens stated:

Counsel, it's a pleasure, and I mean this and rarely say it. I think I've said it two times in 25 years. It is an extreme pleasure to deal with counsel of such caliber. [Tr. at 48.]

In approving the \$225 million settlement in *In re Comverse Technology, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 06-CV-1825 (E.D.N.Y.) in June 2010, Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis stated:

As outlined above, the recovery in this case is one of the highest ever achieved in this type of securities action. ... The court also notes that, throughout this litigation, it has been impressed by Lead Counsel's acumen and diligence. The briefing has been thorough, clear, and convincing, and ... Lead Counsel has not taken short cuts or relaxed its efforts at any stage of the litigation.

In approving a \$146.25 million settlement in *In re Charter Communications Securities Litigation*, No. 02-CV-1186, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14772 (E.D. Mo. June 30, 2005), in which Pomerantz served as sole Lead Counsel, Judge Charles A. Shaw praised the Firm's efforts, citing "the vigor with which Lead Counsel ... investigated claims, briefed the motions to dismiss, and negotiated the settlement." He further stated:

This Court believes Lead Plaintiff achieved an excellent result in a complex action, where the risk of obtaining a significantly smaller recovery, if any, was substantial.

In approving a \$24 million settlement in *In re Force Protection, Inc.*, No. 08 CV 845 (D.S.C. 2011), Judge C. Weston Houk described the Firm as "attorneys of great ability and great reputation" and commended the Firm for having "done an excellent job."

In certifying a class in a securities fraud action against analysts in *DeMarco v. Robertson Stephens Inc.*, 228 F.R.D. 468 (S.D.N.Y. 2005), Judge Gerard D. Lynch stated that Pomerantz had "ably and zealously represented the interests of the class."

Numerous courts have made similar comments:

- Appointing Pomerantz Lead Counsel in *American Italian Pasta Co. Securities Litigation*, No 05-CV-0725 (W.D. Mo.), a class action that involved a massive fraud and restatements spanning several years, the District Court observed that the Firm "has significant experience (and has been extremely effective) litigating securities class actions, employs highly qualified attorneys, and possesses ample resources to effectively manage the class litigation and protect the class's interests."
- In approving the settlement in *In re Wiring Devices Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 331 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 1980), Chief Judge Jack B. Weinstein stated that "Counsel for the plaintiffs I think did an excellent job. ... They are outstanding and skillful. The litigation was and is extremely complex. They assumed a great deal of responsibility. They recovered a very large amount given the possibility of no recovery here which was in my opinion substantial."
- In *Snyder v. Nationwide Insurance Co.*, No. 97/0633, (N.Y. Supreme Court, Onondaga Cty.), a case where Pomerantz served as Co-Lead Counsel, Judge Tormey stated, "It was a pleasure to work with you. This is a good result. You've got some great attorneys working on it."
- In *Steinberg v. Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co.* (E.D.N.Y. 2004), Judge Spatt, granting class certification and appointing the Firm as class counsel, observed: "The Pomerantz firm has a strong reputation as class counsel and has demonstrated its competence to serve as class counsel in this motion for class certification." (224 F.R.D. 67, 766.)
- In *Mercury Savings & Loan*, No. 90-cv-00087 LHM (C.D. Cal. 1993), Judge McLaughlin commended the Firm for the "absolutely extraordinary job in this litigation."

- In *Boardwalk Marketplace Securities Litigation*, MDL No. 712 (D. Conn.), Judge Eginton described the Firm’s services as “exemplary,” praised it for its “usual fine job of lawyering ...[in] an extremely complex matter,” and concluded that the case was “very well-handled and managed.” (Tr. at 6, 5/20/92; Tr. at 10, 10/10/92.)
- In *Nodar v. Weksel*, No. 84 Civ. 3870 (S.D.N.Y.), Judge Broderick acknowledged “that the services rendered [by Pomerantz] were excellent services from the point of view of the class represented, [and] the result was an excellent result.” (Tr. at 21-22, 12/27/90.)
- In *Klein v. A.G. Becker Paribas, Inc.*, No. 83 Civ. 6456 (S.D.N.Y.), Judge Goettel complimented the Firm for providing “excellent ...absolutely top-drawer representation for the class, particularly in light of the vigorous defense offered by the defense firm.” (Tr. at 22, 3/6/87.)
- In *Digital Securities Litigation*, No. 83-3255 (D. Mass.), Judge Young lauded the Firm for its “[v]ery fine lawyering.” (Tr. at 13, 9/18/86.)
- In *Shelter Realty Corp. v. Allied Maintenance Corp.*, 75 F.R.D. 34, 40 (S.D.N.Y. 1977), Judge Frankel, referring to Pomerantz, said: “Their experience in handling class actions of this nature is known to the court and certainly puts to rest any doubt that the absent class members will receive the quality of representation to which they are entitled.”
- In *Rauch v. Bilzerian*, No. 88 Civ. 15624 (N.J. Sup. Ct.), the court, after trial, referred to Pomerantz partners as “exceptionally competent counsel,” and as having provided “top drawer, topflight [representation], certainly as good as I’ve seen in my stay on this court.”

Corporate Governance Litigation

Pomerantz is committed to ensuring that companies adhere to responsible business practices and practice good corporate citizenship. We strongly support policies and procedures designed to give shareholders the ability to oversee the activities of a corporation. We vigorously pursue corporate governance reform, particularly in the area of excess compensation, where it can address the growing disparity between the salaries of executives and the workers of major corporations. We have successfully utilized litigation to bring about corporate governance reform in numerous cases, and always consider whether such reforms are appropriate before any case is settled.

Pomerantz’s Corporate Governance Practice Group, led by Partner Gustavo F. Bruckner, enforces shareholder rights and prosecutes actions challenging corporate transactions that arise from an unfair process or result in an unfair price for shareholders.

In September 2017, New Jersey Superior Court Judge Julio Mendez, of Cape May County Chancery Division, approved Pomerantz’s settlement in a litigation against Ocean Shore Holding Co. The settlement provided non-pecuniary benefits for a non-opt out class. In so doing, Judge Mendez became the first New Jersey state court judge to formally adopt the Third Circuit’s nine-part *Girsh* factors, *Girsh v. Jepson*, 521 F.2d 153 (3d Cir. 1975). There has never before been a published New Jersey state court opinion setting out the factors a court must consider in evaluating whether a class action settlement should be determined to be fair and adequate. After conducting an analysis of each of the nine *Girsh* factors and holding that “class actions settlements involving non-monetary benefits to the class are subject to more exacting scrutiny,” Judge Mendez held that the proposed settlement provided a material benefit to the shareholders.

In February 2018, the Maryland Circuit Court, Montgomery County, approved a \$17.5 million settlement that plaintiffs achieved as additional consideration on behalf of a class of shareholders of American Capital, Ltd. *In re Am. Capital, Ltd. S'holder Litig.*, C.A. No. 422598-V (2018). The settlement resolved Plaintiffs' claims regarding a forced sale of American Capital.

Pomerantz filed an action challenging the sale of American Capital, a Delaware corporation with its headquarters in Maryland. Among other things, American Capital's board of directors (the "Board") agreed to sell the company at a price below what two other bidders were willing to offer. Worse, the merger price was even below the amount that shareholders would have received in the company's planned phased liquidation, which the company was considering under pressure from Elliott Management, an activist hedge fund and holder of approximate 15% of American Capital stock. Elliott was not originally named as a defendant, but after initial discovery showed the extent of its involvement in the Board's breaches of fiduciary duty, Elliott was added as a defendant in an amended complaint under the theory that Elliott exercised actual control over the Board's decision-making. Elliott moved to dismiss on jurisdictional grounds and additionally challenged its alleged status as a controller of American Capital. In June 2017, minutes before the hearing on defendants' motion to dismiss, a partial settlement was entered into with the members of the Board for \$11.5 million. The motion to dismiss hearing proceeded despite the partial settlement, but only as to Elliott. In July 2017, the court denied the motion to dismiss, finding that Elliott, "by virtue solely of its own conduct, ... has easily satisfied the transacting business prong of the Maryland long arm statute." The court also found that the "amended complaint in this case sufficiently pleads that Elliott was a controller with respect to" the sale, thus implicating a higher standard of review. Elliott subsequently settled the remaining claims for an additional \$6 million. Pomerantz served as Co-Lead Counsel.

In May 2017, the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon approved the settlement achieved by Pomerantz and co-counsel of a derivative action brought by two shareholders of Lithia Motors, Inc. The lawsuit alleged breach of fiduciary duties by the board of directors in approving, without any meaningful review, the Transition Agreement between Lithia Motors and Sidney DeBoer, its founder, controlling shareholder, CEO, and Chairman, who was stepping down as CEO. DeBoer and his son, the current CEO, Bryan DeBoer, negotiated virtually all the material terms of the Agreement, by which the company agreed to pay the senior DeBoer \$1,060,000 and a \$42,000 car allowance annually for the rest of his life, plus other benefits, in addition to the \$200,000 per year that he would receive for continuing to serve as Chairman.

The *Lithia* settlement extracted corporate governance therapeutics that provide substantial benefits to Lithia and its shareholders and redress the wrongdoing alleged by plaintiffs. The board will now be required to have at least five independent directors -- as defined under the New York Stock Exchange rules -- by 2020; a number of other new protocols will be in place to prevent self-dealing by board members. Further, the settlement calls for the Transition Agreement to be reviewed by an independent auditor who will determine whether the annual payments of \$1,060,000 for life to Sidney DeBoer are reasonable. Lithia has agreed to accept whatever decision the auditor makes.

In January 2017, the Group received approval of the Delaware Chancery Court for a \$5.6 million settlement it achieved on behalf of a class of shareholders of Physicians Formula Holdings Inc. over an ignored merger offer in 2012. *In re Physicians Formula Holdings Inc.*, C.A. No. 7794-VCL (Del. Ch.).

The Group obtained a landmark ruling in *Strougo v. Hollander*, C.A. No. 9770-CB (Del. Ch.), that fee-shifting bylaws adopted after a challenged transaction do not apply to shareholders affected by the transaction. They were also able to obtain a 25% price increase for members of the class cashed out in the going private transaction.

In *Miller v. Bolduc*, No. SUCV 2015-00807 (Mass. Super. Ct.), the Group caused Implant Sciences to hold its first shareholder annual meeting in five years and put an important compensation grant up for a shareholder vote.

In *Smollar v. Potarazu*, C.A. No. 10287-VCN (Del. Ch.), the Group pursued a derivative action to bring about the appointment of two independent members to the board of directors, retention of an independent auditor, dissemination of financials to shareholders and the holding of first ever in-person annual meeting, among other corporate therapeutics.

In *Hallandale Beach Police Officers & Firefighters' Personnel Retirement Fund vs. Lululemon athletica, Inc.*, C.A. No. 8522-VCP (Del. Ch.), in an issue of first impression in Delaware, the Chancery Court ordered the production of the chairman's 10b5-1 stock trading plan. The court found that a stock trading plan established by the company's chairman, pursuant to which a broker, rather than the chairman himself, would liquidate a portion of the chairman's stock in the company, did not preclude potential liability for insider trading.

In *Strougo v. North State Bancorp*, No. 15 CVS 14696 (N.C. Super. Ct.), the Group caused the Merger Agreement to be amended to provide a "majority of the minority" provision for the holders of North State Bancorp's common stock in connection with the shareholder vote on the merger. As a result of the Action, common shareholders could stop the merger if they did not wish it to go forward.

Pomerantz's commitment to advancing sound corporate governance principles is further demonstrated by the more than 26 years that we have co-sponsored the Abraham L. Pomerantz Lecture Series with Brooklyn Law School. These lectures focus on critical and emerging issues concerning shareholder rights and corporate governance and bring together top academics and litigators.

Our bi-monthly newsletter, *The Pomerantz Monitor*, provides institutional investors updates and insights on current issues in corporate governance.

Strategic Consumer Litigation

Pomerantz's Strategic Consumer Litigation practice group, led by Partner Jordan Lurie, represents consumers in actions that seek to recover monetary and injunctive relief on behalf of class members while also advocating for important consumer rights. The attorneys in this group have successfully prosecuted claims involving California's Unfair Competition Law, California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act, the Song Beverly Consumer Warranty Act and the Song Beverly Credit Card Act. They have resolved data breach privacy cases and cases involving unlawful recording, illegal background checks, unfair business practices, misleading advertising, and other consumer finance related actions. All of these actions also have resulted in significant changes to defendants' business practices.

Pomerantz currently represents consumers in a nationwide class action against Facebook for mistargeting ads. Plaintiff alleges that Facebook programmatically displays a material percentage of ads to users outside the defined target market and displays ads to “serial Likers” outside the defined target audience in order to boost Facebook’s revenue. *IntegrityMessageBoards.com v. Facebook, Inc. (N.D. Cal.) Case No. 4:18 -cv-05286 PJH*.

Pomerantz has pioneered litigation to establish claims for public injunctive relief under California’s unfair business practices statute. For example, Pomerantz has filed cases seeking to prevent major auto manufacturers from unauthorized access to, and use of, drivers’ vehicle data without compensation, and seeking to require the auto companies to share diagnostic data extracted from drivers’ vehicles. The Strategic Consumer Litigation practice group also is prosecuting class cases against auto manufacturers for failing to properly identify high-priced parts that must be covered in California under extended emissions warranties.

Other consumer matters handled by Pomerantz’s Strategic Consumer Litigation practice group include actions involving cryptocurrency, medical billing, price fixing, and false advertising of various consumer products and services.

Antitrust Litigation

Pomerantz has earned a reputation for prosecuting complex antitrust and consumer class actions with vigor, innovation, and success. Pomerantz’s Antitrust and Consumer Group has recovered billions of dollars for the Firm’s business and individual clients and the classes that they represent. Time and again, Pomerantz has protected our free-market system from anticompetitive conduct such as price fixing, monopolization, exclusive territorial division, pernicious pharmaceutical conduct, and false advertising. Pomerantz’s advocacy has spanned across diverse product markets, exhibiting the Antitrust and Consumer Group’s versatility to prosecute class actions on any terrain.

Pomerantz has served and is currently serving in leadership or Co-Leadership roles in several high-profile multi-district litigation class actions. In December 2018, the Firm achieved a \$31 billion partial settlement with three defendants on behalf of a class of U.S. lending institutions that originated, purchased or held loans paying interest rates tied to the U.S. Dollar London Interbank Offered Rate (USD LIBOR). It is alleged that the class suffered damages as a result of collusive manipulation by the LIBOR contributor panel banks that artificially suppressed the USD LIBOR rate during the class period, causing the class members to receive lower interest payments than they would have otherwise received. *In re Libor Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litig.*, 1:11-md-2262.

Pomerantz represented baseball and hockey fans in a game-changing antitrust class action against Major League Baseball and the National Hockey League, challenging the exclusive territorial division of live television broadcasts, internet streaming, and the resulting geographic blackouts. *See Laumann v. NHL and Garber v. MLB* (S.D.N.Y. 2012).

Pomerantz has spearheaded the effort to challenge harmful anticompetitive conduct by pharmaceutical companies—including Pay-for-Delay Agreements—that artificially inflates the price of prescription drugs by keeping generic versions off the market.

Even prior to the 2013 precedential U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Actavis*, Pomerantz litigated and successfully settled the following generic-drug-delay cases:

- *In re Flonase Antitrust Litig.* (E.D. Pa. 2008) (\$35 million);
- *In re Toprol XL Antitrust Litig.* (D. Del. 2006) (\$11 million); and
- *In re Wellbutrin SR Antitrust Litig.* (E.D. Pa. 2004) (\$21.5 million).

Other exemplary victories include Pomerantz's prominent role in *In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.), which resulted in a settlement in excess of \$1 billion for class members, one of the largest antitrust settlements in history. Pomerantz also played prominent roles in *In re Sorbates Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal.), which resulted in over an \$82 million recovery, and in *In re Methionine Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal.), which resulted in a \$107 million recovery. These cases illustrate the resources, expertise, and commitment that Pomerantz's Antitrust Group devotes to prosecuting some of the most egregious anticompetitive conduct.

A Global Advocate for Asset Managers and Public and Taft-Hartley Pension Funds

Pomerantz represents some of the largest pension funds, asset managers, and institutional investors around the globe, monitoring assets of \$8 trillion, and growing. Utilizing cutting-edge legal strategies and the latest proprietary techniques, Pomerantz protects, expands, and vindicates shareholder rights through our securities litigation services and portfolio monitoring program.

Pomerantz partners routinely advise foreign and domestic institutional investors on how best to evaluate losses to their investment portfolios attributable to financial misconduct and how best to maximize their potential recoveries worldwide. In particular, Pomerantz Partners, Jeremy Lieberman, Jennifer Pafiti, and Marc Gross regularly travel throughout the U.S. and across the globe to meet with clients on these issues and are frequent speakers at investor conferences and educational forums in North America, Europe, and the Middle East.

Pomerantz was honored by European Pensions with its 2020 Thought Leadership award in recognition of significant contributions the Firm has made in the European pension environment.

Institutional Investor Services

Pomerantz offers a variety of services to institutional investors. Through the Firm's proprietary system, PomTrack[®], Pomerantz monitors client portfolios to identify and evaluate potential and pending securities fraud, ERISA and derivative claims, and class action settlements. Monthly customized PomTrack[®] reports are included with the service. PomTrack[®] currently monitors assets of nearly \$9 trillion for some of the most influential institutional investors worldwide.

When a potential securities claim impacting a client is identified, Pomerantz offers to analyze the case's merits and provide a written analysis and recommendation. If litigation is warranted, a team of Pomerantz attorneys will provide efficient and effective legal representation. The experience and

expertise of our attorneys – which have consistently been acknowledged by the courts – allow Pomerantz to vigorously pursue the claims of investors, taking complex cases to trial when warranted.

Pomerantz is committed to ensuring that companies adhere to responsible business practices and practice good corporate citizenship. The Firm strongly support policies and procedures designed to give shareholders the ability to oversee the activities of a corporation. Pomerantz has successfully utilized litigation to bring about corporate governance reform, and always considers whether such reforms are appropriate before any case is settled.

Pomerantz provides clients with insightful and timely commentary on matters essential to effective fund management in our bi-monthly newsletter, *The Pomerantz Monitor* and regularly sponsors conferences and roundtable events around the globe with speakers who are experts in securities litigation and corporate governance matters.

Attorneys

Partners

Jeremy A. Lieberman

Jeremy A. Lieberman is Pomerantz’s Managing Partner. He became associated with the Firm in August 2004 and was elevated to Partner in January 2010. The Legal 500, in honoring Jeremy as a Leading Lawyer and Pomerantz as a 2021 and 2022 Tier 1 Plaintiffs Securities Law Firm, stated that “Jeremy Lieberman is super impressive – a formidable adversary for any defense firm.” Among the client testimonials posted on The Legal 500’s website: “Jeremy Lieberman led the case for us with remarkable and unrelenting energy and aggression. He made a number of excellent strategic decisions which boosted our recovery.” Lawdragon named Jeremy among the 2021 Leading 500 Lawyers in the United States. Super Lawyers® named him among the Top 100 Lawyers in the New York Metro area in 2021. In 2020, Jeremy won a Distinguished Leader award from the *New York Law Journal*. He was honored as Benchmark Litigation’s 2019 Plaintiff Attorney of the Year. In 2018, Jeremy was honored as a Titan of the Plaintiffs Bar by Law360 and as a Benchmark Litigation Star. The Pomerantz team that Jeremy leads was named a 2018 Securities Practice Group of the Year.

Jeremy led the securities class action litigation *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation*, which arose from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme involving Brazil’s largest oil company, Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. – Petrobras, in which Pomerantz was sole Lead Counsel. The biggest instance of corruption in the history of Brazil ensnared not only Petrobras’ former executives but also Brazilian politicians, including former president Lula da Silva and one-third of the Brazilian Congress. In January and February 2018, Jeremy achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement for the Class. This is not only the largest securities class action settlement in a decade but is the largest settlement ever in a securities class action involving a foreign issuer, the fifth-largest securities class action settlement ever achieved in the United States, the largest securities class action settlement achieved by a foreign Lead Plaintiff, and the largest securities class action settlement in history not involving a restatement of financial reports.

Jeremy also secured a significant victory for Petrobras investors at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, when the court rejected the heightened ascertainability requirement for obtaining class certification that had been imposed by the Third Circuit Courts of Appeals. The ruling will have a positive impact on plaintiffs in securities fraud litigation. Indeed, the *Petrobras* litigation was honored in 2019 as a National Impact Case by Benchmark Litigation.

Jeremy was Lead Counsel in *Pirnik v. Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V. et al.*, No. 1:15-cv-07199-JMF (S.D.N.Y.), in which the Firm achieved a \$110 million settlement for the class. Plaintiff alleged that Fiat Chrysler concealed from investors that it improperly outfitted its diesel vehicles with “defeat device” software designed to cheat NOx emissions regulations in the U.S. and Europe, and that regulators had accused Fiat Chrysler of violating the emissions regulations. The *Fiat Chrysler* recovery provided the class of investors with as much as 20% of recoverable damages—an excellent result when compared to historical statistics in class action settlements, where typical recoveries for cases of this size are between 1.6% and 3.3%.

In November 2019, Jeremy achieved a critical victory for investors in the securities fraud class action against Perrigo Co. plc when Judge Arleo of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey certified classes of investors that purchased Perrigo securities on both the New York Stock Exchange and the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. Pomerantz represents a number of institutional investors that purchased Perrigo securities on both exchanges after an offer by Mylan N.V. to tender Perrigo shares. This is the first time since *Morrison* that a U.S. court has independently analyzed the market of a security traded on a non-U.S. exchange and found that it met the standards of market efficiency necessary allow for class certification.

Jeremy heads the Firm’s individual action against pharmaceutical giant Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. and Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (together, “Teva”), and certain of Teva’s current and former employees and officers, relating to alleged anticompetitive practices in Teva’s sales of generic drugs. Teva is a dual-listed company, and the Firm represents several Israeli institutional investors who purchased Teva shares on the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. In early 2021, Pomerantz achieved a major victory for global investors when the district court agreed to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Israeli law claims. *Clal Insurance Company Ltd. v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.*

In 2019, Jeremy achieved a \$27 million settlement for the Class in *Strougo v. Barclays PLC*, a high-profile securities class action in which Pomerantz was Lead Counsel. Plaintiffs alleged that Barclays PLC misled institutional investors about the manipulation of the banking giant’s so-called “dark pool” trading systems in order to provide a trading advantage to high-frequency traders over its institutional investor clients. This case turned on the duty of integrity owed by Barclays to its clients. In November 2017, Jeremy achieved precedent-setting victories for investors, when the Second Circuit Court of Appeals held that direct evidence of price impact is not always necessary to demonstrate market efficiency to invoke the presumption of reliance, and that defendants seeking to rebut the presumption of reliance must do so by a preponderance of the evidence rather than merely meeting a burden of production.

Jeremy led the Firm’s securities class action litigation against Yahoo! Inc., in which Pomerantz, as Lead Counsel, achieved an \$80 million settlement for the Class in 2018. The case involved the biggest data breaches in U.S. history, in which over 3 billion Yahoo accounts were compromised. This was the first significant settlement to date of a securities fraud class action filed in response to a data breach.

In 2018 Jeremy achieved a \$3,300,000 settlement for the Class in the Firm's securities class action against Corinthian Colleges, one of the largest for-profit college systems in the country, for alleged misrepresentations about its job placement rates, compliance with applicable regulations, and enrollment statistics. Pomerantz prevailed in the motion to dismiss the proceedings, a particularly noteworthy victory because Chief Judge George King of the Central District of California had dismissed two prior lawsuits against Corinthian with similar allegations. *Erickson v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc.* (C.D. Cal.).

Jeremy led the Firm's litigation team that in 2018 secured a \$31 million partial settlement with three defendants in *In re Libor Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation*, a closely watched multi-district litigation, which concerns the London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) rigging scandal.

In *In re China North East Petroleum Corp. Securities Litigation*, Jeremy achieved a significant victory for shareholders in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, whereby the Appeals Court ruled that a temporary rise in share price above its purchase price in the aftermath of a corrective disclosure did not eviscerate an investor's claim for damages. The Second Circuit's decision was deemed "precedential" by the *New York Law Journal* and provides critical guidance for assessing damages in a § 10(b) action.

Jeremy had an integral role in *In re Comverse Technology, Inc. Securities Litigation*, in which he and his partners achieved a historic \$225 million settlement on behalf of the Class, which was the second-largest options backdating settlement to date.

Jeremy regularly consults with Pomerantz's international institutional clients, including pension funds, regarding their rights under the U.S. securities laws. Jeremy is working with the Firm's international clients to craft a response to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Morrison v. National Australia Bank, Ltd.*, which limited the ability of foreign investors to seek redress under the federal securities laws.

Jeremy is a frequent lecturer worldwide regarding current corporate governance and securities litigation issues.

Jeremy graduated from Fordham University School of Law in 2002. While in law school, he served as a staff member of the *Fordham Urban Law Journal*. Upon graduation, he began his career at a major New York law firm as a litigation associate, where he specialized in complex commercial litigation.

Jeremy is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Southern District of Texas, the District of Colorado, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and the Northern District of Illinois; the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth, and Tenth Circuits; and the United States Supreme Court.

Gustavo F. Bruckner

Gustavo F. Bruckner heads Pomerantz's Corporate Governance practice group, which enforces shareholder rights and prosecutes litigation challenging corporate actions that harm shareholders. Under Gustavo's leadership, the Corporate Governance group has achieved numerous noteworthy litigation successes. He has been quoted on corporate governance issues by *The New York Times*, *The*

Wall Street Journal, *Bloomberg*, *Law360*, and *Reuters*, and was honored from 2016 through 2021 by Super Lawyers® as a “Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney,” a recognition bestowed on no more than 5% of eligible attorneys in the New York Metro area. Gustavo regularly appears in state and federal courts across the nation. Gustavo presented at the prestigious Institute for Law and Economic Policy conference.

Gustavo is a fierce advocate of aggressive corporate clawback policies that allow companies to recover damages from officers and directors for reputational and financial harm. Most recently, in *McIntosh vs Keizer, et al.*, Docket No. 2018-0386 (Del. Ch.), Pomerantz filed a derivative suit on behalf of Hertz Global Holdings, Inc. shareholders, seeking to compel the Hertz board of directors to claw back millions of dollars in unearned and undeserved payments that the Company made to former officers and directors who significantly damaged Hertz through years of wrongdoing and misconduct. Under pressure from plaintiff’s litigation efforts, the Hertz board of directors elected to take unprecedented action and mooted plaintiff’s claims, initiating litigation to recover tens of millions of dollars in incentive compensation and more than \$200 million in damages from culpable former Hertz executives.

Pomerantz through initiation and prosecution of a shareholder derivative action, forced the Hertz board to seek clawback from former officers and directors of the company, unjustly enriched after causing the Company to file inaccurate and false financial statements leading to a \$235 million restatement and \$16 million fee to the SEC.

In September 2017, Gustavo’s Corporate Governance team achieved a settlement in New Jersey Superior Court that provided non-pecuniary benefits for a non-opt out class. In approving the settlement, Judge Julio Mendez, of Cape May County Chancery Division, became the first New Jersey state court judge to formally adopt the Third Circuit’s nine-part *Girsh* factors, *Girsh v. Jepson*, 521 F.2d 153 (3d Cir. 1975). Never before has there been a published New Jersey state court opinion setting out the factors a court must consider in evaluating whether a class action settlement should be determined to be fair and adequate.

Gustavo successfully argued *Strougo v. Hollander*, C.A. No. 9770-CB (Del. Ch. 2015), obtaining a landmark ruling in Delaware that bylaws adopted after shareholders are cashed out do not apply to shareholders affected by the transaction. In the process, Gustavo and the Corporate Governance team beat back a fee-shifting bylaw and were able to obtain a 25% price increase for members of the class cashed out in the “going private” transaction. Shortly thereafter, the Delaware Legislature adopted legislation to ban fee-shifting bylaws.

In *Stein v. DeBoer* (Or. Cir. Ct. 2017), Gustavo and the Corporate Governance group achieved a settlement that provides significant corporate governance therapeutics on behalf of shareholders of Lithia Motors, Inc. The company’s board had approved, without meaningful review, the Transition Agreement between the company and Sidney DeBoer, its founder, controlling shareholder, CEO, and Chairman, who was stepping down as CEO. DeBoer and his son, the current CEO, negotiated virtually all the material terms of the Agreement, by which the company agreed to pay the senior DeBoer \$1,060,000 and a \$42,000 car allowance annually for the rest of his life, plus other benefits, in addition to the \$200,000 per year that he would receive for continuing to serve as Chairman.

In *Miller v. Bolduc*, No. SUCV 2015-00807 (Mass. Sup. Ct. 2015), Gustavo and the Corporate Governance group, by initiating litigation, caused Implant Sciences to hold its first shareholder annual meeting in 5 years and to place an important compensation grant up for a shareholder vote.

In *Strougo v. North State Bancorp*, No. 15 CVS 14696 (N.C. Super. Ct. 2015), Gustavo and the Corporate Governance team caused the North State Bancorp merger agreement to be amended to provide a “majority of the minority” provision for common shareholders in connection with the shareholder vote on the merger. As a result of the action, common shareholders had the ability to stop the merger if they did not wish it to go forward.

In *Hallandale Beach Police Officers and Firefighters’ Personnel Retirement Fund vs. Lululemon athletica, Inc.*, C.A. No. 8522-VCP (Del. Ch. 2014), in an issue of first impression in Delaware, Gustavo successfully argued for the production of the company chairman’s Rule 10b5-1 stock trading plan. The court found that a stock trading plan established by the company’s chairman, pursuant to which a broker, rather than the chairman himself, would liquidate a portion of the chairman’s stock in the company, did not preclude potential liability for insider trading.

Gustavo was Co-Lead Counsel in *In re Great Wolf Resorts, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, C.A. No. 7328-VCN (Del. Ch. 2012), obtaining the elimination of stand-still provisions that allowed third parties to bid for Great Wolf Resorts, Inc., resulting in the emergence of a third-party bidder and approximately \$94 million (57%) in additional merger consideration for Great Wolf shareholders.

Gustavo received his law degree in 1992 from the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, where he served as an editor of the Moot Court Board and on the Student Council. Upon graduation, he received the award for outstanding student service.

After graduating law school, Gustavo served as Chief-of-Staff to a New York City legislator.

Gustavo is a Mentor and Coach to the NYU Stern School of Business, Berkley Center for Entrepreneurial Studies, New Venture Competition. He was a University Scholar at NYU where he obtained a B.S. in Marketing and International Business in 1988 and an MBA in Finance and International Business in 1989.

Gustavo is a Trustee and former Treasurer of the Beit Rabban Day School, and an arbitrator in the Civil Court of the City of New York.

Gustavo is admitted to practice in New York and New Jersey; the United States District Courts for the Eastern, Northern, and Southern Districts of New York and the District of New Jersey; the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Seventh Circuits; and the United States Supreme Court.

Brian Calandra

Brian Calandra joined Pomerantz in June 2019 as Of Counsel and was elevated to Partner in January 2023. He has extensive experience in securities, antitrust, complex commercial, and white-collar matters in federal and state courts nationwide. Brian has represented issuers, underwriters, and individuals in securities class actions involving the financial, telecommunications, real estate, and pharmaceutical

industries. He has also represented financial institutions in antitrust class actions concerning foreign exchange; supra-national, sub-sovereign and agency bonds; bonds issued by the government of Mexico; and credit card fees. In 2021, Brian was honored as a Super Lawyers® “Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney”.

Brian has written multiple times on developments in securities law and other topics, including co-authoring an overview of insider trading law and enforcement for *Practical Compliance & Risk Management for the Securities Industry*, co-authoring an analysis of anti-corruption compliance risks posed by sovereign wealth funds for *Risk & Compliance*, and authoring an analysis of the effects of the 2005 Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act on women in bankruptcy for the *Women’s Rights Law Reporter*.

Before joining Pomerantz, Brian was a litigation associate at Shearman & Sterling LLP. Brian graduated from Rutgers School of Law-Newark in 2009, *cum laude*, Order of the Coif. While at Rutgers, Brian was co-editor-in-chief of the *Women’s Rights Law Reporter* and received the Justice Henry E. Ackerson Prize for Distinction in Legal Skills and the Carol Russ Memorial Prize for Distinction in Promoting Women’s Rights.

Justin D. D’Aloia

Justin D. D’Aloia is a Partner in Pomerantz’s New York office, where he specializes in securities class action litigation. He has extensive experience litigating high-profile securities cases in federal and state courts across the country. Justin has represented issuers, underwriters, and senior executives in matters involving a range of industries, including the financial services, life sciences, real estate, technology, and consumer retail sectors. His practice covers the full spectrum of proceedings from pre-suit demand through settlement.

Justin joined Pomerantz as a Partner in October 2022. Before joining Pomerantz, Justin was counsel at a large international law firm where he focused on securities litigation and other complex shareholder class action litigation. He previously served as a law clerk to Judge Mark Falk of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

Justin received his J.D. from Fordham University School of Law, where he was Editor-in-Chief of the Fordham International Law Journal. He earned his undergraduate degree from Rutgers University with a concentration in Business and Economics.

Justin is admitted to practice in New York; United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the District of Colorado; United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, and Tenth Circuits.

Emma Gilmore

Emma Gilmore is a Partner at Pomerantz and is regularly involved in high-profile class-action litigation. In 2022, Benchmark Litigation shortlisted her for Plaintiff Attorney of the Year. In 2021, Emma was

awarded a spot on *National Law Journal's* prestigious Elite Women of the Plaintiffs Bar list. In 2021 and 2020, she was named by Benchmark Litigation as one of the Top 250 Women in Litigation — an honor bestowed on only seven plaintiffs' lawyers in the U.S. those years. The *National Law Journal* and the *New York Law Journal* honored her as a "Plaintiffs' Lawyer Trailblazer". Emma was honored by Law360 in 2018 as an MVP in Securities Litigation, part of an "elite slate of attorneys [who] have distinguished themselves from their peers by securing hard-earned successes in high-stakes litigation, complex global matters and record-breaking deals." Only up to six attorneys nationwide are selected each year as MVPs in Securities Litigation. Emma is the first woman plaintiff attorney to receive this outstanding award since it was initiated in 2011. Emma has been honored since 2018 as a Super Lawyer®. She has been recognized by Lawdragon as one of the top 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers.

Emma is regularly invited to speak about recent trends and developments in securities litigation. She serves on the New York City Bar Association's Securities Litigation Committee. Emma regularly counsels clients around the world on how to maximize recoveries on their investments.

Emma played a leading role in the Firm's class action case in the Southern District of New York against Brazil's largest oil company, Petrobras, arising from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme, in which the Firm was sole Lead Counsel. In a significant victory for investors, Pomerantz achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement with Petrobras. This is not only the largest securities class action settlement in a decade but is the largest settlement ever in a class action involving a foreign issuer, the fifth-largest class action settlement ever achieved in the United States, and the largest settlement achieved by a foreign lead plaintiff. The biggest instance of corruption in the history of Brazil had ensnared not only Petrobras' former executives but also Brazilian politicians, including former president Lula da Silva and one-third of the Brazilian Congress. Emma traveled to Brazil to uncover evidence of fraud and drafted the complaint. She deposed and defended numerous fact and expert witnesses, including deposing the former CEO of Petrobras, the whistleblower, and the chief accountant. She drafted the appellate brief, playing an instrumental role in securing a significant victory for investors in this case at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, when the Court rejected the heightened ascertainability requirement for obtaining class certification that had been imposed by other circuit courts. She opposed defendants' petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. Emma successfully obtained sanctions against a professional objector challenging the integrity of the settlement, both in the District Court and in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Emma organized a group of twenty-seven of the foremost U.S. scholars in the field of evidence and spearheaded the effort to submit an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court on their behalf in a critical issue for investors. One of the two pending issues before the High Court in *Goldman Sachs Group Inc. et al v. Arkansas Teachers Retirement System, et al.* (No. 20-222) squarely affected investors' ability to pursue claims collectively as a class: whether, in order to rebut the presumption of reliance originated by the Court in the landmark *Basic v. Levinson* decision, defendants bear the burden of persuasion, or whether they bear only the much lower burden of production. The scholars argued that defendants

carry the higher burden of persuasion. In a 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court sided with Pomerantz and the scholars.

Emma led the Firm's class action litigation against Deutsche Bank and its executives, arising from the Bank's improper anti-money-laundering and know-your-customer procedures. Plaintiffs alleged that, despite the Bank's representations that it implemented a "robust and strict" Know Your Customer program with "special safeguards" for politically exposed persons (PEPs), defendants repeatedly exempted high-net-worth individuals and PEPs from any meaningful due diligence, enabling their criminal activities through the Bank's facilities. For example, Deutsche Bank continued "business as usual" with Jeffrey Epstein even after learning that 40 underage girls had come forward with testimony that he had sexually assaulted them. Deutsche Bank's former CEOs also onboarded, retained, and serviced Russian oligarchs and other clients reportedly engaged in criminal activities, with little or no due diligence. On October 20, 2022, Emma secured for investors nearly 50% of recoverable damages, which reflects a premium for the palpable misconduct and is exceptionally high for securities class action settlements. The Deutsche Bank litigation and settlement serve as important legal precedents aimed to deter financial institutions from enabling the wealthy and powerful to commit crimes in return for financial benefits to the institutions.

Emma co-leads the Firm's securities class action against Amazon arising from the behemoth's anti-competitive practices, which are also the subject of investigations by the U.S Congress and foreign regulators. Amazon is accused of misrepresenting its business dealing with third-party sellers on its market platform. Unbeknownst to investors, Amazon repeatedly misappropriated third-party sellers' data to create competing products, tied and bundled its products, exploited its power over third party sellers and favored its private-label products to the detriment of third-party sellers and consumers. The lawsuit seeks to recover billions of dollars in damages on behalf of defrauded investors.

Emma played a leading role in *Strougo v. Barclays PLC*, a high-profile securities class action that alleged Barclays PLC misled institutional investor clients about the extent of the banking giant's use of so-called "dark pool" trading systems. She secured an important precedent-setting opinion from the Second Circuit. Emma organized a group of leading evidence experts who filed amicus briefs supporting plaintiffs' position in the Second Circuit.

Emma secured a unanimous decision by a panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, benefiting defrauded investors in *Costa Brava Partnership III LP v. ChinaCast Education Corp.* In an issue of first impression, the Ninth Circuit held that imputation of the CEO's scienter to the company was warranted vis-a-vis innocent third parties, despite the fact that the executive acted for his own benefit and to the company's detriment.

She has also devoted a significant amount of time to pro bono matters. She played a critical role in securing a unanimous ruling by the Arkansas Supreme Court striking down as unconstitutional a state law banning cohabiting individuals from adopting children or serving as foster parents. The ruling was a

relief for the 1,600-plus children in the state of Arkansas who needed a permanent family. The litigation generated significant publicity, including coverage by the *Arkansas Times*, *the Wall Street Journal*, and *the New York Times*.

She is Lead Counsel in the Firm's class action litigation against Arconic, arising from the deadliest U.K. fire in more than a century. Arconic is the U.S. company that manufactured the highly flammable aluminum cladding allegedly responsible for the inferno that eradicated the public housing, killing 71 people and injuring over 70 other tenants. Arconic repeatedly misrepresented to the market its safety protocols and the safety classification of its cladding products. When the truth about Arconic's unsafe practices emerged, investors lost over \$1 billion in damages.

Before joining Pomerantz, Emma was a litigation associate with the firms of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and Flom, LLP, and Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP. She worked on the *WorldCom Securities Litigation*, which settled for \$2 billion.

She also served as a law clerk to the Honorable Thomas C. Platt, former U.S. Chief Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Emma graduated *cum laude* from Brooklyn Law School, where she served as a staff editor for the *Brooklyn Law Review*. She was the recipient of two CALI Excellence for the Future Awards, in the subjects of evidence and discovery. She graduated *summa cum laude* from Arizona State University, with a BA in French and a minor in Business.

She serves on the Firm's Anti-Harassment and Discrimination Committee.

Michael Grunfeld

Michael Grunfeld joined Pomerantz in July 2017 as Of Counsel and was elevated to Partner in 2019.

Michael has extensive experience in securities, complex commercial, and white-collar matters in federal and state courts around the country.

He has played a leading role in some of the Firm's significant class action litigation, including its case against Yahoo! Inc. arising out of the biggest data breaches in U.S. history, in which the Firm, as Lead Counsel, achieved an \$80 million settlement on behalf of the Class. This settlement made history as the first substantial shareholder recovery in a securities fraud class action related to a cybersecurity breach. Michael also plays a leading role in many of the Firm's other ongoing class actions.

Michael is an honoree of Benchmark Litigation's 40 & Under Hot List 2020, 2021, and 2022, granted to a few of the "best and brightest law firm partners who stand out in their practices." He was named a 2019 Rising Star by Law360, a prestigious honor awarded to a select few top litigators under 40 years old "whose legal accomplishments transcend their age." In 2020, 2021, and 2022, Michael was recognized by Super Lawyers® as a Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney;" in 2018 and 2019 he was honored as a New York Metro Rising Star.

Michael also leads Pomerantz's litigation on behalf of the Colorado Public Employees' Retirement System as an intervenor in *The Doris Behr 2012 Irrevocable Trust v. Johnson & Johnson*. At issue is an activist investor's attempt to have Johnson & Johnson ("J&J") shareholders vote on a proxy proposal instituting a corporate bylaw that would require all securities fraud claims against the company to be pursued through mandatory arbitration, and that would waive shareholder's rights to bring securities class actions. In March 2022, the district court handed down an important victory for shareholders when it granted J&J's and the Intervenors' Motion to Dismiss the Third Amended Complaint.

Michael is the co-author of a chapter on damages in securities class actions in the LexisNexis treatise, *Litigating Securities Class Actions*.

Michael served as a clerk for Judge Ronald Gilman of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals and as a foreign law clerk for Justice Asher Grunis of the Israeli Supreme Court. Before joining Pomerantz, he was a litigation associate at Shearman & Sterling LLP and Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP.

Michael graduated from Columbia Law School in 2008, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar and Submissions Editor of the Columbia Business Law Review. He graduated from Harvard University with an A.B. in Government, *magna cum laude*, in 2004.

Michael is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the District of Colorado; and the United States Courts of Appeal for the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth, and Tenth Circuits.

J. Alexander Hood II

J. Alexander Hood II joined Pomerantz in June 2015 and was elevated to Of Counsel to the Firm in 2019. He was elevated to Partner in 2022. Alex leads the Firm's case origination team, identifying and investigating potential violations of the federal securities laws. In 2023, Alex was selected as a Rising Star in the *National Law Journal's* Elite Trial Lawyers awards competition. This award honors lawyers under 40 who represent the next generation of legal leaders. He has been named a Super Lawyers® Rising Star each year since 2019.

He has been named a Super Lawyers® Rising Star each year since 2019.

Alex played a key role in securing Pomerantz's appointment as Lead Counsel in actions against Yahoo! Inc., Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V., Wynn Resorts Limited, Mylan N.V., The Western Union Company, Perrigo Company plc, Blue Apron Holdings, Inc., AT&T Inc., Wells Fargo & Company, and Raytheon Technologies Corporation, among others.

Alex also oversees the firm's involvement on behalf of institutional investors in non-U.S. litigations, assisting Pomerantz clients with respect to evaluating and pursuing recovery in foreign jurisdictions, including matters in the Netherlands, Germany, the UK, Australia, Brazil, Denmark, and elsewhere.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Alex practiced at nationally recognized law firms, where he was involved in commercial, financial services, corporate governance and securities matters.

Alex graduated from Boston University School of Law (J.D.) and from the University of Oregon School of Law (LL.M.). During law school, he served as a member of the Boston University Review of Banking & Financial Law and participated in the Thomas Tang Moot Court Competition. In addition, Alex clerked for the American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee and, as a legal extern, worked on the Center for Biological Diversity's Clean Water Act suit against BP in connection with the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

Alex is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern, Eastern, Western and Northern Districts of New York; the District of Colorado; the Eastern District of Michigan; the Eastern District of Wisconsin; the Northern District of Illinois; the Northern District of Indiana; the Southern District of Texas; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Omar Jafri

Omar Jafri is a Partner at Pomerantz. He represents defrauded investors in individual and class action securities litigation. In 2021, Omar was recognized by the *National Law Journal* as a Rising Star of the Plaintiffs' Bar. The *National Law Journal* selected lawyers who "demonstrated repeated success in cutting-edge work on behalf of plaintiffs over the last 18 months [and] possess a solid track record of client wins over the past three to five years." In 2021, 2022 and 2023, Omar was recognized by Super Lawyers® as a Rising Star in Securities Litigation.

Omar has played an integral role in numerous cases where the Firm achieved significant recoveries for defrauded shareholders as Lead, Co-Lead or Additional Counsel, including: *In re Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. N.V. Securities Litigation* (\$44 million recovery); *In re Juno Therapeutics, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$24 million recovery); *In re Aveo Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$18 million recovery, which was more than four times larger than the SEC's fair fund recovery in its parallel litigation); *Sudunagunta v. NantKwest, Inc.* (\$12 million settlement); *Cooper v. Thoratec Corporation et. al.* (\$11.9 million settlement following a reversal in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit after the lower court repeatedly dismissed the case); *Thomas v. MagnaChip Semiconductor Corp. Securities Litigation* (\$6.2 million settlement with majority shareholder, Avenue Capital); *Solomon v. Sprint Corporation et. al.* (\$3.75 million settlement); *Schaeffer v. Nabriva Therapeutics plc et. al.* (\$3 million settlement); and *In re Sequans Communications S.A. Securities Litigation* (\$2.75 million settlement).

Through vigorous litigation, Omar has helped shape important precedents for all investors. *NantKwest* was the first case in the United States to recognize statistical proof of traceability. In *Roofers Pension Fund v. Papa et. al.*, the District Court independently analyzed the market of a security traded on a foreign exchange and found that it met the standards of market efficiency to allow for class certification for the first time since the U.S. Supreme Court decided *Morrison*. *Nabriva* was the first case in the Second Circuit to sustain a complaint based on the failure to disclose the FDA's serious criticisms identified in a Form 483 letter. In *Yan v. ReWalk Robotics et. al.*, while the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit disagreed on the merits, the Circuit held that it is erroneous to dismiss a case for lack of standing when a named plaintiff can be substituted with another class member, shutting the door on such defense tactics in any future case filed in that Circuit. *In re Bed Bath & Beyond Corporation Securities Litigation* was one of the first decisions in the country to conclude that the dissemination of a misleading emoji can be an actionable misrepresentation under the federal securities laws. And in *Glazer Capital Management, L.P. et. al. v. Forescout Technologies, Inc. et. al.*, Omar won a

rare reversal in a securities fraud class action in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. In a published decision that reversed the dismissal in *Forescout*, the Ninth Circuit held that lower courts must not comingle the lower standard for falsity with the higher standard for scienter in analyzing the sufficiency of a securities fraud complaint, and repudiated numerous arguments concerning the testimony of Confidential Witnesses that the defense bar had convinced many lower courts to erroneously endorse over the years.

Omar started his legal career at the height of the financial crisis in 2008 and has litigated major disputes on behalf of institutional investors arising out of the credit crisis, including disputes related to Collateralized Debt Obligations, Residential Mortgage-Backed Securities, Credit Default Swaps and other complex financial investments. Omar also represented the Examiner in the *Lehman Brothers* bankruptcy, the largest in history at the time, and helped draft a report that identified colorable claims against Lehman's senior executives for violating their fiduciary duties. He also has a robust *pro bono* criminal defense practice and has represented indigent defendants charged with crimes that range from simple battery to arson and murder.

Before joining Pomerantz, Omar was a law clerk to Judge William S. Duffey, Jr. of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, and an associate at an international law firm where he represented clients in a wide variety of matters, including securities litigation, complex commercial litigation, white collar criminal defense, and internal investigations.

Omar is a 2004 honors graduate of the University of Texas at Austin, and a 2008, *magna cum laude*, graduate of the University of Illinois College of Law, where he was inducted into the *Order of the Coif* and received the Rickert Award for Excellence in Advocacy. He is a fellow of the American Bar Foundation.

Omar is admitted to practice in Illinois; the United States District Courts for the Northern District of Illinois (Trial Bar) and the Northern District of Indiana; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Second, Fifth, and Ninth Circuits.

Jordan L. Lurie

Jordan L. Lurie joined Pomerantz as a partner in the Los Angeles office in December 2018. Jordan heads Pomerantz's Strategic Consumer Litigation practice. He was named a 2021 Southern California Super Lawyer®.

Jordan has litigated shareholder class and derivative actions, complex corporate securities and consumer litigation, and a wide range of fraud and misrepresentation cases brought under state and federal consumer protection statutes involving unfair competition, false advertising, and privacy rights. Among his notable representations, Jordan served as Lead Counsel in the prosecution and successful resolution of major nationwide class actions against Nissan, Ford, Volkswagen, BMW, Toyota, Chrysler and General Motors. He also successfully preserved a multi-million dollar nationwide automotive class action settlement by convincing the then Chief Judge of the Ninth Circuit and his wife, who were also class members and had filed objections to the settlement, to withdraw their objections and endorse the settlement.

Jordan has argued cases in the California Court of Appeals and in the Ninth Circuit that resulted in published opinions establishing class members' rights to intervene and clarifying the standing requirements for an objector to appeal. He also established a Ninth Circuit precedent for obtaining attorneys' fees in a catalyst fee action. Jordan has tried a federal securities fraud class action to verdict. He has been a featured speaker at California Mandatory Continuing Legal Education seminars and is a trained ombudsman and mediator.

Outside of his legal practice, Jordan is an active educator and community leader and has held executive positions in various organizations in the Los Angeles community. Jordan participated in the first Wexner Heritage Foundation leadership program in Los Angeles and the first national cohort of the Board Member Institute for Jewish Nonprofits at the Kellogg School of Management.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Jordan was the Managing Partner of the Los Angeles office of Weiss & Lurie and Senior Litigator at Capstone Law APC.

Jordan graduated cum laude from Yale University in 1984 with a B.A in Political Science and received his law degree in 1987 from the University of Southern California Law Center, where he served as Notes Editor of the *University of Southern California Law Review*.

Jordan is a member of the State Bar of California and has been admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Northern, Southern, Central and Eastern Districts of California, the Eastern and Western Districts of Michigan, and the District of Colorado.

Jennifer Pafiti

Jennifer Pafiti became associated with the Firm in April 2014 and was elevated to Partner in December 2015. A dually qualified U.K. solicitor and U.S. attorney, she is the Firm's Head of Client Services and also takes an active role in complex securities litigation, representing clients in both class and non-class action securities litigation.

In 2023, Jennifer was one of only four individuals to be honored with the *New York Law Journal's* Innovation Award, which recognizes "creative and inspiring approaches by forward-thinking firms and individuals." Jennifer was nominated as a 2023 Lawyer of Distinction. In 2022, *The Enterprise World* named Jennifer as *The Most Successful Business Leader to Watch*. In 2021, Jennifer was selected as one of the "Women, Influence and Power in Law" honorees by Corporate Counsel, in the Collaborative Leadership – Law Firm category. Lawdragon has named Jennifer among the Leading 500 Lawyers in the United States every year since 2021. In 2020 she was named a Southern California Rising Star by Super Lawyers® and was recognized by Benchmark Litigation as a Future Star. Lawdragon has recognized Jennifer as a Leading Plaintiff Financial Attorney from 2019 through 2021. In 2019, she was also honored by Super Lawyers® as a Southern California Rising Star in Securities Litigation, named to Benchmark Litigation's *40 & Under Hot List* of the best young attorneys in the United States, and recognized by *Los Angeles Magazine* as one of Southern California's Top Young Lawyers. In 2018, Jennifer was recognized as a Lawyer of Distinction. She was honored by Super Lawyers® in 2017 as both a Rising Star and one of the Top Women Attorneys in Southern California. In 2016, the *Daily Journal* selected Jennifer for its "Top 40 Under 40" list of the best young attorneys in California.

Jennifer was an integral member of the Firm's litigation team for *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation*, a case relating to a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme at Brazil's largest oil company, Petróleo Brasileiro S.A.- Petrobras, in which the Firm was sole Lead Counsel. She helped secure a significant victory for investors in this case at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, when the court rejected the heightened ascertainability requirement for obtaining class certification that had been imposed by other Circuit courts such as the Third and Sixth Circuit Courts of Appeals. Working closely with Lead Plaintiff, Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited, she was also instrumental in achieving the historic settlement of \$3 billion for Petrobras investors. This is not only the largest securities class action settlement in a decade but is the largest settlement ever in a securities class action involving a foreign issuer, the fifth-largest securities class action settlement ever achieved in the United States, the largest securities class action settlement achieved by a foreign Lead Plaintiff, and the largest securities class action settlement in history not involving a restatement of financial reports.

Jennifer was involved, among other cases, in the securities class action against rare disease biopharmaceutical company, KaloBios, and certain of its officers, including CEO Martin Shkreli. In 2018, Pomerantz achieved a settlement of \$3 million plus 300,000 shares for defrauded investors – an excellent recovery in light of the company's bankruptcy. *Isensee v. KaloBios*. Jennifer also helped achieve a \$10 million recovery for the class in a securities litigation against the bankrupt Californian energy company, PG&E, which arose from allegedly false statements made by the company about its rolling power outages in the wake of the catastrophic wildfire incidents that occurred in California in 2015, 2017, and 2018. *Vataj v. Johnson, et al.*

Jennifer earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology at Thames Valley University in England, prior to studying law. She earned her law degrees at Thames Valley University (G.D.L.) and the Inns of Court School of Law (L.P.C.) in the U.K.

Before studying law in England, Jennifer was a regulated financial advisor and senior mortgage underwriter at a major U.K. financial institution. She holds full CeFA and CeMAP qualifications. After qualifying as a solicitor, Jennifer specialized in private practice civil litigation, which included the representation of clients in high-profile cases in the Royal Courts of Justice. Prior to joining Pomerantz, Jennifer was an associate with Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP in their San Diego office.

Jennifer regularly travels throughout the U.S. and Europe to advise clients on how best to evaluate losses to their investment portfolios attributable to financial fraud or other misconduct, and how best to maximize their potential recoveries. Jennifer is also a regular speaker at events on securities litigation and fiduciary duty.

Jennifer served on the Honorary Steering Committee of Equal Rights Advocates ("ERA"), which focuses on specific issues that women face in the legal profession. ERA is an organization that protects and expands economic and educational access and opportunities for women and girls.

Jennifer is a member of the National Association of Pension Fund Attorneys and represents the Firm as a member of the California Association of Public Retirement Systems, the State Association of County Retirement Systems, the National Association of State Treasurers, the National Conference of Employee Retirement Systems, the Texas Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems, and the U.K.'s National Association of Pension Funds.

Jennifer is admitted to practice in England and Wales; California; the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central and Southern Districts of California; and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Joshua B. Silverman

Joshua B. Silverman is a partner in the Firm's Chicago office. He specializes in individual and class action securities litigation.

Josh was Lead Counsel in *In re Groupon, Inc. Securities Litigation*, achieving a \$45 million settlement, one of the highest percentage recoveries in the Seventh Circuit. He was also Lead or Co-Lead Counsel in *In re MannKind Corp. Securities Litigation* (\$23 million settlement); *In re AVEO Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$18 million settlement, more than four times larger than the SEC's fair fund recovery in parallel litigation); *New Mexico State Investment Council v. Countrywide Financial Corp.* (very favorable confidential settlement); *New Mexico State Investment Council v. Cheslock Bakker & Associates* (summary judgment award in excess of \$30 million); *Sudunagunta v. NantKwest, Inc.* (\$12 million settlement); *Bruce v. Suntech Power Holdings Corp.* (\$5 million settlement); *In re AgFeed, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$7 million settlement); and *In re Hemispherx BioPharma Securities Litigation* (\$2.75 million settlement). Josh also played a key role in the Firm's representation of investors before the United States Supreme Court in *StoneRidge*, and prosecuted many of the Firm's other class cases, including *In re Sealed Air Corp. Securities Litigation* (\$20 million settlement).

Josh, together with Managing Partner Jeremy Lieberman, achieved a critical victory for investors in the securities fraud class action against Perrigo Co. plc when Judge Arleo of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey certified classes of investors that purchased Perrigo securities on both the New York Stock Exchange and the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. Pomerantz represents a number of institutional investors that purchased Perrigo securities on both exchanges after an offer by Mylan N.V. to tender Perrigo shares. This is the first time since *Morrison* that a U.S. court has independently analyzed the market of a security traded on a non-U.S. exchange, and found that it met the standards of market efficiency necessary allow for class certification.

Several of Josh's cases have set important precedent. For example, *In re MannKind* established that investors may support complaints with expert information. *New Mexico v. Countrywide* recognized that investors may show Section 11 damages for asset-backed securities even if there has been no interruption in payment or threat of default. More recently, *NantKwest* was the first Section 11 case in the nation to recognize statistical proof of traceability.

In addition to prosecuting cases, Josh regularly speaks at investor conferences and continuing legal education programs.

Before joining Pomerantz, Josh practiced at McGuireWoods LLP and its Chicago predecessor, Ross & Hardies, where he represented one of the largest independent futures commission merchants in commodities fraud and civil RICO cases. He also spent two years as a securities trader, and continues to actively trade stocks, futures, and options for his own account.

Josh is a 1993 graduate of the University of Michigan, where he received Phi Beta Kappa honors, and a 1996 graduate of the University of Michigan Law School.

Josh is admitted to practice in Illinois; the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois; the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Second, Third, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Circuits; and the United States Supreme Court.

Brenda Szydlo

Brenda Szydlo joined Pomerantz in January 2016 as Of Counsel and was elevated to Partner in 2022. She brings to the Firm extensive experience in complex civil litigation in federal and state court on behalf of plaintiffs and defendants, with a particular focus on securities and financial fraud litigation, litigation against pharmaceutical corporations, accountants' liability, and commercial litigation. In 2020, 2021, and 2022, Brenda was recognized by Super Lawyers® as a "Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney." Brenda was also included on the Lawdragon 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers list in 2022 and 2023.

Brenda played a leading role in the Firm's securities class action case in the Southern District of New York against Brazil's largest oil company, Petrobras, arising from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme, in which the Firm, as sole Lead Counsel, achieved a precedent-setting legal ruling and a historic \$3 billion settlement for the Class. This is not only the largest securities class action settlement in a decade but is the largest settlement ever in a securities class action involving a foreign issuer, the fifth-largest securities class action settlement ever achieved in the United States, the largest securities class action settlement achieved by a foreign Lead Plaintiff, and the largest securities class action settlement in history not involving a restatement of financial reports.

Brenda has represented investors in additional class and private actions that have resulted in significant recoveries, such as *In re Pfizer, Inc. Securities Litigation*, where the recovery was \$486 million, and *In re Refco, Inc. Securities Litigation*, where the recovery was in excess of \$407 million. She has also represented investors in opt-out securities actions, such as investors opting out of *In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative & ERISA Litigation* in order to pursue their own securities action.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Brenda served as Senior Counsel in a prominent plaintiff advocacy firm, where she represented clients in securities and financial fraud litigation, and litigation against pharmaceutical corporations and accounting firms. Brenda also served as Counsel in the litigation department of one of the largest premier law firms in the world, where her practice focused on defending individuals and corporation in securities litigation and enforcement, accountants' liability actions, and commercial litigation.

Brenda is a graduate of St. John's University School of Law, where she was a St. Thomas More Scholar and member of the Law Review. She received a B.A. in economics from Binghamton University.

Brenda is admitted to practice in New York; United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits; and the United States Supreme Court.

Matthew L. Tuccillo

A Partner since 2013, Matthew L. Tuccillo joined Pomerantz in 2011. With 23+ years of experience, he is recognized as a top national securities litigator.

Matt serves as the Firm's lead litigator on high-stakes securities class action litigation in courts nationwide. He closely advises his institutional clients, which are regularly appointed to serve as lead plaintiffs overseeing such lawsuits. His current caseload includes multiple billion-dollar lawsuits headed by his clients. Matt's representative cases include:

- In *In re Miniso Group Holding Limited Securities Litigation*, No. CV-22-5815 (MR Wx) (S.D.N.Y.), one of Matt's foreign pension fund clients has been appointed lead plaintiff to oversee class action claims arising from a China-based retail company's U.S. IPO. An amended complaint will be filed and a motion to dismiss will be litigated in 2023.
- In *In re Emergent Biosolutions, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 8:21-cv-00955-PWG (D. Md.), arising from a company's COVID-19 vaccine manufacturing failures, one of Matt's foreign pension fund clients serves as court-appointed lead plaintiff. Matt filed a robust amended complaint, based on confidential sources and extensive U.S. government documents, and has opposed the motion to dismiss, with a ruling expected in 2023.
- In *Edwards v. McDermott Int'l, Inc.*, No. 4:18-cv-4330-AB (S.D. Tex.), Matt successfully opposed a motion to dismiss a class action lawsuit, led by one of his foreign pension fund clients, alleging a years-long, multi-prong fraud by an engineering and construction company that did a risky merger, belatedly reported massive write-downs, and declared bankruptcy. Matt has secured court orders in discovery requiring defendants to review for production over 1.25 million documents identified by running plaintiff-authored search terms on plaintiff-selected custodians.
- In *Chun v. Fluor Corp., et al.*, No. 3:18-cv-01338-S (N.D. Tex.), with two of his U.S. municipal pension fund clients serving as co-lead plaintiffs, Matt served as co-lead counsel in hard-fought litigation concerning underperforming, large-scale, fixed-bid projects through two motions to dismiss. A months-long mediation and negotiation process resulted in a court-approved \$33 million settlement, which was a 37.5% recovery of the upheld claim value.
- In *Odonate Therapeutics, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:20-01828-H-LL (S.D. Cal.), Matt successfully opposed a motion to dismiss in a securities lawsuit arising from a pharmaceuticals company's failure to advance its lead drug candidate to FDA approval. Notably, the court held that defendants' scienter (intent) was sufficiently pled, even though they bought, rather than sold, company stock during the period of alleged fraud. A successful mediation resulted in a court-approved \$12.75 million settlement.
- In *In re BP p.l.c. Secs. Litig.*, No. 4:10-md-2185 (S.D. Tex.), where the court praised the "uniformly excellent" "quality of lawyering," Matt spearheaded lawsuits over BP's Gulf of Mexico oil spill by

125+ global institutional investors. Over 9 years, he successfully opposed three motions to dismiss, oversaw e-discovery of 1.75 million documents, led the Plaintiffs Steering Committee, was the sole interface with BP and the Court, and secured some of the Firm's most ground-breaking rulings. In a ruling of first impression, he successfully argued that investors asserted viable English law "holder claims" for losses due to retention of already-owned shares in reliance on a fraud, a theory barred under U.S. law since *Blue Chip Stamps v. Manor Drug Stores*, 421 U.S. 723 (1975). He successfully argued against *forum non conveniens* (wrong forum) dismissal of 80+ global institutions' lawsuits - the first ruling after *Morrison v. Nat'l Australia Bank Ltd.*, 130 S. Ct. 2869 (2010), to permit foreign investors to pursue in U.S. court their foreign law claims for losses in a foreign company's securities traded on a foreign exchange. He successfully argued that the U.S. Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998 (SLUSA), which extinguishes U.S. state law claims in deference to the U.S. federal law, should not extend to the foreign law claims of U.S. and foreign investors, a ruling that saved those claims from dismissal where U.S. federal law afforded no remedy after *Morrison*. In 2021, Matt achieved mediator-assisted, confidential, favorable monetary settlement for all 35 Firm clients including public and private pension funds, money management firms, partnerships, and trusts from the U.S., Canada, the U.K., France, the Netherlands, and Australia. Notably, seven of these plaintiffs were Matt's institutional clients from the U.S., U.K., and Canada.

- In *In re Toronto-Dominion Bank Securities Litigation*, No. 1:17-cv-01735 (D.N.J.), Matt pled a multi-year fraud arising at one of Canada's largest banks, based on extensive statements by former employees detailing underlying retail banking misconduct. Matt persuaded the court to reject a motion to dismiss in an order noteworthy because it validated the scienter (intent) pleading despite no witness speaking directly to the individual defendants' state of mind. The court approved a \$13.25 million class-wide settlement achieved after mediation.

- In *Perez v. Higher One Holdings, Inc., et al.*, No. 14-cv-00755-AWT (D. Conn.), Matt persuaded the court, after an initial dismissal, to uphold a second amended complaint asserting five threads of fraud by an education funding company and its founders and to approve a \$7.5 million class-wide settlement. Notably, the court held that the company's reported financial results violated SEC Regulation S-K, Item 303, for failure to disclose known trends and impacts from underlying misconduct – a rare ruling absent an accounting restatement.

- In *In re KaloBios Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 15-cv-05841 (N.D. Cal.), a lawsuit against a bankrupt drug company and its jailed ex-CEO, Matt negotiated two class-wide settlements totaling \$3.25+ million, including cash payments and stock from the company, that were approved by the bankruptcy and district courts.

- In *In re Silvercorp Metals, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 1:12-cv-09456 (S.D.N.Y.), Matt worked with mining, accounting, damages, and market efficiency experts to survive a motion to dismiss by a Canadian company with mining operations in China and NYSE-traded stock. In approving the \$14 million settlement achieved after two mediations, Judge Rakoff called the case "unusually complex," given the technical nature of mining metrics, the need to compare mining standards in Canada, China, and the U.S., and the volume of Chinese-language evidence.

Matt was also on the multi-firm team that represented commercial real estate investors against the Empire State Building's long-term lessees/operators regarding a consolidation, REIT formation, and IPO in *In re Empire State Realty Trust, Inc. Investor Litig.*, No. 650607/2012 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.), which was resolved for a \$55 million cash/securities settlement fund, a \$100 million tax benefit from restructured terms, remedial disclosures, and deal protections.

Matt regularly counsels institutional investors, foreign and domestic, regarding pending or potential complex litigation in the U.S. He is skilled at identifying potential securities frauds early, regularly providing clients with the first opportunity to evaluate and pursue their claims, and he has worked extensively with outside investment management firms retained by clients to identify a winning set of supporting evidence. When litigation is filed, he fully oversees its conduct and resolution, counseling clients throughout every step of the process, while handling all significant motions and courtroom arguments. These skills have enabled him to sign numerous institutional clients for litigation and portfolio monitoring services, including public and private pension plans, investment management firms and sponsored investment vehicles, from both the U.S. and abroad. Matt's clients have spearheaded the Firm's litigation efforts in the *BP*, *Fluor*, *McDermott*, *Emergent*, and *Miniso* litigations discussed above.

Matt takes great pride in representing union clients. He got his own union card as a teenager (United Food & Commercial Workers International Union, Local 371), following in the footsteps of his grandfather (International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 560).

Before joining Pomerantz, Matt worked at a large full-service firm then plaintiff-side boutique firms in Boston and Connecticut, litigating complex business disputes and securities, consumer, and employment class actions. His pro bono work included securing Social Security benefits for a veteran with non-service-related disabilities.

Matt graduated from the Georgetown University Law Center in 1999, where he made the Dean's List. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1995, and among his various volunteer activities, he served as President of the Wesleyan Lawyers Association from 2017-2020.

His has been named a *Super Lawyers*® "Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney" (2016-present), *Benchmark* Litigation Star (2021-present), *Legal 500* Recommended Securities Litigator (2016, 2021), *American Lawyer* Northeast Trailblazer (2021), *Lawdragon* Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyer (2019-2020), and a *Martindale-Hubbell* AV® Preeminent™ peer-rated attorney (2014-present). His advocacy has been covered by Bloomberg, Law360, the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Hartford Business Journal*, and other outlets.

He is a member of the Bars the Supreme Court of the United States; the State of New York; the State of Connecticut; the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the Second and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals; and the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern District of New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, the Northern District of Illinois, the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and the Southern District of Texas. He is regularly admitted *pro hac vice* in state and federal courts nationwide.

Austin P. Van

Austin focuses his practice on high-profile securities class actions. In 2020, Austin was named by Law360 in 2020 as an MVP in Securities Litigation, part of an “elite slate of attorneys [who] have distinguished themselves from their peers by securing hard-earned successes in high-stakes litigation, complex global matters and record-breaking deals.” Only up to six attorneys nationwide are selected each year as MVPs in Securities Litigation. Austin was named to Benchmark Litigations “40 and Under Hotlist” in 2020 and 2021. Austin has been recognized by Lawdragon as one of the top 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers and has been named as a Recommended Lawyer by The Legal 500. Every year from 2018 through 2021, Austin has been honored as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star.

Austin led Pomerantz’s securities class action against TechnipFMC, an oil and gas services provider. He uncovered the theory of this case: that TechnipFMC massively overstated its net income in its initial registration statement due to its use of incorrect foreign exchange rates. Austin successfully argued at oral argument in 2018 that the Court should deny defendants’ motion to dismiss the central claim in the matter. In 2019, Austin successfully argued lead plaintiff’s motion for class certification. He led the class through complete preparations for trial. The case settled in 2020 for approximately \$20 million.

Austin led a successful securities class action at Pomerantz against Rockwell Medical, Inc. and served as co-lead counsel on the matter with another firm. Austin extensively investigated the facts of this case and drafted the operative complaint. At a pre-motion conference for Defendants’ motion to dismiss, District Senior Judge Allyn R. Ross stated: “based on what I have reviewed, it is virtually inconceivable to me that the consolidated amended complaint could possibly be dismissed on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion or a Rule 9(b) motion” and that the proposed motion practice “would be a complete waste of time and resources of counsel, of the clients’ money, and my time.” Defendants declined even to move to dismiss the complaint and settled the case in 2019 for \$3.7 million—a highly favorable settlement for the Class.

Austin received a J.D. from Yale Law School, where he was an editor of the Yale Law Journal and the Yale Journal of International Law. He has a B.A. from Yale University and an M.Sc. from the London School of Economics.

Austin is admitted to practice law in New York and New Jersey; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the District of New Jersey, the Northern District of Illinois, and the Southern District of Texas; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the First and Second Circuits.

Murielle Steven Walsh

Murielle Steven Walsh joined the Firm in 1998 and was elevated to Partner in 2007. In 2022, Murielle was selected to participate on Law360’s Securities Editorial Board. She was named a 2020 Plaintiffs’ Lawyer Trailblazer by the *National Law Journal*, an award created to “honor a handful of individuals from each practice area that are truly agents of change” and was also honored as a 2020 Plaintiffs’ Trailblazer by the *New York Law Journal*. Murielle was honored in 2019, 2020 and 2021 as a Super Lawyers® “Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney,” a recognition bestowed on 5% of eligible attorneys in the New York Metro area. Lawdragon named her a Top Plaintiffs’ Financial Lawyer in 2019 and 2020.

During her career at Pomerantz, Murielle has prosecuted highly successful securities class action and corporate governance cases. She was one of the lead attorneys litigating *In re Livent Noteholders' Securities Litigation*, a securities class action in which she obtained a \$36 million judgment against the company's top officers, a ruling which was upheld by the Second Circuit on appeal. Murielle was also part of the team litigating *EBC I v. Goldman Sachs*, where the Firm obtained a landmark ruling from the New York Court of Appeals, that underwriters may owe fiduciary duties to their issuer clients in the context of a firm-commitment underwriting of an initial public offering.

Murielle leads the Firm's securities class action against Wynn Resorts Ltd., in which Pomerantz is lead counsel. The litigation arises from the company's concealment of a long-running pattern of sexual misconduct against Wynn employees by billionaire casino mogul Stephen Wynn, the company's founder and former Chief Executive Officer. In May 2020, the court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss while granting Pomerantz leave to amend. In May 2020, the court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss while granting Pomerantz leave to amend its complaint. The defendants moved to dismiss the newly amended complaint, but the court denied their motion in part, sustaining claims that arose from critical misstatements by the company. The case is now in discovery. *Ferris v. Wynn Resorts Ltd.*, No. 18-cv-479 (D. Nev.)

In a securities class action against Ormat Technologies, Inc., Murielle achieved a \$3,750,000 settlement on behalf of defrauded investors in January 2021. Ormat's securities are dual-listed on the NYSE and the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. Murielle persuaded the district court in exercise supplemental jurisdiction in order to apply U.S. securities law to the claims in the case, regardless of where investors purchased their securities.

Murielle led the Firm's ground-breaking litigation that arose from the popular Pokémon Go game, in which Pomerantz was lead counsel. Pokémon Go is an "augmented reality" game in which players use their smart phones to "catch" Pokémon in real-world surroundings. GPS coordinates provided by defendants to gamers included directing the public to private property without the owners' permission, amounting to an alleged mass nuisance. *In re Pokémon Go Nuisance*, No. 3:16-cv-04300 (N.D. Cal.)

Murielle was co-lead counsel in *Thorpe v. Walter Investment Management Corp.*, No. 14-cv-20880 (S.D. Fla.), a securities fraud class action challenging the defendants' representations that their lending activities were regulatory-compliant, when in fact the company's key subsidiary engaged in rampant violations of federal consumer financial protection laws, subjecting it to various government investigations and a pending enforcement action by the CFPB and FTC. In 2016, the Firm obtained a \$24 million settlement on behalf of the class. She was also co-lead counsel in *Robb v. Fitbit Inc.*, No. 16-cv-00151 (N.D. Cal.), a securities class action alleging that the defendants misrepresented that their key product delivered "highly accurate" heart rate readings when in fact their technology did not consistently deliver accurate readings during exercise and its inaccuracy posed serious health risks to users of Fitbit's products. The Firm obtained a \$33 million settlement on behalf of the investor class in this action.

In 2018 Murielle, along with then-Senior Partner Jeremy Lieberman, achieved a \$3,300,000 settlement for the Class in the Firm's case against Corinthian Colleges, one of the largest for-profit college systems in the country, for alleged misrepresentations about its job placement rates, compliance with applicable regulations, and enrollment statistics. Pomerantz prevailed in the motion to dismiss the proceedings, a

particularly noteworthy victory because Chief Judge George King of the Central District of California had dismissed two prior lawsuits against Corinthian with similar allegations. *Erickson v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc.*, No. 2:13-cv-07466 (C.D. Cal.).

Murielle serves as a member and on the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the non-profit organization Court Appointed Special Advocates for Children (“CASA”) of Monmouth County. She served on the Honorary Steering Committee of Equal Rights Advocates (“ERA”), which focuses on and discusses specific issues that women face in the legal profession. ERA is an organization that protects and expands economic and educational access and opportunities for women and girls. In the past, Murielle served as a member of the editorial board for Class Action Reports, a Solicitor for the Legal Aid Associates Campaign, and has been involved in political asylum work with the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Murielle serves on the Firm's Anti-Harassment and Discrimination Committee.

Murielle graduated *cum laude* from New York Law School in 1996, where she was the recipient of the Irving Mariash Scholarship. During law school, Murielle interned with the Kings County District Attorney and worked within the mergers and acquisitions group of Sullivan & Cromwell.

Murielle is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Sixth Circuits.

Tamar A. Weinrib

Tamar A. Weinrib joined Pomerantz in 2008. She was Of Counsel to the Firm from 2014 through 2018 and was elevated to Partner in 2019. In 2020, The Legal 500 honored her as a Next Generation Partner. Tamar was named a 2018 Rising Star under 40 years of age by Law360, a prestigious honor awarded to a select few “top litigators and dealmakers practicing at a level usually seen from veteran attorneys.” Tamar has been recognized by Super Lawyers® as a 2021 “Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney;” she was honored as a New York Metro Rising Star every year from 2014 to 2019.

In 2019, Tamar and Managing Partner Jeremy Lieberman achieved a \$27 million settlement for the Class in *Strougo v. Barclays PLC*, a high-profile securities class action in which Pomerantz was Lead Counsel. Plaintiffs alleged that Barclays PLC misled institutional investor clients about the extent of the banking giant’s use of so-called “dark pool” trading systems. This case turned on the duty of integrity owed by Barclays to its clients. In November 2016, Tamar and Jeremy achieved precedent-setting victories for investors, when the Second Circuit Court of Appeals held that direct evidence of price impact is not always necessary to demonstrate market efficiency to invoke the presumption of reliance, and that defendants seeking to rebut the presumption of reliance must do so by a preponderance of the evidence rather than merely meeting a burden of production. In 2018, Tamar successfully opposed Defendants’ petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari.

In approving the settlement in *Strougo v. Barclays PLC* in June 2019, Judge Victor Marrero of the Southern District of New York stated:

Let me thank counsel on both sides for the extraordinary work both sides did in bringing this matter to a reasonable conclusion. As the parties have indicated, the matter was

intensely litigated, but it was done in the most extraordinary fashion with cooperation, collaboration, and high levels of professionalism on both sides, so I thank you.

Tamar headed the litigation of *In re Delcath Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation*, in which Pomerantz achieved a settlement of \$8,500,000 for the class. She successfully argued before the Second Circuit in *In re China North East Petroleum Securities Litigation*, to reverse the district court's dismissal of the defendants on scienter grounds.

Among other securities fraud class actions that Tamar led to successful settlements are *KB Partners I, L.P. v. Pain Therapeutics, Inc.* (\$8,500,000); *New Oriental Education & Technology Group, Inc.* (\$3,150,000 pending final approval); and *Whiteley v. Zynherba Pharmaceuticals Inc. et al.* (\$4,000,000 pending final approval).

Before coming to Pomerantz, Tamar had over three years of experience as a litigation associate in the New York office of Clifford Chance US LLP, where she focused on complex commercial litigation. Tamar has successfully tried pro bono cases, including two criminal appeals and a housing dispute filed with the Human Rights Commission.

Tamar graduated from Fordham University School of Law in 2004 and while there, won awards for successfully competing in and coaching Moot Court competitions.

Tamar is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, and Ninth Circuits.

Michael J. Wernke

Michael J. Wernke joined Pomerantz as Of Counsel in 2014 and was elevated to Partner in 2015. He was named a 2020 Plaintiffs' Lawyer Trailblazer by the *National Law Journal*, an award created to "honor a handful of individuals from each practice area that are truly agents of change."

Michael, along with Managing Partner Jeremy Lieberman, led the litigation in *Pirnik v. Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V. et al.*, No. 1:15-cv-07199-JMF (S.D.N.Y), in which the Firm, as Lead Counsel, achieved a \$110 million settlement for the class. This high-profile securities class action alleges that Fiat Chrysler concealed from investors that it improperly outfitted its diesel vehicles with "defeat device" software designed to cheat NOx emissions regulations in the U.S. and Europe, and that regulators had accused Fiat Chrysler of violating the emissions regulations. The *Fiat Chrysler* recovery provides the class of investors with as much as 20% of recoverable damages—an excellent result when compared to historical statistics in class action settlements, where typical recoveries for cases of this size are between 1.6% and 3.3%.

Michael led the securities class action *Zwick Partners, LP v. Quorum Health Corp., et al.*, No. 3:16-cv-2475, achieving a settlement of \$18,000,000 for the class in June 2020. The settlement represented between 12.7% and 42.9% of estimated recoverable damages. Plaintiff alleged that defendants misrepresented to investors the poor prospects of hospitals that the parent company spun off into a stand-alone company. In defeating defendants' motions to dismiss the complaint, Michael successfully

argued that company from which Quorum was spun off was a “maker” of the false statements even though all the alleged false statements concerned only Quorum’s financials and the class involved only purchasers of Quorum’s common stock. This was a tremendous victory for plaintiffs, as cases alleging false statements of goodwill notoriously struggle to survive motions to dismiss.

Along with Managing Partner Jeremy Lieberman, Michael leads the Firm’s individual action against pharmaceutical giant Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. and Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (together, “Teva”), and certain of Teva’s current and former employees and officers, relating to alleged anticompetitive practices in Teva’s sales of generic drugs. Teva is a dual-listed company; the Firm represents several Israeli institutional investors who purchased Teva shares on the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. In early 2021, Pomerantz achieved a major victory for global investors when the district court agreed to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Israeli law claims. *Clal Insurance Company Ltd. v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.*

In December 2018, Michael, along with Pomerantz Managing Partner Jeremy A. Lieberman, secured a \$31 million partial settlement with three defendants in *In re Libor Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation*, a closely watched multi-district litigation, which concerns the LIBOR rigging scandal.

In October 2018, Michael secured a \$15 million settlement in *In re Symbol Technologies, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 2:05-cv-03923-DRH-AKT (E.D.N.Y.), a securities class action that alleges that, following an accounting fraud by prior management, Symbol’s management misled investors about state of its internal controls and the Company’s ability to forecast revenues.

He was Lead Counsel in *Thomas v. Magnachip Semiconductor Corp.*, in which he achieved a \$23.5 million partial settlement with certain defendants, securing the settlement despite an ongoing investigation by the Securities and Exchange Commission and shareholder derivative actions. He played a leading role in *In re Lumber Liquidators, Inc. Securities Litigation*, in which Pomerantz, as Co-Lead Counsel, achieved a settlement of \$26 million in cash and 1,000,000 shares of Lumber Liquidators common stock for the Class. Michael also secured a \$7 million settlement (over 30% of the likely recoverable damages) in the securities class action *Todd v. STAAR Surgical Company, et. al.*, No. 14-cv-05263-MWF-RZ (C.D. Cal.), which alleged that STAAR concealed from investors violations of FDA regulations that threatened the approval of STAAR’s long awaited new product.

In the securities class action *In re Atossa Genetics, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 13-cv-01836-RSM (W.D. Wash.), Michael secured a decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that reversed the district court’s dismissal of the complaint. The Ninth Circuit held that the CEO’s public statements that the company’s flagship product had been approved by the FDA were misleading despite the fact that the company’s previously filed registration statement stated that that the product did not, at that time, require FDA approval.

During the nine years prior to coming to Pomerantz, Michael was a litigator with Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP, with his primary focus in the securities defense arena, where he represented multinational financial institutions and corporations, playing key roles in two of only a handful of securities class actions to go to jury verdict since the passage of the PSLRA.

In 2020 and 2021, Michael was honored as a Super Lawyers® “Top Rated Securities Litigation Attorney.” In 2014 and 2015, he was recognized as a Super Lawyers® New York Metro Rising Star.

Michael received his J.D. from Harvard Law School in 2004. He also holds a B.S. in Mathematics and a B.A. in Political Science from Ohio State University, where he graduated *summa cum laude*.

He serves on the Firm's Anti-Harassment and Discrimination Committee.

Michael is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; and the United States Supreme Court.

Senior Counsel

Stanley M. Grossman

Stanley M. Grossman, Senior Counsel, is a former Managing Partner of Pomerantz. Widely recognized as a leader in the plaintiffs' securities bar, he was honored in 2020 with a Lifetime Achievement award by the *New York Law Journal*. Martindale Hubbell awarded Stan its 2021 AV Preeminent Rating®, "given to attorneys who are ranked at the highest level of professional excellence for their legal expertise, communication skills, and ethical standards by their peers." Stan was selected by *Super Lawyers*® as an outstanding attorney in the United States for the years 2006 through 2020 and was featured in the *New York Law Journal* article *Top Litigators in Securities Field -- A Who's Who of City's Leading Courtroom Combatants*. Lawdragon named Stan a Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyer in 2019 and 2020, and in 2021, he was inducted into the Lawdragon Hall of Fame. In 2013, Brooklyn Law School honored Stan as an Alumnus of the Year.

Stan has primarily represented plaintiffs in securities and antitrust class actions, including many of those listed in the Firm biography. See, e.g., *Ross v. Bernhard*, 396 U.S. 531 (1970); *Rosenfeld v. Black*, 445 F.2d 137 (2d Cir. 1971); *Wool v. Tandem Computers, Inc.*, 818 F.2d 1433 (9th Cir. 1987); and *In re Salomon Bros. Treasury Litig.*, 9 F.3d 230 (2d Cir. 1993). In 2008 he appeared before the United States Supreme Court to argue that scheme liability is actionable under Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5(a) and (c). See *StoneRidge Inv. Partners, LLC v. Sci.-Atlanta, Inc.*, No. 06-43 (2008). Other cases where he was the Lead or Co-Lead Counsel include: *In re Salomon Brothers Treasury Litigation*, No. 91 Civ. 5471 (S.D.N.Y. 1994) (\$100 million cash recovery); *In re First Executive Corporation Securities Litigation*, No. CV-89-7135 (C.D. Cal. 1994) (\$100 million settlement); and *In re Sorbates Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, No. C98-4886 (N.D. Cal. 2000) (over \$80 million settlement for the class).

In 1992, Senior Judge Milton Pollack of the Southern District of New York appointed Stan to the Executive Committee of counsel charged with allocating to claimants hundreds of millions of dollars obtained in settlements with Drexel Burnham & Co. and Michael Milken.

Many courts have acknowledged the high quality of legal representation provided to investors by Stan. In *Gartenberg v. Merrill Lynch Asset Management, Inc.*, No. 79 Civ. 3123 (S.D.N.Y.), where Stan was lead trial counsel for plaintiff, Judge Pollack noted at the completion of the trial:

[I] can fairly say, having remained abreast of the law on the factual and legal matters that have been presented, that I know of no case that has been better presented so as

to give the Court an opportunity to reach a determination, for which the court thanks you.

Stan was also the lead trial attorney in *Rauch v. Bilzerian* (N.J. Super. Ct.) (directors owed the same duty of loyalty to preferred shareholders as common shareholders in a corporate takeover), where the court described the Pomerantz team as “exceptionally competent counsel.” He headed the six week trial on liability in *Walsh v. Northrop Grumman* (E.D.N.Y.) (a securities and ERISA class action arising from Northrop’s takeover of Grumman), after which a substantial settlement was reached.

Stan frequently speaks at law schools and professional organizations. In 2010, he was a panelist on *Securities Law: Primary Liability for Secondary Actors*, sponsored by the Federal Bar Council, and he presented *Silence Is Golden – Until It Is Deadly: The Fiduciary’s Duty to Disclose*, at the Institute of American and Talmudic Law. In 2009, Stan was a panelist on a Practising Law Institute “Hot Topic Briefing” entitled *StoneRidge - Is There Scheme Liability or Not?*

Stan served on former New York State Comptroller Carl McCall’s Advisory Committee for the NYSE Task Force on corporate governance. He is a former president of NASCAT. During his tenure at NASCAT, he represented the organization in meetings with the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and before members of Congress and of the Executive Branch concerning legislation that became the PSLRA.

Stan served for three years on the New York City Bar Association’s Committee on Ethics, as well as on the Association’s Judiciary Committee. He is actively involved in civic affairs. He headed a task force on behalf of the Association, which, after a wide-ranging investigation, made recommendations for the future of the City University of New York. He was formerly on the board of the Appleseed Foundation, a national public advocacy group.

Stan is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Central District of California, Eastern District of Wisconsin, District of Arizona, District of Colorado; the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Second, Third, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits; and the United States Supreme Court.

Marc I. Gross

Marc I. Gross is Senior Counsel at Pomerantz LLP where he has litigated securities fraud class actions for over four decades, serving as its Managing Partner from 2009 to 2016. His major lawsuits include SAC Capital (Steven Cohen - insider trading); Chesapeake Energy (Aubrey McClendon - insider bail out); Citibank (analyst Jack Grubman – false AT&T stock recommendation); and Charter Communications (Paul Allen - accounting fraud). He also litigated market efficiency issues in the firm’s landmark \$3 billion recovery in *Petrobras*.

Mr. Gross has also served as President of the Institute of Law and Economic Policy (“ILEP”), which has organized symposiums each year where leading academics have presented papers on securities law and consumer protection issues. These papers have been cited in over 200 cases, including several in the United States Supreme Court. <http://www.ilep.org>.

Mr. Gross has addressed numerous forums in the United States on shareholder-related issues, including ILEP; Loyola-Chicago School of Law's Institute for Investor Protection Conference; the National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems' ("NCPERS") Legislative Conferences; PLI conferences on Current Trends in Securities Law; a panel entitled *Enhancing Consistency and Predictability in Applying Fraud-on-the-Market Theory*, sponsored by the Duke Law School Center for Judicial Studies, as well as securities law students at NYU and Georgetown Law schools.

Among other articles, Mr. Gross authored *Cooking Books? The Valuation Treadmill*, 50 Sec.Reg.L.Jrl 363 (2022); *Reputation and Securities Litigation*, 47 Sec. Reg. l Jrl. 99 (2019) *Back to Basic(s): Common Sense Trumps Econometrics*, N.Y.L.J. (Jan. 8, 2018) (with Jeremy Lieberman); and *Class Certification in a Post-Halliburton II World*, 46 Loyola-Chicago L.J. 485 (2015).

Mr. Gross was honored in 2022 by T'ruah, the Rabbinic Call to Human Rights, for his pro bono work in support of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers in Florida in their battle for recognition by Wendy's Restaurants, and recently joined the Board of Mainchance, a homeless drop-in shelter operating in Manhattan.

Mr. Gross is a graduate of NYU Law '76 and Columbia College '73.

Patrick V. Dahlstrom

Patrick Dahlstrom joined Pomerantz as an associate in 1991 and was elevated to Partner in January 1996. He served as Co-Managing Partner with Jeremy Lieberman in 2017 and 2018 and is now Senior Counsel. Patrick heads the Firm's Chicago office. He was honored as a Super Lawyers® "Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney" from 2018 – 2021. In 2021, Patrick was inducted into the Lawdragon Hall of Fame.

Patrick, a member of the Firm's Institutional Investor Practice and New Case Groups, has extensive experience litigating cases under the PSLRA. He led *In re Comverse Technology, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 06-CV-1825 (E.D.N.Y.), in which the Firm, as Lead Counsel, recovered a \$225 million settlement for the Class – the second-highest ever for a case involving back-dating options, and one of the largest recoveries ever from an individual officer-defendant, the company's founder and former CEO. In *Comverse*, the Firm obtained an important clarification of how courts calculate the "largest financial interest" in connection with the selection of a Lead Plaintiff, in a manner consistent with *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336 (2005). Judge Garaufis, in approving the settlement, lauded Pomerantz: "The court also notes that, throughout this litigation, it has been impressed by Lead Counsel's acumen and diligence. The briefing has been thorough, clear, and convincing, and ... Lead Counsel has not taken short cuts or relaxed its efforts at any stage of the litigation."

In *DeMarco v. Robertson Stephens Inc.*, 228 F.R.D. 468 (S.D.N.Y. 2005), Patrick obtained the first class certification in a federal securities case involving fraud by analysts.

Patrick's extensive experience in litigation under the PSLRA has made him an expert not only at making compelling arguments on behalf of Pomerantz' clients for Lead Plaintiff status, but also in discerning

weaknesses of competing candidates. *In re American Italian Pasta Co. Securities Litigation* and *Comverse* are the most recent examples of his success in getting our clients appointed sole Lead Plaintiff despite competing motions by numerous impressive institutional clients.

Patrick was a member of the trial team in *In re ICN/Viratek Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 1997), which, after trial, settled for \$14.5 million. Judge Wood praised the trial team: “[P]laintiffs counsel did a superb job here on behalf of the class. ...This was a very hard fought case. You had very able, superb opponents, and they put you to your task. ...The trial work was beautifully done and I believe very efficiently done.”

Patrick’s speaking engagements include interviews by NBC and the CBC regarding securities class actions, and among others, a presentation at the November 2009 State Association of County Retirement Systems Fall Conference as the featured speaker at the Board Chair/Vice Chair Session entitled: “Cleaning Up After the 100 Year Storm. How trustees can protect assets and recover losses following the burst of the housing and financial bubbles.”

Patrick is a 1987 graduate of the Washington College of Law at American University in Washington, D.C., where he was a Dean’s Fellow, Editor in Chief of the *Administrative Law Journal*, a member of the Moot Court Board representing Washington College of Law in the New York County Bar Association’s Antitrust Moot Court Competition, and a member of the Vietnam Veterans of America Legal Services/Public Interest Law Clinic. Upon graduating, Patrick served as the Pro Se Staff Attorney for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York and was a law clerk to the Honorable Joan M. Azrack, United States Magistrate Judge.

Patrick is admitted to practice in New York and Illinois; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Northern District of Illinois, Northern District of Indiana, Eastern District of Wisconsin, District of Colorado, and Western District of Pennsylvania; the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Circuits; and the United States Supreme Court.

Of Counsel

Samuel J. Adams

Samuel J. Adams became an Associate at Pomerantz in January 2012 and was elevated to Of Counsel to the Firm in 2021. He has been recognized as a Super Lawyers® “Rising Star” every year from 2015 through 2021.

Sam focuses his practice on corporate governance litigation and has served as a member of the litigation team in numerous actions that concluded in successful resolutions for stockholders. He was an integral member of the litigation team that secured a \$5.6 million settlement on behalf of a class of shareholders of Physicians Formula Holdings, Inc. following an ignored merger offer. *In re Physicians Formula Holdings Inc. S’holder Litig.*, C.A. No. 7794-VCL (Del. Ch. Ct.). Sam was also instrumental in achieving a settlement in *Strougo v. Hollander*, C.A. No. 9770-CB (Del. Ch. Ct.) which provided for a 25% price increase for members of the class cashed out in the going-private transaction and established that fee-shifting bylaws adopted after a challenged transaction do not apply to stockholders affected by the transaction. Additionally, he was on the team of Pomerantz attorneys who obtained the elimination of stand-still

provisions that allowed third parties to bid for Great Wolf Resorts, Inc., resulting in the emergence of a third-party bidder and approximately \$94 million (57%) in additional merger consideration for Great Wolf shareholders. *In re Great Wolf Resorts, Inc. S'holder Litig.*, C.A. No. 7328-VCN (Del. Ch.).

Sam is a 2009 graduate of the University of Louisville Louis D. Brandeis School of Law. While in law school, he was a member of the National Health Law Moot Court Team. He also participated in the Louis D. Brandeis American Inn of Court.

Sam is admitted to practice in New York; and the United States District Courts for the Southern, Northern, and Eastern Districts of New York and the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Ari Y. Basser

Ari Y. Basser joined Pomerantz as an associate in April 2019 and was elevated to Of Counsel in January 2022. He focuses his practice on strategic consumer litigation by representing consumers in unfair competition, fraud, false advertising, and auto defect actions that recover monetary and injunctive relief on behalf of class members while also advocating for important consumer rights. Ari has successfully prosecuted claims involving California's Unfair Competition Law, California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act, the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, and the Magnusson-Moss Warranty Act.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Ari was an associate at major litigation law firms in Los Angeles. Ari also worked as a Law Clerk in the Economic Crimes Unit of the Santa Clara County Office of the District Attorney. Ari has litigated antitrust violations, product defect matters, and a variety of fraud and misrepresentation cases brought under state and federal consumer protection statutes involving unfair competition and false advertising. He has also been deputized in private attorneys general enforcement actions to recover civil penalties from corporations, on behalf of the State of California, for violations of the Labor Code.

Ari is a contributing author to the *Competition Law Journal*, the official publication of the Antitrust, UCL, and Privacy Section of the State Bar of California, where he has examined trends in antitrust litigation and the regulatory authority of the Federal Trade Commission.

Ari received dual degrees in Economics and Psychology from the University of California, San Diego in 2004. He earned his Juris Doctor in 2010 from Santa Clara University School of Law.

Cheryl D. Hamer

Cheryl D. Hamer joined Pomerantz in 2003 as an associate, served as a partner from 2007 to 2015 and is now Of Counsel to the Firm. She is based in San Diego.

Before joining Pomerantz, she served as counsel to nationally known securities class action law firms focusing on the protection of investors rights. In private practice for over 20 years, she has litigated, at both state and federal levels, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations, Continuing Criminal Enterprise, death penalty and civil rights cases and grand jury representation. She has authored numerous criminal writs and appeals.

Cheryl was an Adjunct Professor at American University, Washington College of Law from 2010-2011 and served as a pro bono attorney for the Mid-Atlantic Innocence Project. She was an Adjunct Professor at Pace University, Dyson College of Arts and Sciences, Criminal Justice Program and The Graduate School of Public Administration from 1996-1998. She has served on numerous non-profit boards of directors, including Shelter From The Storm, the Native American Preparatory School and the Southern California Coalition on Battered Women, for which she received a community service award.

Cheryl has been a member of the Litigation and Individual Rights and Responsibilities Sections of the American Bar Association, the Corporation, Finance & Securities Law and Criminal Law and Individual Rights Sections of the District of Columbia Bar, the Litigation and International Law Sections of the California State Bar, and the National Association of Public Pension Attorneys (NAPPA) and represents the Firm as a member of the Council of Institutional Investors (CII), the National Association of State Treasurers (NAST), the National Conference on Public Employees Retirement Systems (NCPERS), the International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans (IFEBC), the State Association of County Retirement Systems (SACRS), the California Association of Public Retirement Systems (CALAPRS) and The Association of Canadian Pension Management (ACPM/ACARR).

Cheryl is a 1973 graduate of Columbia University and a 1983 graduate of Lincoln University Law School. She studied tax law at Golden Gate University and holds a Certificate in Journalism from New York University and a Certificate in Photography: Images and Techniques from The University of California San Diego.

Louis C. Ludwig

Louis C. Ludwig joined Pomerantz in April 2012 and was elevated to Of Counsel in 2019. He has been honored as a 2016 and 2017 Super Lawyers® Rising Star and as a 2018 and 2019 Super Lawyers® Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney.

Louis focuses his practice on securities litigation, and has served as a member of the litigation team in multiple actions that concluded in successful settlements for the Class, including *Satterfield v. Lime Energy Co.*, (N.D. Ill.); *Blitz v. AgFeed Industries, Inc.* (M.D. Tenn.); *Frater v. Hemispherx Biopharma, Inc.* (E.D. Pa.); *Bruce v. Suntech Power Holdings Co.* (N.D. Cal.); *In re: Groupon, Inc. Securities Litigation* (N.D. Ill.); *Flynn v. Sientra, Inc.* (C.D. Cal.); *Thomas v. MagnaChip Semiconductor Corp.* (N.D. Cal.); *In re: AVEO Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation* (N.D. Cal.); and *In re: Akorn, Inc. Securities Litigation* (N.D. Ill.).

Louis graduated from Rutgers University School of Law in 2007, where he was a Dean's Law Scholarship Recipient. He served as a law clerk to the Honorable Arthur Bergman, Superior Court of New Jersey. Prior to joining Pomerantz, Louis specialized in litigating consumer protection class actions at Bock & Hatch LLC in Chicago, Illinois.

Louis is admitted to practice in New Jersey and Illinois; the United States District Courts for the District of New Jersey and the Northern District of Illinois; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Seventh and Ninth Circuits.

Jonathan D. Park

Jonathan D. Park joined Pomerantz as Of Counsel in April 2022. Prior to joining Pomerantz, he was associated with a prominent plaintiff-side litigation firm, where he represented clients in securities and investment litigation. He has been recognized as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star every year from 2017 through 2021.

Jonathan focuses his practice on securities litigation. He was a key member of the litigation team that obtained \$19 million for the class in *In re Synchronoss Technologies, Inc. Securities Litigation*, and he represented investors in *In re JPMorgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation*, which arose from the “London Whale” scandal and was settled for \$150 million. He has also represented investors in opt-out securities actions against pharmaceutical manufacturers and other companies.

Jonathan also has experience representing investors in breach of contract actions. He was a key member of the team representing institutional investors injured by the early redemption of bonds issued by CoBank, ACB and AgriBank, FCB. In the litigation against CoBank, the plaintiffs secured a summary judgment ruling on liability, and in the litigation against AgriBank, the plaintiffs defeated a motion to dismiss, permitting the claims to proceed though the plaintiffs were beneficial owners and not record holders of the bonds at issue. Both cases were resolved on confidential terms.

At the New York City Bar Association, Jonathan has served on the Task Force on Puerto Rico, the New Lawyers Council, and the International Human Rights Committee. He also served on the board of his non-profit running club, the Dashing Whippets Running Team.

Jonathan earned his J.D. in 2013 from Fordham University School of Law, where he served on the school’s Moot Court Board as the Editor of the Jessup International Law Competition Team. During law school, he was a Crowley Scholar in International Human Rights, received the Archibald R. Murray Public Service Award, and interned with a refugee law project in Cairo, Egypt. He received a B.A. in 2006 from Vassar College, where he majored in Africana Studies.

Lesley Portnoy

Lesley Portnoy joined Pomerantz as Of Counsel in January 2020, bringing to the Firm more than a decade of experience representing investors and consumers in recovering losses caused by corporate fraud and wrongdoing. Lesley is based in Los Angeles.

Lesley has assisted in the recovery of billions of dollars on behalf of aggrieved investors, including the victims of the Bernard M. Madoff bankruptcy. Courts throughout the United States have appointed him as Lead Counsel to represent investors in securities fraud class actions. Lesley has been recognized as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star every year from 2017 through 2021.

As co-Lead Counsel with Pomerantz in *In re Yahoo! Inc. Sec. Litig.*, a high-profile class action litigation against Yahoo! Inc., Lesley helped achieve an \$80 million settlement for the Class in 2018. The case involved the biggest data breaches in U.S. history, in which over 3 billion Yahoo accounts were compromised.

Other securities fraud cases that Lesley successfully litigated include *Parmelee v. Santander Consumer USA Holdings Inc.*; *In re Fifth Street Asset Management, Inc. Sec. Litig.*; *In re ITT Educational Services, Inc. Sec. Litig.*; *In re Penn West Petroleum Ltd. Sec. Litig.*; *Elkin v. Walter Investment Management Corp.*; *In re CytRx Corporation Sec. Litig.*; *Carter v. United Development Funding IV*; and *In re Akorn, Inc. Sec. Litig.*

Lesley received his B.A. in 2004 from the University of Pennsylvania. In 2009, he simultaneously received his JD magna cum laude from New York Law School and his Master's of Business Administration from City University of New York. At New York Law School, Lesley was on the Dean's List-High Honors and an Articles Editor for the New York Law School Law Review.

Lesley is admitted to practice in New York and California; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Central, Northern, and Southern Districts of California and the Northern District of Texas; and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Jennifer Banner Sobers

Jennifer Banner Sobers is Of Counsel to the Firm.

In 2021, Jennifer was honored as a Super Lawyers® "Top-Rated Securities Litigation Attorney". She was also named a 2020 Rising Star by Super Lawyers®, Law360, and the *New York Law Journal*, all separate and highly competitive awards that honor attorneys under 40 whose legal accomplishments transcend their age. After a rigorous nomination and vetting process, Jennifer was honored in 2019 and 2020 as a member of the National Black Lawyers Top 100, an elite network of the top 100 African American attorneys from each state.

Jennifer played an integral role on the team litigating *In re Petrobras Securities Litigation*, in the Southern District of New York, a securities class action arising from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme involving Brazil's largest oil company, Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. - Petrobras. The Firm, as sole Lead Counsel, achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement on behalf of investors in Petrobras securities. Among Jennifer's contributions to the team's success were: managing the entire third-party discovery in the United States, which resulted in the discovery of key documents and witnesses; deposing several underwriter bank witnesses; drafting portions of Plaintiffs' amended complaints that withstood motions to dismiss the claims and Plaintiffs' successful opposition to Defendants' appeal in the Second Circuit, which resulted in precedential rulings, including the Court rejecting the heightened ascertainability requirement for obtaining class certification that had been imposed by other circuit courts; and second chaired argument in the Second Circuit that successfully led to the Court upholding the award of sanctions against a professional objector challenging the integrity of the settlement.

Jennifer played a leading role in *In re Toronto-Dominion Bank Securities Litigation*, an action in the District of New Jersey alleging a multi-year fraud arising from underlying retail banking misconduct by one of Canada's largest banks that was revealed by investigative news reports. Jennifer undertook significant work drafting the briefing to oppose Defendants' motion to dismiss the claims, which the Court denied. She oversaw the discovery in the action, which included, among other things, heading the complicated process of obtaining documents in Canada and being a principal drafter of the motion to partially lift the PSLRA stay in order to obtain discovery. Jennifer successfully presented oral argument which led to the Court approval of a \$13.25 million class-wide settlement.

U.S. District Judge Noel L. Hillman, in approving the *Toronto-Dominion Bank* settlement, stated, “I commend counsel on both sides for their hard work, their very comprehensive and thoughtful submissions during the motion practice aspect of this case. I paused on it because it was a hard case. I paused on it because the lawyering was so good. So, I appreciate from both sides your efforts.” He added, “It’s clear to me that this was comprehensive, extensive, thoughtful, meaningful litigation leading up to the settlement.” Singling out Pomerantz’s role as lead counsel, the judge also said, “This settlement appears to have been obtained through the hard work of the Pomerantz firm... It was through their efforts and not piggybacking on any other work that resulted in this settlement.”

Jennifer was a key member of the team litigating individual securities actions against BP p.l.c. in the Northern District of Texas on behalf of institutional investors in BP p.l.c. to recover losses in BP’s common stock (which trades on the London Stock Exchange), arising from BP’s 2010 Gulf oil spill. The actions were resolved in 2021 in a confidential, favorable monetary settlement for all 35 Firm clients.

Jennifer is a lead litigator in *Crutchfield v. Match Group, Inc.*, pending. Jennifer is also a key member of the litigation teams of other nationwide securities class action cases, including: *In re Ubiquiti Networks, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, an action in the Southern District of New York, for which Jennifer was one of the principal drafters of the amended complaint—the strength of which led the Court to deny permission to the defendants to file a formal motion to dismiss it—which secured a court-approved \$15 million class-wide settlement; *In re KaloBios Pharmaceuticals Inc. Securities Litigation*, an action in the Northern District of California, which successfully secured settlements from the bankrupt company and its jailed CEO worth over \$3.25 million for the Class that were approved by the Court as well as the bankruptcy court; *Perez v. Higher One Holdings, Inc.*, an action in the District of Connecticut, for which Jennifer was one of the principal drafters of the successful opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss, and which secured a court-approved \$7.5 million class-wide settlement; *Edwards v. McDermott Int’l, Inc.* pending in the Southern District of Texas; *Chun v. Fluor Corp.* pending in the Northern District of Texas; and *Kendall v. Odonate Therapeutics, Inc.*, pending in the Southern District of California.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Jennifer was an associate with a prominent law firm in New York where her practice focused on complex commercial litigation, including securities law and accountants’ liability. An advocate of pro bono representation, Jennifer earned the Empire State Counsel honorary designation from the New York State Bar Association and received an award from New York Lawyers for the Public Interest for her pro bono work.

Jennifer received her B.A. from Harvard University (with honors), where she was on the Dean’s List, a Ron Brown Scholar, and a recipient of the Harvard College Scholarship. She received her J.D. from University of Virginia School of Law where she was a participant in the Lile Moot Court Competition and was recognized for her pro bono service.

She is a member of the Securities Litigation and Public Service Committees of the Federal Bar Council, and the New York City Bar Association.

Jennifer is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Court for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Nicolas Tatin

French lawyer Nicolas Tatin joined Pomerantz in April 2017 as Of Counsel. He heads the Firm's Paris office and serves as its Director-Business Development Consultant for France, Benelux, Monaco and Switzerland. Nicolas advises institutional investors in the European Union on how best to evaluate losses to their investment portfolios attributable to financial misconduct, and how best to maximize their potential recoveries in U.S. and international securities litigations.

Nicolas was previously a financial lawyer at ERAFP, France's €24bn pension and retirement fund for civil servants, where he provided legal advice on the selection of management companies and the implementation of mandates entrusted to them by ERAFP.

Nicolas began his career at Natixis Asset Management, before joining BNP Paribas Investment Partners, where he developed expertise in the legal structuring of investment funds and acquired a global and cross-functional approach to the asset management industry.

Nicolas graduated in International law and received an MBA from IAE Paris, the Sorbonne Graduate Business School.

Associates

Genc Arifi

Genc Arifi focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz in its Chicago office, Genc was an associate with a prominent Chicago law firm and represented an expansive range of businesses in employment law matters as well as complex commercial litigation in both state and federal courts. Genc's experience includes handling complex civil matters, such as cases arising out of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), shareholder derivative lawsuits, and employment law matters. He has also advised technology start-up clients as well as established financial institutions with risk assessment and litigation strategies.

Genc earned his J.D. from DePaul University College of Law and his B.S. from Western Illinois University, *summa cum laude*. He demonstrated strong academic credentials throughout law school; most notably when he achieved the highest grade in Business Organizations, which earned him the CALI Excellence for the Future Award. Genc was a recipient of the Dean's Certificate of Service awarded to law students who provided 100 hours of community service. Genc participated in a criminal appeals clinic and successfully reduced an indigent client's prison sentence.

Genc is co-author of "Valuation," Chapter 6 in "Disputes Involving Closely Held Companies 2020 Edition." Published by the Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education in Feb. 2020, it is the essential guide for Illinois attorneys who represent closely held corporations, partnerships, or LLCs.

Genc currently serves as the Secretary and board member of the Albanian-American Community of Illinois, a 501(c)(3) non-profit whose mission is to preserve and promote Albanian culture, history, and tradition through civic engagement and educational initiatives.

Genc is admitted to practice in Illinois and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Brandon M. Cordovi

Brandon M. Cordovi focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Brandon was an associate at a law firm in New York that specializes in the defense of insurance claims. Brandon's practice focused on the defense of transportation, premises and construction liability matters.

Brandon earned his J.D. in 2018 from Fordham University School of Law, where he served on the Moot Court Board and was the recipient of a merit-based scholarship. While at Fordham Law, Brandon participated in the Securities Litigation and Arbitration Clinic, where he prepared for the negotiation and arbitration of claims brought on behalf of clients with limited resources. During his second summer of law school, Brandon was a summer associate at a major plaintiffs securities firm.

Brandon earned his B.S. from the University of Delaware where he double-majored in Sport Management and Marketing.

Brandon is admitted to practice in New York and New Jersey.

Jessica N. Dell

Jessica Dell focuses her practice on securities litigation.

She has worked on dozens of cases at Pomerantz, including the Firm's securities fraud lawsuits arising from BP's 2010 Gulf oil spill, pending in Multidistrict Litigation. Jessica has expertise in managing discovery and a nose for investigating complex fraud across many sectors, including pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and data security. True to her roots in public interest law, she has also worked in complex pro bono class action litigation at Pomerantz.

Jessica graduated from CUNY School of Law in 2005. She was the recipient of an Everett fellowship for her work at Human Rights Watch. She also interned at the Urban Justice Center and National Advocates for Pregnant Women. While in the CUNY clinical program, she represented survivors of domestic violence facing deportation and successfully petitioned under the Violence Against Women Act. She also successfully petitioned for the release of survivors incarcerated as drug mules in Central America. After Hurricane Katrina, Jessica traveled to Louisiana to aid emergency efforts to reunite families and restore legal process for persons lost in the prison system weeks after the flood.

Jessica is a member of the New York City and State Bar Associations and the National Lawyers Guild.

Zachary Denver

Zachary Denver focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Zachary worked at prominent New York firms where he litigated a variety of complex commercial matters, specializing in financial markets, securities, and bankruptcy.

Zachary graduated from New York University School of Law in 2013 and was a staff editor at the NYU Journal of Law and Liberty and a board member for the Suspension Representation Project. He earned a double bachelor's degree from the University of Massachusetts in Political Science and Communications. After undergrad, Zachary served as a Teach for America corps member in New York City and earned a master's degree in classroom teaching from PACE University.

Zachary also serves as a board member for the Legal Alliance of Pheonjong, a non-profit organization that provides legal services to Tibetan asylum seekers in New York City, and he has served as lead counsel on several applications including two successful trials in immigration court.

Zachary is admitted to practice in New York, the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Dolgora Dorzhieva

Dolgora Dorzhieva focuses her practice on securities litigation. In 2022, she was named a New York Metro Super Lawyers Rising Star.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Dolgora was an associate at a major plaintiffs firm, where her practice focused on consumer fraud litigation.

Dolgora earned her J.D. in 2015 from the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law, where she served as an Executive Editor of the *California Law Review*. In 2010, she graduated *summa cum laude*, Phi Beta Kappa from City College of New York.

Following graduation from law school, she clerked for the Honorable Edward M. Chen in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

Dolgora is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Dean P. Ferrogari

Dean P. Ferrogari focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Dean earned his Juris Doctor in 2020 from Brooklyn Law School, where he served as an Associate Managing Editor for the Brooklyn Law Review. While in law school, Dean was initiated into the International Legal Honor Society of Phi Delta Phi and was an extern for the Brooklyn Volunteer Lawyers Project. He was recognized by the New York State Unified Court System's Office for Justice Initiatives for his distinguished service in assisting disadvantaged civil litigants in obtaining due process in consumer credit actions. Dean also authored the publication "The Dark Web: A Symbol of Freedom Not Cybercrime," New York County Lawyers Association CLE Institute, Security in a Cyber World: Whistle Blowers, Cyber Threats, Domestic Terrorism, Financial Fraud, Policy by Twitter ... and the Evolving Role of the Attorney and Firm, Oct. 4, 2019, at 321.

Dean earned his B.A. from the University of Maryland, where he majored in Economics and was awarded the President's Transfer Scholarship.

Dean is admitted to practice in the United States Districts Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Emily C. Finestone

Emily C. Finestone focuses her practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Emily was an associate at a boutique litigation firm in New York where she successfully litigated matters pertaining to sports and entertainment law, copyright infringement, and employment law. Emily previously worked at a prominent complex litigation firm specializing in consumer protection, antitrust, whistleblower, and securities litigation. She also gained appellate experience as a temporary law clerk and Staff Attorney at the Supreme Court of Virginia.

In 2022 and 2023, Emily was recognized as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star.

Emily graduated from Boston University School of Law in 2015 and was a member of the Review of Banking & Financial Law. She received her B.A. from the University of Virginia in 2012, where she double majored in English and Spanish, and minored in Government.

Emily is admitted to practice in New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, as well as the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, Eastern District of New York, District of Connecticut, District of Massachusetts, and Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

James M. LoPiano

James M. LoPiano focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, James served as a Fellow at Lincoln Square Legal Services, Inc., a non-profit law firm run by faculty of Fordham University School of Law.

James earned his J.D. in 2018 from Fordham University School of Law, where he was awarded the Archibald R. Murray Public Service Award, *cum laude*, and merit-based scholarship. While in law school, James served as Senior Notes and Articles Editor of the *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media and Entertainment Law Journal*. James also completed a legal internship at Lincoln Square Legal Services, Inc.'s *Samuelson-Glushko Intellectual Property and Information Law Clinic*, where he counseled clients

and worked on matters related to Freedom of Information Act litigation, trademarks, and copyrights. As part of his internship, James was granted temporary permission to appear before the United States Patent and Trademark Office for trademark-related matters. Additionally, James completed both a legal externship and legal internship with the Authors Guild. James also served as a judicial intern to the Honorable Stephen A. Bucaria in the Nassau County Supreme Court, Commercial Division, of the State of New York, where he drafted legal memoranda on summary judgment motions, including one novel issue pertaining to whether certain service fees charged by online travel companies were commingled with county taxes.

James earned his B.A. from Stony Brook University, where he double-majored in English and Cinema and Cultural Studies, completed the English Honors Program, and was inducted into the Stony Brook University chapter of the International English Honors Society. Additionally, James earned the university's Thomas Rogers Award, given to one undergraduate student each year for the best analytical paper in an English course.

James has authored several publications over the course of his legal career, including "Public Fora Purpose: Analyzing Viewpoint Discrimination on the President's Twitter Account," Note, 28 FORDHAM INTELL. PROP. MEDIA & ENT. L.J. 511 (2018); "Lessons Abroad: How *Access Copyright v. York University* Helped End Canada's Educational Pirating Regime," Legal Watch, Authors Guild Fall 2017/Winter 2018 Bulletin; and "International News: Proposal for New EU Copyright Directive and India High Court's Educational Photocopy Decision," Legal Watch, Authors Guild Summer 2017 Bulletin.

James is admitted to practice in New York and the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Brian P. O'Connell

Brian P. O'Connell focuses his practice on securities and financial services litigation. Prior to joining Pomerantz in its Chicago office, Brian was an associate at a Cafferty Clobes Meriwether & Sprengel LLP, where he specialized in antitrust and commodity futures litigation. Brian has successfully litigated complex class actions involving securities, as well as manipulation of futures and options contracts. Brian also previously worked at the Financial Regulatory Authority (FINRA) as a contractor focusing on options trading regulation. Following law school, Brian was a legal fellow at the chambers of Judge Marvin E. Aspen in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Brian is passionate about finance and securities law, having previously interned for the Chicago Board Options Exchange and for Susquehanna International Group. Brian serves as Vice Chair of the Chicago Bar Association Securities Law Committee. Brian was recently recognized as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star for 2023.

Brian earned his Juris Doctor from Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law. During his time there, he had the opportunity to work at the Center on Wrongful Convictions, where he argued in court on behalf of a client serving a life sentence and later exonerated. Brian also served as Executive Articles Editor on the Journal of International Human Rights Law and as a teaching assistant for the Northwestern Center on Negotiation and Mediation.

A graduate of Stanford University, Brian majored in Political Science and minored in Economics. During his senior year, he was Editor-in-Chief of The Stanford Review, where he had previously been a Features Editor and a staff writer.

Brian is admitted to practice in Illinois and California, the United States District Courts for the Northern District of Illinois, and the Northern and Central Districts of California, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Thomas H. Przybylowski

Thomas H. Przybylowski focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Thomas was an associate at a large New York law firm, where his practice focused on commercial and securities litigation, and regulatory investigations. In 2020 and 2021, Thomas was honored as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star.

Thomas earned his J.D. in 2017 from the Georgetown University Law Center. While in law school, Thomas served as a Notes Editor for the *Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics* and authored the publication "A Man of Genius Makes No Mistakes: Judicial Civility and the Ethics of the Opinion," Note, 29 *Geo. J. Legal Ethics* 1257 (2016). Thomas earned his B.A. from Lafayette College in 2014, where he double majored in English and Philosophy.

Thomas is admitted to practice in New York and New Jersey, and the United States District Courts for the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and the District of New Jersey.

Elina Rakhlin

Elina Rakhlin focuses her practice on securities litigation. Prior to joining Pomerantz, Elina was an associate at a major complex-litigation practice, focused on class action, mass tort and commercial matters.

Elina earned her J.D. in 2017 from the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, where she served as an Acquisitions Editor for the *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal*. In 2014, she received her undergraduate degree from Baruch College, where she double majored in English and Political Science.

While in law school, she was an intern in the Enforcement Division of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and in the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission. Elina was also selected for the Alexander Fellows Judicial Clerkship where she served as a law clerk to the Honorable Jack B. Weinstein of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Elina is admitted to practice in New York and the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Ankita Sangwan

Ankita Sangwan focuses her practice on corporate governance matters.

She graduated in 2022 from the LL.M. program at Columbia Law School as a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. Prior to attending Columbia Law School, Ankita worked for four years in the Commercial Litigation Team of a prominent law firm in Bombay, India, at which she focused her practice on complex commercial and civil disputes. Ankita assisted in arguments before various courts in India, including the Supreme Court.

In 2017, Ankita graduated with Honors from the B.A. LL.B. program at Jindal Global Law School, India. She was a member of the university's Moot Court Society, which finished as semi-finalists at the World Rounds of the International Investment Moot Court Competition, held in Frankfurt, Germany (2016). Ankita's moot court experience was recognized by her university; she was awarded the "Outstanding Contribution to Moot Court" prize upon graduation.

Ankita is admitted to practice in the State of New York.

Villi Shteyn

Villi Shteyn focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Villi worked on individual securities lawsuits concerning BP's 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil spill, which proceeded in *In re BP p.l.c. Secs Litig.*, No. 4:10-md-2185 (S.D. Tex.) and were resolved in 2021 in a confidential, favorable monetary settlement for all 35 firm clients, including public private pension funds, money management firms, partnerships, and investment trusts from U.S., Canada, the U.K., France, and the Netherlands, and Australia. He also worked on a successful 2021 settlement for investors in a case against Chinese company ChinaCache.

Villi is currently pursuing claims against Deutsche Bank for its lending activities to disgraced financier Jeffrey Epstein and is involved in the Firm's class action litigation against Arconic, arising from the deadliest U.K. fire in more than a century. He is also representing investors in a case against AT&T for widespread fraud relating to their rollout of DirecTVNow, and against Frutarom for fraud related to widespread bribery in Russia and Ukraine. He also represents Safra Bank in a class action against Samarco Mineração S.A., in connection with Fundao dam-burst disaster, which is widely regarded as the worst environmental disaster in Brazil's history. He is also representing investors against Recro Pharma in relation to their non-opioid pain-relief product IV Meloxicam, and against online education companies 2U and K12. Villi also worked on a pending consumer class action against Apple Inc. in relation to alleged slowdowns of the iPhone product.

Before joining Pomerantz, Villi was employed by a boutique patent firm, where he worked on patent validity issues in the wake of the landmark *Alice* decision and helped construct international patent maintenance tools for clients and assisted in pursuing injunctive relief for a patent-holder client against a large tech company.

Villi has been recognized as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star from 2021 through 2023.

Villi graduated from The University of Chicago Law School (J.D., 2017). In 2014, he graduated *summa cum laude* from Baruch College with a Bachelor of Science in Public Affairs.

Villi is admitted to practice in New York, and the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of New York, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Christopher Tourek

Christopher Tourek focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz in its Chicago office, Christopher was an associate at a prominent complex-litigation firm and specialized in consumer protection, antitrust, and securities litigation. Christopher has successfully litigated securities fraud, antitrust violations, and consumer protection violations on behalf of plaintiffs in state and federal court. His litigation experience has led to his being honored as a Super Lawyers® Rising Star in the area of Mass Torts litigation from 2016 through 2021, and in the area of Securities litigation for 2022 and 2023.

Christopher graduated *cum laude* in 2013 from the University of Illinois College of Law, where he obtained his pro bono notation, honors in legal research, and was a member of the Federal Civil Rights Clinic, in which he first-chaired the case of *Powers v. Coleman* in the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois. He earned his bachelor's degree in Government & Law, with a minor in Anthropology & Sociology, from Lafayette College in 2010.

Christopher is admitted to practice in Illinois and the United States District Courts for the District of Columbia, the Northern and Southern Districts of Illinois, the Eastern District of Michigan, and the Eastern District of Missouri.

Staff Attorneys

Jay Douglas Dean

Jay Dean focuses on class action securities litigation. He has been a commercial litigator for more than 30 years.

Jay has been practicing with Pomerantz since 2008, including as an associate from 2009-2014, interrupted by a year of private practice in 2014-2015. More recently, he was part of the Pomerantz teams prosecuting the successful *Petrobras* and *Yahoo* actions. Prior to joining Pomerantz, he served as an Assistant Corporation Counsel in the Office of the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, most recently in its Pensions Division. While at Pomerantz, in the Corporation Counsel's office and previously in large New York City firms, Jay has taken leading roles in trials, motions and appeals.

Jay graduated in 1988 from Yale Law School, where he was Senior Editor of the *Yale Journal of International Law*.

Jay is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Jay has also earned the right to use the Chartered Financial Analyst designation.

Timor Lahav

Timor Lahav focuses his practice on securities litigation.

Timor participated in the Firm's securities class action case against Brazil's largest oil company, Petrobras, arising from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme, in which the Firm, as sole Lead Counsel, achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement for the Class, as well as precedent-setting legal rulings. Timor also participated in the firm's landmark litigation against Yahoo! Inc., for the massive security breach that compromised 1.5 billion users' personal information.

Timor received his LL.B. from Tel Aviv University School of Law in Israel, following which he clerked at one of Israel's largest law firms. He was an associate at a law firm in Jerusalem, where, among other responsibilities, he drafted motions and appeals, including to the Israeli Supreme Court, on various civil matters.

He received his LL.M. from Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in New York. There, Timor received the Uriel Caroline Bauer Scholarship, awarded to exceptional Israeli law graduates.

Timor brings to Pomerantz several years' experience as an attorney in New York, including examining local SOX anti-corruption compliance policies in correlation with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act; and analysis of transactions in connection with DOJ litigation and SEC enforcement actions.

Timor was a Captain in the Israeli Defense Forces. He is a native Hebrew speaker and is fluent in Russian.

He is admitted to practice in New York and Israel.

Laura M. Perrone

Laura M. Perrone focuses on class action securities litigation.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Laura worked on securities class action cases at Labaton Sucharow. Preceding that experience, she represented plaintiffs at her own securities law firm, the Law Offices of Laura M. Perrone, PLLC.

At Pomerantz, Laura participated in the Firm's securities class action case against Brazil's largest oil company, Petrobras, arising from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme, in which the Firm, as sole Lead Counsel, achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement for the Class, as well as precedent-setting legal rulings.

Laura has also represented bondholders against Citigroup for its disastrous investments in residential mortgage-backed securities, shareholders against Barclays PLC for misrepresentations about its dark

pool trading system known as Barclays LX, and shareholders against Fiat Chrysler Automobiles for misrepresentations about its recalls and its diesel emissions defeat devices.

Laura graduated from the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, where she was on the editorial staff of Cardozo's Arts and Entertainment Law Journal and was the recipient of the Jacob Burns Merit Scholarship.

Laura is admitted to practice in New York; the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Allison Tierney

Allison Tierney focuses her practice on securities litigation.

Allison brings to Pomerantz her 10 years' expertise in large-scale securities class action litigation. She participated in the Firm's securities class action case against Brazil's largest oil company, Petrobras, arising from a multi-billion-dollar kickback and bribery scheme, in which the Firm, as sole Lead Counsel, achieved a historic \$3 billion settlement for the Class, as well as precedent-setting legal rulings.

Prior to joining Pomerantz, Allison worked on securities class action cases at several top New York law firms, representing institutional investors. She has represented plaintiffs in disputes related to antitrust violations, corporate financial malfeasance, and residential mortgage-backed securities fraud.

Allison earned her law degree from Hofstra University School of Law, where she served as notes and comments editor for the *Cyberlaw Journal*. She received her B.A. in Psychology from Boston University, where she graduated magna cum laude.

Allison is conversant in Spanish and studying to become fluent.

Allison is admitted to practice in New York.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC. SECURITIES
LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22cv-05258-WJM-AME

**DECLARATION OF ERIC SCHACHTER OF A.B. DATA, LTD.
REGARDING NOTICE AND ADMINISTRATION**

I, Eric Schachter, declare as follows:

1. I am a Senior Vice President of A.B. Data’s Class Action Administration Division (“A.B. Data”), whose Corporate Office is located in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. At the request of Lead Counsel, I am submitting this declaration to provide the Court and the parties to the above-captioned action (“Action”) with information about the procedures and methods that will be used to provide notice and claims administration services related to the proposed Settlement in this Action. I make this declaration based on personal knowledge, and if called to testify, I could and would do so competently.

2. After a competitive bidding process, A.B. Data has been retained by Lead Counsel, subject to Court approval, to provide notice and claims administration services for the settlement of the Action. Specifically, A.B. Data has been retained to: (i) mail a summary notice formatted as a postcard (“Postcard Notice”) to potential Settlement Class Members and nominees; (ii) cause the publication of a summary notice once in *Investor’s Business Daily* and once over an electronic newswire service; and (iii) provide related notice and claims administration and distribution services for the settlement of the Action.

3. A.B. Data has successfully implemented notification and claims administration programs in hundreds of securities class actions. Members of our team have administered many of the most noteworthy securities class action settlements in recent years, including *In re AIG Securities Litigation*, No. 04 Civ. 8141 (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Countrywide Financial Corp. Securities Litigation*, No. 07 Civ. 05295 (C.D. Cal.); *In re Fannie Mae 2008 Securities Litigation*, No. 08 Civ. 7831 (S.D.N.Y.); *In re General Electric Co. Securities Litigation*, No. 09 Civ. 1951 (S.D.N.Y.); and *In re Facebook, Inc. IPO Securities & Derivative Litigation*, MDL No. 12-2389 (S.D.N.Y.). More information on A.B. Data’s qualifications and experience can be found on our website at www.abdataclassaction.com. A detailed description of A.B. Data’s background and capabilities, including lists of representative cases and clients, is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

4. The proposed notice plan in this matter uses customary procedures designed to provide direct mail notification to all investors that are members of the Settlement Class and can be identified with reasonable effort. As in most securities class actions, the vast majority of potential Settlement Class Members are beneficial purchasers whose securities are held in “street name”—that is, the securities are purchased by brokerage firms, banks, institutions, and other third-party nominees in each instance in the name of the nominee, on behalf of the beneficial purchaser. Accordingly, A.B. Data maintains a proprietary database with the names and mailing addresses and, in some instances, email addresses, of approximately 4,000 banks, brokers, and other nominees (the “Nominee List”). The Nominee List, which A.B. Data updates periodically, also includes institutions that regularly file third-party claims on behalf of their investor clients in securities class actions, as well as all entities that have requested notification in every case involving publicly traded securities. To further reach nominees and potential Settlement Class Members, A.B. Data will submit the notice to the Depository Trust Company (“DTC”) to post on the DTC Legal Notice System (“LENS”). LENS enables DTC member banks and brokers to review the notice and contact the Claims Administrator directly to obtain copies for their clients who may be Settlement Class Members.

5. Direct mail notification will be accomplished in this Action by mailing the Postcard Notice via United States Postal Service (“USPS”) First-Class Mail to both the entities on A.B. Data’s Nominee List as well as to the individuals and entities listed on any transfer records provided or caused to be provided by Defendants (“Transfer Records”). A.B. Data will also send notice via email to approximately 1,000 entities on A.B. Data’s Nominee List that have standing requests to receive electronic notifications, as well as to any email addresses provided in the Transfer Records.

6. The Postcard Notice will instruct nominees to facilitate notice by either providing the names and addresses of their clients who may be Settlement Class Members to A.B. Data so that Postcard Notices can be mailed by A.B. Data to these potential Settlement Class Members, or by requesting bulk copies of the Postcard Notice for the nominee to distribute directly to potential Settlement Class Members. For any nominees that do not timely respond to the initial request to facilitate notice, A.B. Data will send supplemental notifications to encourage compliance.

7. For any Postcard Notice that is returned by the USPS as undeliverable as addressed, if a forwarding address is provided by the USPS, the Postcard Notice will promptly be re-mailed to the forwarding address. If no forwarding address is provided by the USPS, A.B. Data will use a third-party information provider to which A.B. Data subscribes to search for an updated address, and a Postcard Notice will be promptly re-mailed to any updated addresses that are identified.

8. In addition to mailing the Postcard Notice and publishing a summary notice, A.B. Data will also establish and maintain a toll-free telephone number and a case-specific website to address Settlement Class Member inquiries. The toll-free telephone number will afford callers access to an automated attendant that answers all calls initially and presents callers with a series of choices to hear answers to frequently asked questions. If callers need further help, they will have the option of being transferred to a live operator during business hours. The case-specific website will include general information about the Action and the Settlement; highlight important dates and deadlines; host key documents related to the

Action, including downloadable versions of the Long-Form Notice and Claim Form; and have functionality for Settlement Class Members to submit their Claim Forms online.

9. Settlement Class Members who wish to be eligible to receive a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund are required to complete and submit to A.B. Data a properly executed Claim Form either by mail or online such that it is postmarked or received no later than the claim-filing deadline established by the Court, together with adequate supporting documentation for the transactions and holdings reported therein.

10. Each submitted claim form is reviewed upon receipt to verify that all required information has been provided. The documentation provided with each Claim Form is also reviewed for authenticity and compared to the information provided on the Claim Form to verify the claimant's identity and the purchase/acquisition transactions, sale transactions, and holdings listed on the Claim Form.

11. If a Claim Form is determined to be defective, a deficiency letter will be sent to the claimant describing the defect including, where applicable, what is necessary to cure the defect. The letter will advise the claimant that the submission of the appropriate information and/or documentary evidence to complete the Claim Form has to be sent within a specified time period from the date of the letter, or the Claim Form would be recommended for rejection to the extent that the deficiency or condition of ineligibility was not cured. The letter will also advise claimants that if they desired to contest the administrative determination, they are required to submit a written statement to A.B. Data requesting Court review of their claim form and setting forth the basis for their request.

12. After the claims have been reviewed and final determination have been made as to which claims are valid, A.B. Data will calculate each claim's Recognized Loss, pursuant to the Court-approved Plan of Allocation, and pro rata distribution amount based on the total Recognized Losses of all claims and the amount available for distribution in the Net Settlement Fund. Based on our experience, we expect the total Recognized Losses for all claims to exceed the amount available in the Net Settlement Fund for distribution such that the fund will be fully exhausted and allocated to eligible claimants.

13. Distribution payments will be sent via checks and wires with a specified period for each claimant to cash their payment (typically 90 or 180 days). For any checks that are not cashed, A.B. Data will conduct an outreach campaign to encourage cashing and provide claimants with reissued checks where applicable.

14. The process described herein is the standard notice and claims administration process for securities class action settlements.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 21st day of September 2023 at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Schachter', is written over a horizontal line.

ERIC SCHACHTER

EXHIBIT A

**Class
Action
Administration**



Headquarters

600 A.B. Data Drive
Milwaukee, WI 53217
P: 866-217-4470
F: 414-961-3099

New York

One Battery Park Plaza
32nd Floor
New York, NY 10004
P: 646-290-9137

Washington DC

915 15th St., NW, Ste. 300
Washington, DC 20005
P: 202-618-2900
F: 202-462-2085

Florida

5080 PGA Boulevard, Ste. 209
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418
P: 561-336-1801
F: 561-252-7720

Israel

19 Weissburg Street
Tel Aviv 69358
Israel
P: +972 (3) 720-8782



CAPABILITIES

About A.B. Data

 Founded in 1981, **A.B. Data has earned a reputation** for expertly managing the complexities of class action administration in consumer, antitrust, securities, Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) enforcement actions, and ERISA, Attorneys General, employment, civil rights, insurance, environmental, wage and hour, and other class action cases. **A.B. Data's work in all aspects of class action administration** has been perfected by decades of experience in hundreds of class action cases involving billions of dollars in total settlements. Dedicated professionals deliver **A.B. Data's all-inclusive services**, working in partnership with its clients to administer their class action cases effectively, efficiently, and affordably, regardless of size or scope.

A.B. Data offers unmatched resources and capacity and is capable of expertly administering any class action notice, settlement, and/or fund administration. Whether notifying millions of class members in the United States or throughout the world, processing millions of claims, distributing payments digitally via A.B. Data's Digital PayPortalSM, or printing and distributing millions of checks, **A.B. Data matches its talent and technology** to the specific needs of its clients, delivering unparalleled service on time and on budget without ever compromising quality.

Location, Ownership Structure

 **A.B. Data is an independently owned**, more than 40-year-old, Milwaukee, Wisconsin-based company that prides itself on its vast expertise and industry-leading innovations. We like to remind our clients and partners that we're not just a class action administration company, but a group of experienced, dedicated professionals who believe that relationships are just as important as the accurate and timely management of class action administrations. In other words, we are people who do business with people.

Services

 **Every A.B. Data client is deserving of the best job we can put forward.** A.B. Data makes class action administration easy for our clients with clarity, convenience, and efficiency. Our priority is to navigate the intricacies of our clients' matters and deliver successful results by using our solid expertise, advanced technology, and top-quality products and services. We pay attention to the details and get it right the first time.

We aim to provide our clients the full experience of a truly collaborative working relationship. It is why we believe much of our success originates from our philosophy of "people doing business with people."

Services

All Digital — From Notice to Distribution

A.B. Data is uniquely positioned to design, implement, and maintain notice and settlement administration programs using an innovative, "all-digital" approach that replaces the more traditional and less efficient methods of administration, such as newspaper ads, mailed notices, and paper checks. Many of our recent proposed notice plans and claim programs utilize the latest technologies such as microtargeted digital ads for notice, streamlined online claims, and distributing settlement funds electronically using a digital paywall. These methods provide significant cost savings, are consistent with the amendments to Rule 23 that are now in effect, and importantly provide much-needed alignment of class action notice and administration with current consumer behaviors.

Pre-Settlement Consultation

The pre-settlement consultation is a collaborative session designed to help A.B. Data clients prepare a stronger case. Our support teams simplify the task of sorting through a maze of documents during investigation and discovery, streamlining the process and preserving fund assets. From there, we assist with fully interactive media packages for court presentations and settlement negotiations. A.B. Data works closely with our clients, offering expert testimony on documents, processing, class and notice manageability, and proposed plans of allocation.

Media Services

A.B. Data continues to earn our reputation as the early innovator in integrating advanced micro-targeting techniques, including contextual targeting, behavioral targeting, and predictive modeling. Coupled with inventive digital media strategies to drive claims, case-specific banner ad development, class member research, and comScore analysis services, our multi-tiered media programs are designed to cost-effectively deliver notice to potential class members and increase claims rates.

Notice Administration

In A.B. Data, clients have a comprehensive resource with a depth of experience in direct notice. Our compliance and understanding of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are crucial in meeting the "plain language" legal requirements for any campaign. From our sophisticated digital media capabilities and extensive global experience with class member research, our experts create notice documents that are easily understandable and cost-efficient to produce. We consult with our clients to deliver notice documents from multi-page, mailed, or emailed notice packets to concise postcards that establish the most influential and cost-effective means of communicating with potential claimants.

Claims Processing

A.B. Data continues to bring game-changing technologies to improve the speed and precision in claims processing. Our robust system for online claims submissions allows us to meticulously verify data and documentation, preserve and authenticate claims, and calculate and verify settlement amounts. In addition, our data network infrastructure includes on-site data storage, backup, contingency plans, and security for electronic and hard copy claim filings. It is all part of a total commitment to be the most innovative and comprehensive resource in the industry. At A.B. Data, we take pride in having the in-house capacity to process millions of pages, as well as the organizational integrity to treat every claim as if it were the only one.

Contact Center

A.B. Data's Contact Center is comprised of a full staff that is trained on and equipped with online and telecommunication systems to monitor and connect with class members. Associates routinely monitor class member communication for all class action administrations, including antitrust, consumer, and securities.

Utilizing monitoring software, associates watch multiple social media channels simultaneously, allowing for instantaneous routing of inquiries and interaction with claimants. Detailed and concise analytical reports outlining Contact Center activities are always provided.

Our Contact Center and case websites are capable of handling millions of class member engagements, as recently displayed in a campaign which garnered over 1.2 million website visits in two months and had more than 72,500 Facebook engagements. Facebook comments and threads are monitored and claimants are guided to the website for more information. Google AdWords and display advertising have also brought hundreds of thousands of visitors to various case websites.

A.B. Data's Contact Center also has Spanish language associates in-house and we can accommodate any language, given proper lead time. Traditional call center facilities are also available, if needed.

Case Websites

We offer a state-of-the-art technology platform that supports every step of our class action administration process. Our expert marketing professionals design customized case-specific websites that provide potential class members easy access to case information, critical documents, important deadlines, as well as the capability to file claim forms and register for future mailings about the case. Claimants can use the website to elect to receive their settlement payments by mail or by one of several digital payment options, all accessible by mobile devices.

Settlement Fund Distribution

From complete escrow services to establishment of qualified settlement funds, check printing and mailing, electronic cash or stock distribution and tax services, A.B. Data has always provided a full-service solution to Settlement Fund Distribution. Our IT team has decades of experience in developing and implementing fast, secure databases and claims administration systems that ensure class members receive the correct amount in their settlement disbursement. Today's digital capabilities allow even greater convenience for class members. In certain instances, claimants can now elect to

instantaneously receive settlement payments through popular digital-payment options, such as PayPal, Amazon, and virtual debit cards.

A.B. Data's Leadership



A.B. Data's administration team is composed of the following key executives, who collectively have decades of experience settling and administering class actions:

Bruce A. Arbit, Co-Managing Director and one of the founders of the A.B. Data Group, serves as Chairman of the Board and oversees the day-to-day operations of the A.B. Data Group of companies, employing almost 400 people in the United States and Israel. Mr. Arbit is also Chairman of the Board of Integrated Mail Industries, Ltd. and has served as a member of the Board of Directors of University National Bank and State Financial Bank. He is the past Chairman of Asset Development Group, Inc., Home Source One, and American Deposit Management and is a member of the National Direct Marketing Association, the Direct Marketing Fundraising Association, and the American Association of Political Consultants. He was named 1996 Direct Marketer of the Year by the Wisconsin Direct Marketing Association.

A.B. Data's work in class action litigation support began with the Court selecting A.B. Data to oversee the restitution effort in the now-famous Swiss Banks Class Action Case, the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims, and every other Holocaust Era Asset Restitution program, in which it was the company's job to identify, contact, and inform survivors of the Holocaust. A.B. Data delivered by reaching out to millions of people in 109 countries who spoke more than 30 languages. Since those days, Mr. Arbit has guided the class action division through phenomenal growth and success. Today, A.B. Data manages hundreds of administrations annually that distributes billions of dollars to class members.

Thomas R. Glenn, President, Mr. Glenn's management of A.B. Data's Class Action Administration Company includes designing and implementing notice plans and settlement administration programs for antitrust, securities, and Securities and Exchange Commission settlements and SEC disgorgement fund distributions, as well as consumer, employment, insurance, and civil rights class actions. Mr. Glenn previously served as Executive Vice President at Rust Consulting and has more than 30 years of executive leadership experience.

Eric Miller, Senior Vice President, as a key member of A.B. Data's Class Action Administration Leadership Team, oversees the Case Management Department and supervises the operations and procedures of all of A.B. Data's class action administration cases. Mr. Miller is recognized in the class action administration industry as an expert on securities, SEC, consumer, product recall, product liability, general antitrust, pharmaceutical antitrust, and futures contract settlements, to name a few settlement types. Prior to joining A.B. Data, Mr. Miller served as the Client Service Director for Rust Consulting, responsible there for its securities practice area. He has more than 20 years of operations, project management, quality assurance, and training experience in the class action administration industry. In addition, Mr. Miller manages A.B. Data's office in Palm Beach Gardens, Florida.

Eric Schachter, Senior Vice President, is a member of A.B. Data's Class Action Administration Leadership Team. He has over 15 years of experience in the legal settlement administration services industry. Mr. Schachter's responsibilities include ensuring successful implementation of claims administration services for A.B. Data's clients in accordance with settlement agreements, court orders, and service agreements. He also works closely with Project Managers to develop plans of administration to provide the highest level of effective and efficient delivery of work product. A frequent speaker on claims administration innovation and best practices at industry events nationwide, Mr. Schachter has a bachelor's degree in sociology from Syracuse University, earned his law degree at Hofstra University School of Law, and was previously an associate at Labaton Sucharow LLP in New York City.

Elaine Pang, Vice President, Media, oversees the Media Department and is responsible for the direction, development, and implementation of media notice plans for A.B. Data's clients. Ms. Pang brings more than 15 years of experience in developing and implementing multifaceted digital and traditional media for high profile complex legal notice programs. She uses her experience in class actions and advertising to provide the best practicable notice plans for large scale campaigns across domestic and international regions, and she leverages her expertise to better understand the evolving media landscape and utilize cutting-edge technology and measurement tools. Prior to entering the class action industry, Ms. Pang worked with many leading reputable brands, including General Mills, Air Wick, Jet-Dry, Comedy Central, Madison Square Garden, Radio City Music Hall, and Geox. She earned her MBA from Strayer University and holds a BS in Marketing from Pennsylvania State University. Ms. Pang's credentials include Hootsuite Social Marketing Certification, Google Adwords and Analytics Certification, and IAB Digital Media Buying and Planning Certification.

Paul Sauberer, Vice President of Quality, is responsible for overseeing quality assurance and process management, working diligently to mitigate risk, ensure exceptional quality control, and develop seamless calculation programming. Mr. Sauberer brings more than 20 years of experience as a quality assurance specialist with a leading claims-processing company where he developed extensive knowledge in securities class action administration. He is recognized as the class action administration industry's leading expert on claims and settlement administrations of futures contracts class actions.

Justin Parks, Vice President, is a member of A.B. Data's Class Action Administration Leadership Team. Mr. Parks brings extensive experience in client relations to A.B. Data's business development team. Mr. Parks has over 15 years of experience in the legal settlement administration services industry and has successfully managed and consulted on notice plans and other administrative aspects in hundreds of cases. Mr. Parks is uniquely experienced in Data Privacy matters, having consulted with clients on numerous matters stemming from data breaches as well as violations of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (BIPA), including some of the first ever Biometric Privacy related settlements in history. Mr. Parks' knowledge and understanding of the class action industry, as well as his client relationship skills, expand A.B. Data's capacity to achieve its business development and marketing goals effectively.

Steve Straub, Senior Director of Operations, started with A.B. Data in 2012 as a Claims Administrator. He moved through the ranks within the company where he spent the past five years as Senior Project Manager managing many of the complex commodities cases such as *In re LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation*, *In re London Silver Fixing, Ltd. Antitrust Litigation*, and *Laydon v. Mizuho Bank, Ltd., et al.* Mr. Straub's performance in these roles over the past ten years, along with his comprehensive knowledge of company and industry practices and first-person experience leading the project management team, has proven him an invaluable member of the A.B. Data team.

In his role as Claimant Operations Director, his responsibilities include developing efficiencies within the operations center, which includes mailroom, call center, and claims processing areas. His areas of expertise include business process development, strategic/tactical operations planning and implementation, risk analysis, budgeting, business expansion, growth planning and implementation, cost reduction, and profit, change, and project management. Mr. Straub is well-versed in the administration of securities, consumer, and antitrust class action settlements. He earned his Juris Doctor degree from Seton Hall University School of Law in Newark, New Jersey.

Jack Ewashko, Director of Client Services, brings twenty years of industry and brokerage experience to his role with A.B. Data. He is an accomplished client manager adept at facilitating proactive communications between internal and outside parties to ensure accurate and timely deliverables. Mr. Ewashko previously held positions at two claim administration firms where he oversaw the securities administration teams and actively managed numerous high-profile matters, including the \$2.3 billion foreign exchange litigation. He notably served as Vice President, FX and Futures Operations at Millennium Management, a prominent global alternative investment management firm. As he progressed through trading, analytic, management, and consultancy roles at major banks and brokerage firms, Mr. Ewashko gained hands-on experience with vanilla and exotic securities products, including FX, commodities, mutual funds, derivatives, OTC, futures, options, credit, debt, and equities products. In the financial sector, he also worked closely with compliance and legal teams to ensure accuracy and conformity with all relevant rules and regulations regarding the marketing and sale of products, as well as the execution and processing of trades. He has held Series 4, Series 6, Series 7, and Series 63 licenses, and has been a member of the Futures Industry Association (FIA) and Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA). Mr. Ewashko earned his Bachelor of Business Administration from Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York.

Brian Devery, Director of Client Services, brings more than a decade of experience in class action administration and project management, as well as over two decades of experience as an attorney (ret.). Mr. Devery currently focuses on consumer, antitrust, employment, and other non-securities based administrations. In addition to driving project administration, he is focused on the implementation of process improvement, streamlining, and automation. Mr. Devery is admitted to practice law in State and Federal Courts of New York with his Juris Doctorate earned from the Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York.

Adam Walter, PMP, Director of Client Services, has nearly fifteen years of experience managing the administration of securities class action settlements and SEC disgorgements totaling more than \$4 billion. He has managed settlement programs in engagements involving some of the largest securities class action settlements and is a key contributor to the development of administration strategies that meet the evolving needs of our clients. His responsibilities include developing case administration strategies to ensure that all client and court requirements and objectives are met, overseeing daily operations of case administrations, ensuring execution of client deliverables, providing case-related legal and administration support to class counsel, overseeing notice dissemination programs, implementing complex claims-processing and allocation methodologies, establishing quality assurance and quality control procedures, and managing distribution of settlement funds. Mr. Walter holds a bachelor's degree in business administration from Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida. He also has been an active member of the Project Management Institute since 2010 and is PMP®-certified.

Eric Nordskog, Director of Client Services, started with A.B. Data in 2012 on the operations team, managing dozens of team leads and claims administrators in the administration of legal cases and actions. In 2017, Mr. Nordskog was promoted to Project Manager, due in part to his proven ability to add consistency and efficiency to the e-claim filing process with new streamlined processes and audit practices. Today, as Senior Project Manager, he directs many of A.B. Data's securities, insurance, and

consumer cases. He regularly oversees the administration of large insurance cases, such as two recent Cigna Insurance matters that involved complex calculations and over one million class members each. He is also the primary hiring and training manager for new project managers and coordinators. Mr. Nordskog earned his Juris Doctor degree from Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, in 2001.

Eric Schultz, MCSE, Information Technology Manager and Security Team Chairperson, has been with A.B. Data for more than 19 years, and is currently responsible for overseeing all information technology areas for all A.B. Data divisions across the United States and abroad, including network infrastructure and architecture, IT operations, data security, disaster recovery, and all physical, logical, data, and information systems security reviews and audits required by our clients or otherwise. As a Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer (MCSE) with more than 25 years of experience in information technology systems and solutions, Mr. Schultz has developed specializations in network security, infrastructure, design/architecture, telephony, and high-availability network systems.

Secure Environment



A.B. Data's facilities provide the highest level of security and customization of security procedures, including:

- A Secure Sockets Layer server
- Video monitoring
- Limited physical access to production facilities
- Lockdown mode when checks are printed
- Background checks of key employees completed prior to hire
- Frequency of police patrol – every two hours, with response time of five or fewer minutes
- Disaster recovery plan available upon request

Data Security



A.B. Data is committed to protecting the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of personal identifying information and other information it collects from our clients, investors, and class members and requires that its employees, subcontractors, consultants, service providers, and other persons and entities it retains to assist in distributions do the same. A.B. Data has developed an Information Security Policy, a suite of policies and procedures intended to cover all information security issues and bases for A.B. Data, and all of its divisions, departments, employees, vendors, and clients. A.B. Data has also recently taken the necessary, affirmative steps toward compliance with the EU's General Data Protection Regulation and the California Consumer Privacy Act.

A.B. Data has a number of high-profile clients, including the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the United States Department of Justice, the Attorneys General of nearly all 50 states, other agencies of the United States government, and the Government of Israel, as well as direct banking and payment services companies with some of the most recognized brands in United States financial services and some of the largest credit card issuers in the world.

We are therefore frequently subjected to physical, logical, data, and information systems security reviews and audits. We have been compliant with our clients' security standards and have also been determined to be compliant with ISO/IEC 27001/2 and Payment Card Industry (PCI) data-security standards, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLB) of 1999, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) Regulations, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996, and the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act (HITECH).

The Government of Israel has determined that A.B. Data is compliant with its rigorous security standards in connection with its work on Project HEART (Holocaust Era Asset Restitution Taskforce).

A.B. Data's fund distribution team has been audited by EisnerAmper LLP and was found compliant with class action industry standards and within 99% accuracy. EisnerAmper LLP is a full-service advisory and accounting firm and is ranked the 15th-largest accounting firm in the United States.

In addition, as part of PCI compliance requirements, A.B. Data has multiple network scans and audits from third-party companies, such as SecurityMetrics and 403 Labs, and is determined to be compliant with each of them.

Fraud Prevention and Detection



A.B. Data is at the forefront of class action fraud prevention.

A.B. Data maintains and utilizes comprehensive proprietary databases and procedures to detect fraud and prevent payment of allegedly fraudulent claims.

We review and analyze various filing patterns across all existing cases and claims. Potential fraudulent filers are reported to our clients as well as to the appropriate governmental agencies where applicable.

Representative Class Action Engagements



A.B. Data and/or its team members have successfully administered hundreds of class actions, including many major cases. Listed below are just some of the most representative or recent engagements.

Consumer & Antitrust Cases

- *In re EpiPen Marketing, Sales Practices and Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation - Commercial (Indirect)*
- *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation - Indirect*
- *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation - Direct*
- *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation - Directs*
- *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation - Indirects*

- *Peter Staley, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc., et al.*
- *In re: Opana ER Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Ranbaxy Generic Drug Application Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals Int'l, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*
- *Staley, et al., v. Gilead Sciences*
- *In Re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation – Direct Purchasers*
- *Beef Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*
- *BCBSM, Inc. v. Vyera Pharmaceuticals, et al. (Daraprim)*
- *In re Automobile Antitrust Cases I and II*
- *Olean Wholesale Grocery Cooperative, Inc., et al. v. Agri Stats, Inc., et al. (Turkey)*
- *Integrated Orthopedics, Inc., et al. v. UnitedHealth Group, et al.*
- *In Re: Restasis (Cyclosporine Ophthalmic Emulsion) Antitrust Litigation*
- *Vista Healthplan, Inc., et al. v. Cephalon, Inc., et al. (Provigil)*
- *Jeffrey Koenig, et al. v. Vizio, Inc.*
- *Wit, et al. v. United Behavioral Health*
- *Weiss, et al. v. SunPower Corporation*
- *Smith, et al. v. FirstEnergy Corp., et al.*
- *Resendez, et al. v. Precision Castparts Corp. and PCC Structural, Inc.*
- *Julian, et al. v. TTE Technology, Inc., dba TCL North America*
- *Eugenio and Rosa Contreras v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC*
- *Phil Shin, et al. v. Plantronics, Inc.*
- *In re: Qualcomm Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Resistors Antitrust Litigation*
- *The Hospital Authority of Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee v. Momenta Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Sandoz Inc. ("Lovenox Antitrust Matter")*
- *William Kivett, et al. v. Flagstar Bank, FSB, and DOES 1-100, inclusive*
- *Adelphia, Inc. v. Heritage-Crystal Clean, Inc.*
- *LLE One, LLC, et al. v. Facebook, Inc.*
- *Bach Enterprises, Inc., et al. v. Advanced Disposal Services South, Inc., et al.*
- *JWG Inc., et al. v. Advanced Disposal Services Jacksonville, L.L.C., et al.*
- *State of Washington v. Motel 6 Operating L.P. and G6 Hospitality LLC*
- *In re GSE Bonds Antitrust Litigation*
- *Wave Lengths Hair Salons of Florida, Inc., et al. v. CBL & Associates Properties, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Loestrin 24 FE Antitrust Litigation*
- *Office of the Attorney General, Department of Legal Affairs, State of Florida v. Pultegroup, Inc. and Pulte Home Company, LLC*
- *In re Cigna-American Specialties Health Administration Fee Litigation*
- *In re: Intuniv Antitrust Litigation*
- *High Street, et al. v. Cigna Corporation, et al.*
- *Gordon Fair, et al. v. The Archdiocese of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin County*
- *Bizzarro, et al. v. Ocean County Department of Corrections, et al.*
- *Meeker, et al. v. Bullseye Glass Co.*
- *MSPA Claims 1, LLC v. Ocean Harbor Casualty Insurance Company*
- *Tennille v. Western Union Company - Arizona*
- *Garner, et al. v. Atherotech Holdings, Inc. and Garner, et al. v. Behrman Brothers IV, LLC, et al.*
- *Robinson, et al. v. Escallate, LLC*
- *Josefina Valle and Wilfredo Valle, et al. v. Popular Community Bank f/k/a Banco Popular North America*
- *Vision Construction Ent., Inc. v. Waste Pro USA, Inc. and Waste Pro USA, Inc. and Waste Pro of Florida, Inc.*

- *Plumley v. Erickson Retirement Communities, et al.*
- *In re London Silver Fixing, Ltd. Antitrust Litigation*
- *Ploss v. Kraft Foods Group, Inc. and Mondelēz Global LLC*
- *In re Mexican Government Bonds Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Ready-Mixed Concrete Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re: Marine Hose Antitrust Litigation*
- *Iowa Ready Mixed Concrete Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Potash Antitrust Litigation (II)*
- *In re Evanston Northwestern Healthcare Corp. Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Lorazepam and Clorazepate Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litigation*
- *Vista Healthplan, Inc., and Ramona Sakiestewa v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., and American BioScience, Inc.*
- *In re Lupron Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*
- *In re Terazosin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re Warfarin Sodium Antitrust Litigation*
- *Rosemarie Ryan House, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC and SmithKline Beecham Corporation*
- *Carpenters and Joiners Welfare Fund, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham*
- *New Mexico United Food and Commercial Workers Union's and Employers' Health and Welfare Trust Fund, et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*
- *In Re Pharmaceutical Industry Average Wholesale Price Litigation*
- *Alma Simonet, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation, d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline*
- *In re Relafen Antitrust Litigation*
- *In Re Remeron Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*
- *In re TriCor Indirect Purchasers Antitrust Litigation*
- *Nichols, et al., v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation*
- *In re: DDAVP Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*

Securities Cases

- *Plymouth County Retirement Association v. Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc., et al.*
- *Tung, et al. v. Dycom Industries, Inc., et al.*
- *Boutchard., et al. v. Gandhi, et al. ("Tower/e-Minis")*
- *MAZ Partners LP v. First Choice Healthcare Solutions, Inc.*
- *SEB Investment Management AB, et al. v. Symantec Corporation, et al.*
- *In re Impinj, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Netshoes Securities Litigation*
- *Yellowdog Partners, LP, et al. v. Curo Group Holdings Corp., et al.*
- *In re Brightview Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Obalon Therapeutics, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Willis Towers Watson PLC Proxy Litigation*
- *In re Blue Apron Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re: Qudian Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Plymouth County Contributory Retirement System v. Adamas Pharmaceuticals, et al.*
- *In re Perrigo Company PLC Securities Litigation*
- *Enriquez, et al. v. Nabriva Therapeutics PLC, et al.*
- *Teamsters Local 456 Pension Fund, et al. v. Universal Health Services, Inc., et al.*
- *Olenik, et al. v. Earthstone Energy, Inc.*

- *Shenk v. Mallinckrodt plc, et al.*
- *In re The Allstate Corp. Securities Litigation*
- *Christopher Vataj v. William D. Johnson, et al. (PG&E Securities II)*
- *Kirkland v. WideOpenWest, Inc.*
- *Oklahoma Police Pension and Retirement System v. Sterling Bancorp, Inc.*
- *In re Uxin Limited Securities Litigation*
- *City of Hallandale Beach Police Officers' & Firefighters' Personnel Retirement Trust v. Ergen, et al. (Echostar)*
- *Lewis v. YRC Worldwide Inc., et al.*
- *Tomaszewski v. Trevena, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Restoration Robotics, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Public Employees' Retirement Systems of Mississippi, et al. v. Treehouse Foods, Inc., et al.*
- *Ronald L. Jackson v. Microchip Technology, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Micro Focus International plc Securities Litigation*
- *In re Dynagas LNG Partners LP Securities Litigation*
- *Weiss, et al. v. Burke, et al. (Nutraceutical)*
- *Yaron v. Intersect ENT, Inc., et al.*
- *Utah Retirement Systems v. Healthcare Services Group, Inc., et al.*
- *In re PPDAl Group Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re: Evoqua Water Technologies Corp. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Aqua Metals, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *St. Lucie County Fire District Firefighters' Pension Trust Fund v. Southwestern Energy Company*
- *In re CPI Card Group Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Arkansas Teacher Retirement System, et al. v. Alon USA Energy, Inc., et al.*
- *In re TAL Education Group Securities Litigation*
- *GCI Liberty Stockholder Litigation*
- *In re SciPlay Corporation Securities Litigation*
- *In re Allergan Generic Drug Pricing Securities Litigation*
- *In re Vivint Solar, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re YayYo Securities Litigation*
- *In re JPMorgan Treasury Futures Spoofing Litigation*
- *Searles, et al. v. Crestview Partners, LP, et al. (Capital Bank)*
- *In re Lyft, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Aegean Marine Petroleum Network, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re JPMorgan Precious Metals Spoofing Litigation*
- *In re Pivotal Software, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Longo, et al. v. OSI Systems, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Homefed Corporation Stockholder Litigation*
- *Pierrelouis v. Gogo Inc., et al.*
- *Pope v. Navient Corporation, et al.*
- *In re Merit Medical Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Frontier Communications Corporation Stockholder Litigation*
- *Holwill v. AbbVie Inc.*
- *Budicak, Inc., et al. v. Lansing Trade Group, LLC, et al. (SRW Wheat Futures)*
- *Yannes, et al. v. SCWorx Corporation*
- *In re Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement Class Action Litigations*
- *In re Myriad Genetics, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. N.V. Securities Litigation*
- *The Arbitrage Fund, et al. v. William Petty, et al. (Exactech)*
- *In re Columbia Pipeline Group, Inc. Merger Litigation*

- *Martinek v. AmTrust Financial Services, Inc.*
- *City of Pittsburgh Comprehensive Municipal Pension Trust Fund, et al. v. Benefitfocus, Inc., et al.*
- *In re: Evoqua Water Technologies Corp. Securities Litigation*
- *Laydon v. Mizuho Bank, Ltd., et al.*
- *Lomingkit, et al. v. Apollo Education Group, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Caraco Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Ltd. Shareholder Litigation*
- *Norfolk County Retirement System, et al. v. Community Health Systems, Inc., et al.*
- *Chester County Employees' Retirement Fund v. KCG Holdings, Inc., et al.*
- *Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System, et al. v. Adeptus Health Inc., et al.*
- *Di Donato v. Insys Therapeutics, Inc., et al.*
- *Lundgren-Wiedinmyer, et al. v. LJM Partners, Ltd, et al.*
- *Martin, et al. v. Altisource Residential Corporation, et al.*
- *Stephen Appel, et al. v. Apollo Management, et al.*
- *In re Medley Capital Corporation Stockholder Litigation*
- *Forman, et al. v. Meridian BioScience, Inc., et al.*
- *Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, et al. v. Endo International PLC, et al.*
- *In Re Flowers Foods, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Jiangchen, et al. v. Rentech, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Liberty Tax, Inc. Stockholder Litigation*
- *In re RH, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Lazan v. Quantum Corporation, et al.*
- *Nabhan v. Quantum Corporation, et al.*
- *Edmund Murphy III, et al. v. JBS S.A.*
- *Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, et al. v. Sprouts Farmers Market, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Starz Stockholder Litigation*
- *Judith Godinez, et al. v. Alere Inc., et al.*
- *Rahman and Giovagnoli, et al. v. GlobalSCAPE, Inc., et al.*
- *Arthur Kaye, et al. v. ImmunoCellular Therapeutics, Ltd., et al.*
- *In re CPI Card Group Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Daniel Aude, et al. v. Kobe Steel, Ltd., et al.*
- *In re Quality Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Cooper, et al. v. Thoratec Corporation, et al.*
- *Washtenaw County Employees' Retirement System, et al. v. Walgreen Co., et al.*
- *Elkin v. Walter Investment Management Corp., et al.*
- *In Re CytRx Corporation Securities Litigation*
- *Ranjit Singh, et al. v. 21Vianet Group, Inc., et al.*
- *In re PTC Therapeutics, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Mark A. Jones*
- *In re Sequans Communications S.A. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Henry Schein, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Ronge, et al. v. Camping World Holdings, Inc., et al.*
- *Oklahoma Firefighters Pension & Retirement System v. Lexmark International, Inc.*
- *Christakis Vrakas, et al. v. United States Steel Corporation, et al.*
- *Emerson et al. v. Mutual Fund Series Trust, et al. ("Catalyst")*
- *In re Fannie Mae 2008 Securities Litigation*
- *In re Anadarko Petroleum Corporation Class Action Litigation*
- *Ge Dandong, et al., v. Pinnacle Performance Limited, et al.*
- *In Re: Rough Rice Commodity Litigation*
- *Xuechen Yang v. Focus Media Holding Limited et al.*
- *In re Massey Energy Co. Securities Litigation*

- *In re Swisher Hygiene, Inc.*
- *The City of Providence vs. Aeropostale, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Metrologic Instruments, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*
- *Public Pension Fund Group v. KV Pharmaceutical Company et al.*
- *Pension Trust Fund for Operating Engineers, et al. v. Assisted Living Concepts, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Lehman Brothers Equity/Debt Securities Litigation*
- *In re: Platinum and Palladium Commodities Litigation (Platinum/Palladium Physical Action)*
- *In re: Platinum and Palladium Commodities Litigation (Platinum/Palladium Futures Action)*
- *In re General Electric Co. Securities Litigation*
- *In re CNX Gas Corporation Shareholders Litigation*
- *Oscar S. Wyatt, Jr. et al. v. El Paso Corporation, et al.*
- *In re Par Pharmaceutical Securities Litigation*
- *In re Par Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*
- *In re Delphi Financial Group Shareholders Litigation*
- *In re SLM Corporation Securities Litigation*
- *In re Del Monte Foods Company Shareholder Litigation*
- *Leslie Niederklein v. PCS Edventures!.com, Inc. and Anthony A. Maher*
- *In re Beckman Coulter, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *Michael Rubin v. MF Global, Ltd., et al.*
- *Allen Zametkin v. Fidelity Management & Research Company, et al.*
- *In re BP Prudhoe Bay Royalty Trust Securities Litigation*
- *Police and Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit et al. v. SafeNet, Inc., et al.*
- *In re Limelight Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation*
- *In re Gilead Sciences Securities Litigation*
- *In re ACS Shareholder Litigation, Consolidated C.A. No. 4940-VCP*
- *Lance Provo v. China Organic Agriculture, Inc., et al.*
- *In re LDK Solar Securities Litigation*

Labor & Employment Cases

- *Verizon OFCCP Settlement*
- *Alvarez, et al. v. GEO Secure Services, LLC*
- *Sartena v. Meltwater FLSA*
- *Carmen Alvarez, et al. v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc., et al.*
- *Turner, et al. v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.*
- *Long, et al. v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*
- *Matheson, et al. v. TD Bank, N.A.*
- *Ludwig, et al. v. General Dynamics Information Technology, Inc., et al.*
- *Bedel, et al. v. Liberty Mutual Group Inc.*
- *Irene Parry, et al. v. Farmers Insurance Exchange, et al.*
- *Maldonado v. The GEO Group, Inc.*
- *Alderman and Maxey v. ADT, LLC*
- *Albaceet v. Dick's Sporting Goods*
- *Rodriguez v. The Procter & Gamble Company*
- *Adekunle, et al. v. Big Bang Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a The Revenue Optimization Companies*
- *Gorski, et al. v. Wireless Vision, LLC*
- *Lopez, et al. v. New York Community Bank, et al.*
- *Hamilton, et al. v. The Vail Corporation, et al.*
- *Eisenman v. The Ayco Company L.P.*
- *Matheson v. TD Bank, N.A.*

- *Simon v. R.W. Express LLC, d/b/a Go Airlink NYC*
- *Perez v. Mexican Hospitality Operator LLC, d/b/a Cosme*
- *Shanahan v. KeyBank, N.A.*
- *Loftin v. SunTrust Bank*
- *Alvarez v. GEO Secure Services, LLC*
- *Weisgarber v. North American Dental Group, LLC*
- *Talisa Borders, et al. v. Wal-mart Stores, Inc.*
- *Reale v. McClain Sonics Inc., et al.*
- *Larita Finisterre and Songhai Woodard, et al. v. Global Contact Services, LLC*
- *Adebisi Bello v. The Parc at Joliet*
- *Garcia, et al. v. Vertical Screen, Inc.*
- *Brook Lemma and Matthieu Hubert, et al. v. 103W77 Partners LLC, et al. ("Dovetail Settlement")*
- *American Federation of Government Employees, Local 1145 v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia*
- *Lisa Ferguson, Octavia Brown, et al. v. Matthew G. Whitaker, Acting AG, DOJ Bureau of Prisons ("USP Victorville")*
- *American Federation of Government Employees, Local 2001 v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Federal Correctional Institution, Fort Dix, New Jersey*
- *American Federation of Government Employees, Local 506 v. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Penitentiary Coleman II, Coleman, Florida*
- *Vargas v. Sterling Engineering*
- *Rosenbohm v. Verizon*
- *Alex Morgan, et al. v. United States Soccer Federation, Inc.*
- *Iskander Rasulev v. Good Care Agency, Inc.*
- *Kyndl Buzas, et al., v. Phillips 66 Company and DOES 1 through 10*
- *American Federation of Government Employees, Local 408 v. U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Federal Correctional Complex, Butner, NC*
- *In re 2014 Avon Products, Inc. ERISA Litigation*
- *In re Eastman Kodak ERISA Litigation*
- *Taronica White, et al. v. Attorney General Loretta Lynch, Department of Justice*
- *Lisa Ferguson, et al. v. Acting Attorney General Matthew Whitaker, Department of Justice*
- *Melissa Compere v. Nusret Miami, LLC, et al.*
- *Abelar v. American Residential Services, L.L.C., Central District of California*
- *Flores, et al. v. Eagle Diner Corp., et al., Eastern District of Pennsylvania*
- *Michael Furman v. Godiva Chocolatier, Inc., 15th Judicial Circuit, Palm Beach County, Florida*
- *Finisterre et. al v. Global Contact Services, LLC, New York State Supreme Court, Kings County*
- *McGuire v. Intelident Solutions, LLC, et al., Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division*
- *Duran De Rodriguez, et al. v. Five Star Home Health Care Agency, Inc. et al., Eastern District of New York*

Data Breach/BIPA Cases

- *Hunter v. J.S.T. Corp. BIPA Settlement*
- *Atkinson, et al. v. Minted, Inc.*
- *Rosenbach, et al. v. Six Flags Entertainment Corporation and Great America LLC*
- *Pratz, et al. v. MOD Super Fast Pizza, LLC*
- *The State of Indiana v. Equifax Data Breach Settlement*
- *In re: Vizio, Inc. Consumer Privacy Litigation*
- *In re: Google, Inc. Street View Electronic Communications Litigation*
- *Devin Briggs and Bobby Watson, et al. v. Rhinoag, Inc. ("Briggs Biometric Settlement")*
- *Trost v. Pretium Packaging L.L.C.*

- *In re: Barr, et al. v. Drizly, LLC f/k/a Drizly, Inc., et al.*

Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Cases

- *Perrong, et al. v. Orbit Energy & Power, LLC*
- *Baldwin, et al. v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*
- *Floyd and Fabricant, et al. v. First Data Merchant Services LLC, et al.*
- *Hoffman, et al. v. Hearing Help Express, Inc., et al.*
- *Lowe and Kaiser, et al. v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc., et al.*
- *Johansen v. HomeAdvisor, Inc., et al.*
- *Charvat, et al. v. National Holdings Corporation*
- *Hopkins, et al. v. Modernize, Inc.*
- *Diana Mey vs. Frontier Communications Corporation*
- *Matthew Donaca v. Dish Network, L.L.C.*
- *Matthew Benzion and Theodore Glaser v. Vivint, Inc.*
- *John Lofton v. Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC, et al.*
- *Lori Shamblin v. Obama for America, et al.*
- *Ellman v. Security Networks*

For More Information

For more detailed information regarding A.B. Data's experience, services, or personnel, please see our website at www.abdataclassaction.com.

Adam M. Apton, Esq.
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22cv-05258-WJM-AME

**DECLARATION OF
DR. SCOTT GREENBAUM**

I, Dr. Scott Greenbaum, declare as follows:

1. I respectfully submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement. I have personal knowledge of the statements herein and if called upon as a witness, could and would competently testify thereto.

2. I am one of the initial complainants in this consolidated class action lawsuit. On or around October 4, 2022, I contacted the law firm of Levi & Korsinsky, LLP to discuss the lawsuit that was pending at the time against Humanigen, Inc. and certain of its executives. On October 17, 2022, following several conversations with

the firm and its attorneys, I authorized the filing of an additional complaint and the commencement of the action styled *Greenbaum v. Humanigen, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-06118 (D.N.J.).

3. The additional complaint filed on my behalf differed from the initial complaint already on file in at least three significant ways. First, my complaint expanded the class period by almost an entire year, beginning with statements made by the defendants in Humanigen's quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 2020. As a result of the new class period, my lawsuit sought to represent investors who purchased Humanigen stock on the OTCQB Venture Market prior to its uplisting on the NASDAQ Stock Market. Second, my complaint expanded on the theory of liability by addressing directly the risks associated with lenzilumab as a GM-CSF inhibitor in patients with pre-existing lung dysfunction and statements concerning its clinical trial history relative to other drugs already in development at the time, *i.e.*, mavrilimumab. Third, in light of the theory of liability contained in my complaint, I included an additional individual named defendant in the action.

4. On October 25, 2022, my attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky filed a motion for lead plaintiff on my behalf. At that time, I submitted a declaration to the Court certifying, among other things, that: I had reviewed a complaint filed in the action; I did not purchase the security that is the subject of this action at the direction of

plaintiff's counsel or in order to participate in this private action; I was willing to serve as a representative party on behalf of the class, including providing testimony at deposition and trial, if necessary; and I would not accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of the class beyond my pro rata share of any recovery, except as ordered or approved by the court, including any award for reasonable costs and expenses (including lost wages) directly relating to the representation of the class.

5. Other lead plaintiff motions on behalf of other investors were also filed, including the motion filed by Mr. Joshua Mailey and his attorneys at Pomerantz LLP. Mr. Mailey and I ultimately decided to resolve our pending motions by stipulating to the appointment of co-lead plaintiffs and co-lead counsel. On December 9, 2022, the Court so-ordered our stipulation.

6. Since then, I have remained engaged and kept up to date with the various proceedings by staying in communication with my attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky. I have reviewed filings, including the complaints, stipulations and various motion papers. I have also participated by providing documents in my possession relating to my transactions in Humanigen stock as well as helping counsel identify false and/or materially misleading statements about lenzilumab, given my educational background as a medical doctor.

7. I am in favor of settling this case for \$3,000,000. I have at all relevant

times been familiar with the issues in the case, the negotiations that took place during the mediation, and Humanigen's financial situation. The settlement presents a favorable outcome in my opinion. It will return a substantial amount of money to investors who, in my opinion, suffered damages as a result of investing in Humanigen based on what I believe were inaccurate and misleading statements. I, of course, am included amongst those investors and welcome the opportunity to put this matter to rest. The Court should grant Plaintiffs' motion and preliminarily approve the settlement.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 13th day of September 2023.


Scot Greenbaum MD (Sep 13, 2023 15:59 EDT)

DR. SCOTT GREENBAUM

Brenda Szydlo, Esq.
POMERANTZ LLP
600 Third Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel.: (212) 661-1100
Fax: (917) 463-1044

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22cv-05258-WJM-AME

**DECLARATION OF
JOSHUA MAILEY**

I, Joshua Mailey, declare as follows:

1. I respectfully submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement. I have personal knowledge of the statements herein and if called upon as a witness, could and would competently testify thereto.

2. On October 25, 2022, my attorneys at Pomerantz LLP filed a motion on my behalf seeking my appointment as lead plaintiff in the action. At that time, I submitted a declaration to the Court certifying, among other things, that: I had reviewed a complaint filed in the action; I did not purchase the security that is the

subject of this action at the direction of plaintiff's counsel or in order to participate in this private action; I was willing to serve as a representative party on behalf of the class, including providing testimony at deposition and trial, if necessary; and I would not accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of the class beyond my pro rata share of any recovery, except as ordered or approved by the Court, including any award for reasonable costs and expenses (including lost wages) directly relating to the representation of the class.

3. Other lead plaintiff motions on behalf of other investors were also filed, including the motion filed by Dr. Scott Greenbaum and his attorneys at Levi & Korsinsky, LLP. Dr. Greenbaum and I ultimately decided to resolve our pending motions by stipulating to the appointment of co-lead plaintiffs and co-lead counsel. On December 9, 2022, the Court so-ordered our stipulation.

4. On March 27, 2023, the Amended Complaint in this action was filed naming Dr. Scott Greenbaum and me as co-lead plaintiffs, and Mr. Alejandro Pieroni as plaintiff (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated.

5. Since then, I have remained engaged and kept up to date with the various proceedings by staying in communication with counsel. I have reviewed filings, including the complaints, stipulations and various motion papers. I have also participated by providing documents in my possession relating to my transactions in

Humanigen stock.

6. I am in favor of settling this case for \$3,000,000. I have at all relevant times been familiar with the issues in the case, the negotiations that took place during the mediation, and Humanigen's financial situation. The settlement presents a favorable outcome in my opinion. It will return a substantial amount of money to investors who, in my opinion, suffered damages as a result of investing in Humanigen based on what I believe were inaccurate and misleading statements. I, of course, am included amongst those investors and welcome the opportunity to put this matter to rest. The Court should grant Plaintiffs' motion and preliminarily approve the settlement.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

9/12/2023

Executed this ____ day of September 2023.

DocuSigned by:

Joshua Mailey

7A8EE162974F442...
JOSHUA MAILEY

Adam M. Apton, Esq.
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
55 Broadway, 4th Floor
New York, NY 10006
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22cv-05258-WJM-AME

**DECLARATION OF
ALEJANDRO PIERONI**

I, Alejandro Pieroni, declare as follows:

1. I respectfully submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement. I have personal knowledge of the statements herein and if called upon as a witness, could and would competently testify thereto.

2. I am the initial complainant in this consolidated class action lawsuit and authorized the filing of a complaint and the commencement of the action styled *Alejandro Pieroni v. Humanigen, Inc.*, 1:22-cv-05258 (D.N.J.).

3. On December 9, 2022, the Court so-ordered a stipulation appointing

Mr. Joshua Mailey and Dr. Scott Greenbaum as co-lead plaintiffs, Pomerantz LLP and Levi & Korsinsky, LLP to serve as co-lead Counsel, and consolidating the related actions that were filed.

4. On March 27, 2023, the Amended Complaint was filed naming Mr. Mailey and Dr. Scott Greenbaum as c-lead plaintiffs and me as plaintiff (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

5. Since then, I have remained engaged and kept up to date with the various proceedings by staying in communication with counsel. I have reviewed filings, including the complaints, stipulations and various motion papers. I have also participated by providing documents in my possession relating to my transactions in Humanigen stock.

6. I am in favor of settling this case for \$3,000,000. I have at all relevant times been familiar with the issues in the case, the negotiations that took place during the mediation, and Humanigen’s financial situation. The settlement presents a favorable outcome in my opinion. It will return a substantial amount of money to investors who, in my opinion, suffered damages as a result of investing in Humanigen based on what I believe were inaccurate and misleading statements. I, of course, am included amongst those investors and welcome the opportunity to put this matter to rest. The Court should grant Plaintiffs’ motion and preliminarily approve the settlement.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this ¹² ___ day of September 2023.

DocuSigned by:

4C6DFFE2000E432...

ALEJANDRO PIERONI

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-cv-05258-WJM-AME

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
SETTLEMENT**

WHEREAS, a consolidated class action is pending before the Court entitled *In re Humanigen, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 2:22-cv-05258-WJM-AME (D.N.J.);

WHEREAS, (a) Lead Plaintiffs Dr. Scott Greenbaum and Joshua Mailey together with Plaintiff Alejandro Pieroni, individually and on behalf of the Settlement Class (“Plaintiffs”), and (b) defendants Humanigen, Inc. (“Humanigen”), Cameron Durrant, and Dale Chappell (collectively, “Defendants”; and together with the Plaintiffs, the “Parties”) have determined to settle all claims asserted against Defendants in this Litigation with prejudice on the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement dated September 22, 2023 (the “Stipulation”) subject to the approval of this Court (the “Settlement”);

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered Plaintiffs’ unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (the “Motion”); as well as all papers submitted in support thereof; the proposed Settlement as set forth in the Stipulation, which, together with the exhibits annexed thereto, sets forth the terms and conditions of a proposed settlement of the above-captioned Litigation, dismissing the Defendants with prejudice upon the terms and conditions set forth therein; a copy of which has been submitted with the Motion and the terms of which are incorporated herewith; and all other prior proceedings in this Litigation; and good cause for this Order having been shown:

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The provisions of the Stipulation, including definitions of the terms used therein, are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. All capitalized terms used herein have the meanings set forth and defined in the Stipulation.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Litigation and over all parties to this Litigation, including Settlement Class Members.

3. The Court preliminarily approves the Settlement and the proposed Plan of Allocation described in the Notice as fair, reasonable and adequate as to all Settlement Class Members, pending a final settlement and fairness hearing (the “Settlement Hearing”). The Court preliminarily finds that the proposed Settlement

should be approved as: (i) the result of serious, extensive arm's-length and non-collusive negotiations; (ii) falling within a range of reasonableness warranting final approval; (iii) having no obvious deficiencies; (iv) not improperly granting preferential treatment to any of the Plaintiffs or segments of the Settlement Class; and (v) warranting notice of the proposed Settlement at the Settlement Hearing described below.

4. Pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for purposes of this Settlement only, the Court hereby certifies a Settlement Class, defined as: all Persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Humanigen securities during the Class Period. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Defendants; (ii) the officers, directors, and affiliates of Humanigen, at all relevant times; (iii) Humanigen's employee retirement or benefit plan(s) and their participants or beneficiaries to the extent they purchased or acquired Humanigen securities through any such plan(s); (iv) any entity in which Defendants have or had controlling interest; (v) Immediate Family members of any excluded person; and (vi) the legal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns of any excluded person or entity. Also excluded from the Settlement Class are those Persons who validly and timely request exclusion.

5. With respect to the Settlement Class, this Court finds solely for purposes of effectuating this settlement that: (a) the Settlement Class Members are

so numerous that joinder of all Settlement Class Members in the Litigation is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over any individual questions; (c) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiffs have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interests of all of the Settlement Class Members; and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, considering: (i) the interests of the members of the Settlement Class in individually controlling the prosecution of the separate actions; (ii) the extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by members of the Settlement Class; (iii) the desirability or undesirability of continuing the litigation of these claims in this particular forum; and (iv) the difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of the class action.

6. The Court hereby finds and concludes that pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for the purposes of the Settlement only, Plaintiffs are adequate class representatives and certifies them as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class. The Court also appoints Lead Counsel as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class, pursuant to Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

7. The Court approves the appointment of A.B. Data, Ltd. as the Claims

Administrator to supervise and administer the notice procedure and the processing of claims.

8. The Court orders the stay of any pending litigation and enjoins the initiation of any new litigation by any Settlement Class Member in any court, arbitration, or other tribunal that includes any Released Claims against the Released Parties.

9. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the proposed Notice and Postcard Notice, substantially in the forms annexed hereto as Exhibits A-1 and A-4, and directs that as soon as practicable after entry of this Order, but no later than fourteen (14) days after entry of this Order granting preliminary approval, that the Settlement Administrator publish the Notice on a website to be maintained by the Claims Administrator and provide the Postcard Notice to each known Settlement Class Member via first class U.S. mail, postage pre-paid. Humanigen shall cooperate in the identification of Settlement Class Members by producing reasonably available information from its shareholder transfer records or transfer agent. The Claims Administrator shall file with the Court proof of mailing of the Notice seven (7) days prior to the Settlement Hearing.

10. Banks, brokerage firms, institutions, and other persons who are nominees who purchased or otherwise acquired Humanigen securities for the beneficial interest of other persons during the Settlement Class Period are directed

to, within ten (10) days after receipt of the Notice: either (a) send the Notice and the Proof of Claim form to all beneficial owners of Humanigen securities purchased or otherwise acquired during the Class Period; or (b) send a list of the names and addresses of such beneficial owners to the Claims Administrator. Upon full compliance with these directions, such nominees may seek reimbursement of their reasonable expenses actually incurred up to a maximum of \$0.15 per name and address provided to the Claims Administrator and up to \$0.15 per Notice actually mailed, plus postage at the rate used by the Claims Administrator. The Claims Administrator shall provide the Notice to each Settlement Class Member identified through point (b) of this Paragraph via first class U.S. mail, postage pre-paid, no later than sixty (60) days prior to the Settlement Hearing.

11. The cost of providing the Notice to the Settlement Class as specified in this Order shall be paid as set forth in the Stipulation.

12. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the proposed form Summary Notice, substantially in the form annexed hereto as Exhibit A-3, and directs that within twenty-one (21) days after entry of this Order granting preliminary approval the Claims Administrator shall cause such Summary Notice to be published on a national business newswire. The Claims Administrator shall file with the Court proof of publication of the Summary Notice seven (7) days prior to the Settlement Hearing.

13. The Court approves the proposed Proof of Claim substantially in the form of Exhibit A-2 hereto.

14. The Court orders that the Notices, Proof of Claim form, Stipulation of Settlement and all papers submitted in support thereof be posted to a website to be maintained by the Claims Administrator.

15. This Court preliminarily finds that the distribution of the Notice and the publication of the Publication Notice, and the notice methodology, contemplated by the Stipulation and this Order:

(a) Constitute the best practicable notice to Settlement Class Members under the circumstances of this Action;

(b) Are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of: (i) the proposed Settlement of this Action; (ii) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iii) their right to object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement; (iv) their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing, either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense, if they did not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and (v) the binding effect of the proceedings, rulings, orders, and judgments in this Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons not excluded from the Settlement Class;

(c) Are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice; and

(d) Fully satisfy all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (including Rules 23(c) and (d)), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(7), the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, the Rules of Court, and any other applicable law.

16. Settlement Class Members who wish to participate in the Settlement shall complete and submit the Proof of Claim and Release form in accordance with the instructions contained in the Notice. Unless the Court orders otherwise, all Proof of Claim and Release forms must be submitted no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after entry of this Order.

17. Any Settlement Class Member who does not submit a Proof of Claim and Release within the time provided shall be barred from sharing in the distribution of the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, but shall nevertheless be bound by any final judgment entered by the Court. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Lead Counsel shall have the discretion to accept late-submitted claims for processing by the Claims Administrator so long as distribution of the Net Settlement Fund is not materially delayed thereby.

18. Any person falling within the definition of the Settlement Class may

seek to be excluded from the Settlement Class by submitting to the Settlement Administrator a request for exclusion (“Request for Exclusion”), which complies with the requirements set forth in the Notice and is postmarked no later than twenty-eight (28) days prior to the Settlement Hearing. Any Request for Exclusion that does not supply the information required by this Paragraph 16 shall be rejected, and any such Settlement Class Member shall be bound by the Stipulation and any judgment entered in connection therewith.

19. All persons who submit valid and timely Requests for Exclusion shall have no rights under the Stipulation, shall not share in the distribution of the Net Settlement Fund, and shall not be bound by the Settlement Stipulation or the Judgment. However, a Settlement Class Member may submit a written revocation of a Request for Exclusion up until seven (7) days prior to the date of the Settlement Hearing and still be eligible to receive payments pursuant to the Stipulation provided the Settlement Class Member also submits a valid Proof of Claim prior to the Settlement Hearing (the “Bar Date”).

20. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the Court stays all proceedings in the Action other than proceedings necessary to carry out or enforce the terms and conditions of the Stipulation. Pending final determination of whether the Settlement should be approved, the Court bars and enjoins Plaintiffs, and all other members of the Settlement Class, from commencing or prosecuting any and all of the Released

Plaintiffs' Claims against each and all of the Defendants' Related Parties.

21. The Settlement Hearing shall take place before the undersigned, United States District Judge William J. Martini, in Courtroom MLK 4B at the Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse, 50 Walnut Street, Newark, New Jersey 07101, on _____, at ____:__.m., to determine:

(a) Whether the Settlement, on the terms and conditions provided for in the Stipulation, should be finally approved by the Court as fair, reasonable, and adequate;

(b) Whether the Litigation should be dismissed on the merits and with prejudice as to the Defendants;

(c) Whether the Court should permanently enjoin the assertion of any claims that arise from or relate to the subject matter of the Litigation;

(d) Whether the application for attorneys' fees and expenses to be submitted by Lead Counsel should be approved;

(e) Whether the Plan of Allocation is fair and reasonable to the members of the Settlement Class;

(f) Whether the application for a Compensatory Award to be submitted on behalf of Lead Plaintiffs Dr. Scott Greenbaum and Joshua Mailey and Plaintiff Alejandro Pieroni should be approved; and

(g) Such other matters as the Court may deem necessary or appropriate.

22. The Court may finally approve the Stipulation at or after the Settlement Hearing with any modifications agreed to by the parties and without further notice to the Settlement Class Members.

23. Lead Counsel and/or Defendants' Counsel shall submit papers in support of the Settlement, Plan of Allocation and Award of Attorney Fees and Expenses, and Lead Plaintiff's Compensatory Awards no later than thirty-five (35) days prior to the Settlement Hearing.

24. Any Settlement Class Member and any other interested person may appear at the Settlement Hearing in person or by counsel and be heard, to the extent allowed by the Court, either in support of or in opposition to the matters to be considered at the hearing; provided, however, that no person shall be heard, and no papers, briefs, or other submissions shall be considered by the Court in connection to such matters, unless no later than twenty-eight (28) days before the Settlement Hearing, such person files with the Court a statement of objection setting forth: (i) whether the person is a Settlement Class Member; (ii) to which part of the Stipulation the Settlement Class Member objects; (iii) the specific reason(s), if any, for such objection including any legal support the Settlement Class Member wishes to bring to the Court's attention. Such Settlement Class Member shall also provide

documentation sufficient to establish the Humanigen securities purchased, acquired and sold from May 16, 2020 and July 12, 2022, both dates inclusive (including the number of shares, dates, and prices). Failure to provide such information and documentation shall be grounds to void the objection.

25. All papers in response to objections or otherwise in support of the Settlement and related matters shall be filed fourteen (14) days prior to the Settlement Hearing.

26. Defendants shall have no responsibility for the Plan of Allocation or any Fee and Expense Application, and such matters will be considered separately from the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Stipulation.

27. At or after the Settlement Hearing, the Court shall determine whether the Plan of Allocation and any Fee and Expense Application proposed by Lead Counsel should be approved.

28. All reasonable expenses incurred in identifying and notifying Settlement Class Members as well as administering the Settlement Fund shall be paid as set forth in the Stipulation. The Court may adjourn the Settlement Hearing, including the consideration of the motion for attorneys' fees and expenses, without further notice of any kind other than an announcement of such adjournment in open court at the Settlement Hearing or any adjournment thereof. The contents of the Settlement Fund held by Esquire Bank (which the Court approves as the Escrow

Agent), shall be deemed and considered to be *in custodia legis* of the Court, and shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of the Court, until such time as they shall be distributed pursuant to the Stipulation and/or further order(s) of the Court.

29. If the Settlement is approved, all Settlement Class Members will be bound by the terms of the Settlement as set forth in the Stipulation, and by any judgment or determination of the Court affecting the Settlement Class, regardless of whether or not a Settlement Class Member submits a Proof of Claim. Any member of the Settlement Class who fails to opt out of the Settlement Class or who fails to object in the manner prescribed therein shall be deemed to have waived, and shall be foreclosed forever from raising objections or asserting any claims arising out of, related to, or based in whole or in part on any of the facts or matters alleged, or which could have been alleged, or which otherwise were at issue in the Action.

30. Upon payment of the Settlement consideration to the Escrow Account by Defendants, the Settlement Fund shall be deemed to be in the custody of the Court and shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of the Court until such time as the Settlement Fund is distributed or returned to Defendants pursuant to the Stipulation and/or further order of this Court. There shall be no distribution of any part of the Net Settlement Fund to the Settlement Class until the Plan of Allocation is finally

approved.

31. Except for the obligation to cooperate in the production of reasonably available information with respect to the identification of Class Members from Humanigen's shareholder transfer records, in no event shall Defendants have any responsibility for the administration of the Settlement, and Defendants shall not have any obligation or liability to Plaintiffs in connection with such administration.

32. No Person shall have any claim against the Released Parties, the Claims Administrator, the Escrow Agent or any other agent designated by Lead Counsel based on distribution determinations or claim rejections made substantially in accordance with this Stipulation and the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, or further orders of the Court, except in the case of fraud or willful misconduct. No person shall have any claim under any circumstances against the Released Parties, based on any distributions, determinations, claim rejections or the design, terms, or implementation of the Plan of Allocation.

33. Defendants have denied, and continue to deny, any and all allegations and claims asserted in the Litigation, and Defendants have represented that they entered into the Settlement solely to eliminate the burden, expense, and uncertainties of further litigation.

34. Neither the Stipulation, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor any of the negotiations or proceedings connected with it, shall be construed as an admission

or concession by Defendants of the truth of any of the allegations in the Litigation, or of any liability, fault, or wrongdoing of any kind.

35. The Released Parties, and each of their counsel may file the Stipulation and/or the Order and Final Judgment in any action that may be brought against them in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on the principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction of any other theory of claim preclusion or issues preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.

36. In the event that the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the Stipulation, this Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by and in accordance with the Stipulation and shall be vacated, and in such event, all orders entered and releases delivered in connection therewith shall be null and void to the extent provided by and in accordance with the Settlement, and without prejudice to the rights of the parties to the Stipulation before it was executed.

37. The Court reserves the right to alter the time or the date of the Settlement Hearing without further notice to the Settlement Class Members, provided that the time or the date of the Settlement Hearing shall not be set at a time or date earlier than the time and date set forth above, and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the settlement.

SO ORDERED in the District of New Jersey on _____, 202__

THE HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Adam M. Apton, Esq.
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
33 Whitehall Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 363-7500
Fax: (212) 363-7171

*Attorneys for Co-Lead Plaintiffs and
Co-Lead Counsel for the Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE HUMANIGEN, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-cv-05258-WJM-AME

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 22, 2023 copies of the foregoing motion, brief, and accompanying declarations and exhibits were served upon counsel of record via CM/ECF.

Executed this 22nd day of September 2023.

s/ Adam M. Apton

Adam M. Apton