UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF JAMES A. HARROD IN SUPPORT OF (I) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION, AND (II) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF EXHIBITS iii

I. HISTORY OF THE ACTION 5

A. Background Concerning Kornit 5

B. The Appointment of Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel 6

C. The Investigation and Filing of the Consolidated Complaint 7

D. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss 9

E. Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings 14

F. The Parties' Fact Discovery Efforts 15

G. Work with Experts 17

H. The Parties' Mediation Efforts and the Settlement of the Action 18

I. The Court Grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement 20

II. RISKS OF CONTINUED LITIGATION 21

A. Risks Concerning Liability 23

1. Falsity 23

2. Scienter 24

B. Risks Related to Loss Causation and Damages 26

C. The Settlement Amount Compared to the Likely Maximum Damages that Could Be Proved at Trial 28

III. LEAD PLAINTIFFS' COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER REQUIRING ISSUANCE OF NOTICE 30

IV. ALLOCATION OF THE PROCEEDS OF THE SETTLEMENT.....34

V. THE FEE AND EXPENSE APPLICATION.....39

A. The Fee Application.....40

1. Lead Plaintiffs Have Authorized and Support the Fee Application.....41

2. The Favorable Settlement Achieved.....41

3. The Time and Labor Devoted to the Action by Plaintiffs' Counsel.....42

4. The Skill and Experience of Plaintiffs' Counsel.....44

5. Standing and Caliber of Defendants' Counsel.....45

6. The Risks of Litigation and the Need to Ensure the Availability of Competent Counsel in High-Risk Contingent Cases.....46

7. The Reaction of the Settlement Class to the Fee Application.....48

B. The Expense Application.....48

VI. CONCLUSION.....52

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 Declaration of Karl Kramer, Chairperson of Genesee County Employees' Retirement System, in Support of: (I) Lead Plaintiffs' Motion For Final Approval of Settlement and Plan of Allocation; and (II) Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses ("Kramer Decl.")

Exhibit 2 Declaration of Donnie Calic, on Behalf of Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD and Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet, in Support of: (I) Lead Plaintiffs' Motion For Final Approval of Settlement and Plan of Allocation; and (II) Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses ("Calic Decl.")

Exhibit 3 Declaration of Sagi Kahalani, on Behalf of Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd., in Support of: (I) Lead Plaintiffs' Motion For Final Approval of Settlement and Plan of Allocation; and (II) Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses ("Kahalani Decl.")

Exhibit 4 Declaration of Luiggy Segura of JND Legal Administration Regarding: (A) Dissemination of Postcard Notice and Notice Packet; (B) Publication of the Summary Notice; and (C) Report on Requests for Exclusion Received to Date ("Segura Decl.")

Exhibit 5 Summary of Plaintiffs' Counsel's Hours, Lodestar, and Expenses

Exhibit 5A Declaration of James A. Harrod in Support of Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses on Behalf of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP

Exhibit 5B Declaration of James Cecchi in Support of Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses on Behalf of Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Brody & Agnello, P.C.

Exhibit 6 Breakdown of Plaintiffs' Counsel's Expenses by Category

Exhibit 7 Compendium of Unpublished Opinions and Authority Cited in the Fee and Expense Motion

JAMES A. HARROD declares as follows:

1. I am a partner in the law firm of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP ("BLB&G" or "Lead Counsel"). BLB&G was appointed Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs Genesee County Employees' Retirement System ("Genesee County"), Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD and Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD (the "Teachers Funds"), and Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. ("Hachshara") in the above-captioned action (the "Action"). I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein based on my active participation in all aspects of the prosecution and settlement of the Action.[1]

2. The proposed Settlement before the Court provides for the resolution of all claims in the Action in exchange for a cash payment of $19,500,000, plus interest, for the benefit of the Settlement Class. The Settlement Amount has been paid into an escrow account and is earning interest. As detailed herein, the Settlement is a highly favorable outcome for the Settlement Class because it confers a substantial, certain, and near-term recovery for class members while avoiding the

---

[1] All capitalized terms that are not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings provided in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-2) (the "Stipulation"), which was entered into by and among (i) Lead Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, and (ii) defendant Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit" or the "Company"), and individual defendants Ronen Samuel and Alon Rozner (collectively, the "Individual Defendants" and, together with Kornit, "Defendants").

significant risks of continued litigation, including the risk that the Settlement Class could recover nothing or less than the Settlement Amount after years of additional litigation, appeals, and delay.

3. The proposed Settlement is the result of extensive efforts by Lead Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel, which included, among other things: (1) conducting a detailed investigation into the alleged fraud, including a thorough review of public information such as filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), analyst reports, conference call transcripts, and news articles; consultation with experts; and interviews with dozens of former Kornit employees; (2) researching and drafting a detailed Consolidated Complaint based on Lead Counsel's extensive investigation, and—after the Court's initial dismissal of the Action—an Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint (the "Amended Complaint" or "Complaint"); (3) litigating two rounds of Defendants' motions to dismiss through extensive briefing and oral argument, which resulted in the Court sustaining Lead Plaintiffs' claims as to five of the challenged statements; (4) opposing Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings; (5) initiating discovery, including drafting a protective order, ESI protocol, Joint Discovery Plan, initial disclosures, and initial requests for production of documents and interrogatories, and engaging in meet and confers with Defendants related to these topics; (6) consulting with experts on issues of damages and loss causation;

(7) conducting pre-mediation discovery of documents directed at key liability issues; and (8) engaging in extended arm's-length settlement negotiations overseen by an independent mediator, including the exchange of mediation briefs and a formal mediation session. Due to these efforts, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel were well informed of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses in the Action at the time they achieved the proposed Settlement.

4. The $19.5 million Settlement was based on a mediator's recommendation made by an experienced mediator, Jed D. Melnick of JAMS, following extensive mediation briefing and a full-day, in-person mediation session.

5. Lead Plaintiffs actively participated in the Action and closely supervised the work of Lead Counsel, and they have strongly endorsed the approval of the Settlement. *See* Declaration of Karl Kramer, Chairperson of Genesee County ("Kramer Decl."), attached hereto as Exhibit 1, at ¶¶ 4-5; Declaration of Donnie Calic on Behalf of the Teachers Funds ("Calic Decl."), attached hereto as Exhibit 2, at ¶¶ 4-5; Declaration of Sagi Kahalani on Behalf of Hachshara ("Kahalani Decl."), attached hereto as Exhibit 3, at ¶¶ 4-5.

6. As discussed in further detail below, the proposed Plan of Allocation, which was developed with the assistance of Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert, provides for the equitable distribution of the Net Settlement Fund to Settlement

Class Members who submit Claim Forms that are approved for payment by the Court on a *pro rata* basis fairly based on losses attributable to the alleged fraud.

7. For its efforts in achieving the Settlement, Lead Counsel requests an attorneys' fee award of 22% of the Settlement Fund for all Plaintiffs' Counsel.[2] A 22% fee award is well within the range of percentage fees that courts in this District and Circuit typically award in connection with comparable settlements. Lead Counsel respectfully submits that the requested fee is fair and reasonable in light of the result achieved in the Action, the efforts of Lead Counsel, and the risks and complexity of the litigation.

8. Lead Counsel's Fee and Expense Application also seeks payment of $136,695.22 in Litigation Expenses incurred by Plaintiffs' Counsel in connection with the prosecution and settlement of the Action, and reimbursement of an aggregate of $22,500 to Lead Plaintiffs in connection with their representation of the Settlement Class.

9. For all the reasons discussed in this Declaration and in the accompanying motions, including the quality of the result obtained and the meaningful litigation risks discussed below, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel

---

2 Plaintiffs' Counsel are Lead Counsel BLB&G; Liaison Counsel Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Brody & Agnello ("Carella Byrne"); VMT Law P.C., additional counsel for Lead Plaintiff Genesee County; and Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll LLP, counsel for additional named plaintiff Indiana State Police Pension Trust ("Indiana Police").

respectfully submit that the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation are "fair, reasonable, and adequate," and that the Court should approve them under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e). For similar reasons, and for the additional reasons discussed below, Lead Counsel respectfully submits that the Fee and Expense Application is also fair and reasonable and should be approved.

I. HISTORY OF THE ACTION

A. Background Concerning Kornit

10. Kornit is a company that manufactures and sells commercial textile printers and the ink and supplies needed to use them, particularly for the fashion, apparel, and home décor sectors. Kornit's ordinary shares were listed on and traded on the Nasdaq Stock Market under the ticker symbol "KRNT." During the Class Period, approximately 90% of Kornit's revenues came from its direct-to-garment business, which featured high-end printers costing up to nearly $1 million each. Kornit also supported its business by selling ink and other consumables intended to be used with Kornit's printers, as well as maintenance and support contracts designed to ensure that customers' machines were serviced quickly to avoid downtime. In this Action, Lead Plaintiffs allege, among other things, that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements during the Class Period concerning: (1) the length and mandatory nature of Kornit's service contracts

with customers; (2) an alleged "pull-forward" of approximately $30 million in sales into the first quarter of 2022; and (3) Kornit's growth and demand trends.

B. The Appointment of Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel

11. On February 15, 2023, Genesee County, through BLB&G, brought a putative class action in this Court against Defendants, alleging violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act") and SEC Rule 10b-5. Dkt. No. 1.

12. On April 17, 2023, Genesee County, the Teachers Funds, and Hachshara filed a motion to serve as Lead Plaintiffs in the Action. Dkt. No. 12. Two other movants filed a competing motion for appointment as lead plaintiff (Dkt. No. 13) and subsequently withdrew their motion (Dkt. No. 14).

13. On August 30, 2023, this Court (the Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo) entered an Order finding that Genesee County, the Teachers Funds, and Hachshara had the largest financial interest in the Action among the movants, and were otherwise qualified to act as lead plaintiffs in the Action. Dkt. No. 18. The Court appointed Genesee County, the Teachers Funds, and Hachshara as Lead Plaintiffs for the Action and approved their selection of BLB&G as Lead Counsel. *Id*. The Court captioned the action *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation*. *Id.*

C. The Investigation and Filing of the Consolidated Complaint

14. Lead Counsel undertook an extensive investigation into the alleged fraud and potential claims that could be asserted by Lead Plaintiffs in the Action. This investigation continued through preparation of the Consolidated Complaint (defined below). The investigation included a careful review and analysis of: (1) Kornit's public filings with the SEC; (2) research reports by securities and financial analysts; (3) transcripts of investor conference calls; (4) publicly available presentations by Kornit; (5) press releases and media reports; and (6) securities pricing data.

15. In connection with its investigation, Lead Counsel and its in-house investigators located former employees of Kornit and other industry participants who might have relevant information pertaining to the claims asserted in the Action. This included contacting 363 former Kornit employees who were believed to have potentially relevant information. Lead Counsel and its investigators interviewed 40 of these individuals, and Lead Counsel ultimately included detailed information received from 12 of the former Kornit employees in the Consolidated Complaint.

16. In connection with the preparation of the Consolidated Complaint, Lead Counsel also consulted with damages consultants who have substantial experience in providing expert analysis regarding loss causation and damages in securities class actions. Lead Counsel consulted with these consultants about,

among other things, the impact of Defendants' alleged misstatements and omissions on the market price of Kornit's ordinary shares and the damages suffered by Kornit shareholders.

17. On October 27, 2023, Lead Plaintiffs filed and served the detailed, 113-page Consolidated Class Action Complaint for Violations of Federal Securities Laws (Dkt. No. 23) (the "Consolidated Complaint"), based on this thorough investigation. The Consolidated Complaint asserted (i) claims under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and SEC Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5, promulgated thereunder, against all Defendants; (ii) claims under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78t(a), against the Individual Defendants; and (iii) claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77k, 77l, and 77o, against the Company, the Former Underwriter Defendants, and the Individual Defendants. The Consolidated Complaint asserted these claims on behalf of all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the ordinary shares of Kornit from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, and were damaged thereby, and/or pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021. The Consolidated Complaint also included additional named plaintiff Indiana Police, which had purchased Kornit ordinary shares in the Company's November 2021 secondary offering and asserted claims under the Securities Act. The Consolidated

Complaint alleged that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements or omissions concerning the impact of customer service and reliability problems, combined with competition, which led to sales losses from two of their top ten customers; the length of service contracts, which were mostly for one year—not two, as Defendants told investors; the "pull-forward" of revenue in Q1 2022 to mask declining demand; and the poor performance and lack of KornitX sales. *Id.* ¶¶ 1-7. The Consolidated Complaint further alleged that the price of Kornit's ordinary shares was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants' allegedly false and misleading misstatements and omissions and declined when the truth was allegedly revealed through two corrective disclosures on May 11, 2022 and July 5, 2022. *Id.* ¶¶ 95-110.

D. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss

18. On December 21, 2023, Defendants moved to dismiss the Consolidated Complaint. Dkt. No. 34. Defendants argued that Lead Plaintiffs failed to adequately plead a false and misleading statement because, among other things: (a) Defendants had no duty to disclose the allegedly omitted information; (b) the allegedly omitted information—including risks related to product defects, competition, customer loss, and the limited near-term revenue contributions of KornitX—had been comprehensively disclosed in Kornit's SEC filings; (c) many of the challenged statements were inactionable as a matter of law as forward-

looking statements protected by the PSLRA's safe harbor, statements of honestly held opinion, or as immaterial corporate puffery; and (d) the anonymous former employee allegations on which Lead Plaintiffs relied lacked sufficient indicia of reliability. *Id.* Defendants also argued that Lead Plaintiffs failed to plead a strong inference of scienter as to any Defendant. *Id*. Defendants further argued that the Securities Act claims under Sections 11 and 12(a)(2) should be dismissed on independent grounds. *Id.*

19. On the same day, the Former Underwriter Defendants separately moved to dismiss the Securities Act claims under Sections 11 and 12(a)(2), i.e., the only claims asserted against them. Dkt. Nos. 35-36. The Former Underwriter Defendants argued that Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to sue under Sections 11 and 12(a)(2), and that Lead Plaintiffs failed to plead facts showing that any of the challenged statements in the offering materials for Kornit's November 2021 secondary offering of ordinary shares were false. Dkt. No. 36.

20. On February 16, 2024, Lead Plaintiffs filed and served a memorandum of law in opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss, as well as the Former Underwriter Defendants' motion to dismiss. Dkt. No. 37. Lead Plaintiffs argued that the Consolidated Complaint adequately identified the false and misleading statements and omissions, detailed the reasons why each challenged statement was

materially false or omitted material facts and raised a strong inference of scienter. *Id*.

21. On April 1, 2024, Defendants and the Former Underwriter Defendants filed and served reply papers in support of their motions to dismiss. Dkt. Nos. 45, 46.

22. The Court held oral argument on the motions to dismiss the Consolidated Complaint on August 15, 2024. Dkt. Nos. 54, 55.

23. On August 15, 2024, the Court granted Defendants' and the Former Underwriter Defendants' motions to dismiss the Consolidated Complaint with leave to amend. Dkt. No. 54. The Court did not issue a written opinion and instead indicated its conclusions orally during the hearing. Dkt. No. 56.

24. On November 8, 2024, Lead Plaintiffs and Indiana Police filed the Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint for Violations of the Federal Securities Laws (the "Amended Complaint" or "Complaint"). Dkt. No. 61. The Amended Complaint asserted claims on behalf of all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the ordinary shares of Kornit from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period") and were damaged thereby, and/or pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021. Like the Consolidated Complaint, the Amended Complaint alleged that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements

or omissions concerning the impact of customer service and reliability problems, combined with competition, which led to sales losses from two of their top ten customers; the length of service contracts, which were mostly for one year—not two, as Defendants told investors; the "pull-forward" of revenue in Q1 2022 to mask declining demand; and the instability of KornitX and lack of sales. *Id.* ¶¶ 1-18. The Amended Complaint added allegations from Lead Counsel's ongoing investigation, including information provided by an additional former Kornit employee. The Amended Complaint asserted (i) claims under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and SEC Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5, promulgated thereunder, against all Defendants; (ii) claims under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78t(a), against the Individual Defendants; and (iii) claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77k, 77l, and 77o, against the Company, the Former Underwriter Defendants, and the Individual Defendants.

25. On January 24, 2025, the Defendants and the Former Underwriter Defendants moved to dismiss the Amended Complaint. Dkt. Nos. 64, 65. They asserted (among other things) that Lead Plaintiffs failed to sufficiently allege any actionable false or misleading statements or an inference of scienter, and that the Securities Act claims remained deficient and should be dismissed. *Id.*

26. On March 10, 2025, Lead Plaintiffs filed and served a memorandum of law in opposition to the motions to dismiss the Amended Complaint. Dkt. No. 66.

27. On April 25, 2025, Defendants filed and served reply papers in support of their motions to dismiss. Dkt. No. 68.

28. The Court held oral argument on the motions to dismiss the Amended Complaint on September 4, 2025. Dkt. Nos. 74, 75.

29. On September 4, 2025, the Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants' motion to dismiss, and granted the Former Underwriter Defendants' motion to dismiss. Dkt. No. 74. The Court did not issue a written opinion and instead indicated its conclusions orally during the hearing. Dkt. No. 76. The Court dismissed all of the Securities Act claims, including the claims under Sections 11, 12(a), and 15 against the Company, the Former Underwriter Defendants, and the Individual Defendants. *Id.* The Court sustained Lead Plaintiffs' Section 10(b) claims with respect to five statements: (1) Defendant Samuel's statement in February 2021 regarding the length and mandatory nature of Kornit's service contracts; (2) Defendant Samuel's statement in February 2022 that Kornit had "never been in a better position as a company"; (3) Defendant Rozner's statement during Kornit's May 2022 earnings call regarding the "pull-forward" of sales; and (4) two

statements during Kornit's May 2022 earnings call regarding the demand for Kornit's products. *Id*.

30. On December 4, 2025, Defendants filed their answer to the Complaint. Dkt. No. 83. Defendants' answer denied all of Lead Plaintiffs' claims and asserted 28 affirmative defenses including, among others, that the allegations are based on forward-looking statements that fall within the PSLRA's safe harbor provisions, that their statements were inactionable opinions, and that Defendants acted in good faith. *Id*.

E. Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

31. On December 4, 2025, Defendants also filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Dkt. No. 84. In their motion, Defendants argued that the February 2021 service contract statement should be dismissed on loss causation grounds because none of the alleged corrective disclosures mentioned Kornit's service contracts or revealed any inaccuracy in that statement. *Id.*

32. On December 22, 2025, Lead Plaintiffs filed a memorandum of law in opposition to Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings. Dkt. No. 86.

33. On January 7, 2026, Defendants filed reply papers in further support of their motion. Dkt. No. 89.

34. The motion for judgment on the pleadings was fully briefed in January 2026, and remained pending at the time the Parties reached the Settlement.

F. The Parties' Fact Discovery Efforts

35. Discovery in the Action commenced following the Court's ruling on Defendants' motion to dismiss the Complaint.

36. The Parties negotiated and exchanged drafts of a protective order, a protocol governing the search of electronically stored information ("ESI"), and each element of the Joint Discovery Plan. Following these negotiations, on November 11, 2025, the Parties met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), during which the Parties exchanged information concerning relevant custodians, systems, and sources of ESI likely to contain information relevant to the Parties' claims and defenses, among other topics.

37. The Parties submitted the Joint Discovery Plan to the Court on December 2, 2025. Dkt. No. 81. The Joint Discovery Plan discussed the allegations, issues, and history of the case and set forth the Parties' proposed case schedule. *Id*.

38. Thereafter, the Parties participated in the Initial Pretrial Conference on December 5, 2025 before Magistrate Judge Espinosa.

39. On December 5, 2025, Lead Plaintiffs served their First Set of Requests for the Production of Documents to Defendants. Lead Plaintiffs requested 40 categories of documents and communications, including those regarding the Company's service contracts, actual or forecasted demand for Kornit's products and services, and the preparation of the challenged statements, among other things.

40. The same day, Lead Counsel also served Lead Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories on Defendants, requesting that Defendants identify Kornit's largest customers, all service contracts entered into between Kornit and any customer, and all current or former employees of Kornit who authored the challenged statements, as well as several other categories of information.

41. The Parties exchanged their Initial Disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on December 15, 2025.

42. On December 9, 2025, Defendants served Requests for Production of Documents on each of the three Lead Plaintiffs, seeking production of documents across 47 separate subjects.

43. Also on December 9, 2025, Defendants served Interrogatories on each of the three Lead Plaintiffs, seeking responses to 16 discrete requests for information.

44. In December 2025 and January 2026, Lead Plaintiffs discussed the initial discovery requests served by Defendants with Lead Counsel. During that period, Lead Counsel prepared draft responses and objections, and shared and discussed those with Lead Plaintiffs. Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel also began the process of collecting documents to be produced in response to Defendants' discovery requests.

45. On January 22, 2026, on behalf of each of the Lead Plaintiffs, Lead Counsel served responses and objections to Defendants' Requests for Production of Documents, offering to meet and confer regarding numerous of the requests.

46. Also on January 22, 2026, on behalf of each of the Lead Plaintiffs, Lead Counsel served responses and objections to Defendants' Interrogatories.

47. On December 30, 2025, the Court entered the Pretrial Scheduling Order setting forth a schedule for the case which included April 15, 2026 as the deadline for substantial completion of document production from agreed-upon priority review; June 1, 2026 as the deadline for filing a motion for class certification; and July 15, 2026 as the deadline for substantial completion of document production. Dkt. No. 88.

48. On February 2, 2026, the Parties filed a Proposed Discovery Confidentiality Order. Dkt. No. 90.

49. Before the Parties' discovery efforts were stayed in March 2026 in connection with the mediation, Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel engaged in several meet and confers concerning Lead Plaintiffs' document requests and Defendants had begun production of documents.

G. Work with Experts

50. Following the denial of the Motion to Dismiss, Lead Plaintiffs consulted Eugene Orlov of Econic Partners, an expert financial economist, and his

team concerning loss causation and damages issues, including concerning the impact of Defendants' alleged misstatements and omissions on the price of Kornit's ordinary shares and the damages suffered by Kornit shareholders. Lead Plaintiffs consulted with Dr. Orlov in connection with settlement negotiations, and in preparing the mediation briefing. After the Settlement was reached, Lead Counsel worked with Dr. Orlov and his team in developing the proposed Plan of Allocation.

H. The Parties' Mediation Efforts and the Settlement of the Action

51. The Parties began exploring the possibility of a settlement in early 2026. The Parties agreed to engage in private mediation and retained Jed D. Melnick of JAMS to act as the mediator in the Action. Mr. Melnick is an experienced mediator of securities class actions and other complex litigation.

52. On March 6, 2026, the Parties filed a letter with the Court, informing the Court of the Parties' agreement to conduct a private mediation before Mr. Melnick. Dkt. No. 94. On March 11, 2026, the Court granted the Parties' request to stay discovery pending the outcome of their private mediation. Dkt. No. 95.

53. The Parties scheduled the mediation session with Mr. Melnick for April 7, 2026. In advance of that session, the Parties conducted pre-mediation discovery, with Defendants producing documents directed at key liability issues in the case, including documents relating to service contracts, product demand, and

accounting for the first quarter of 2022 sales. The Parties negotiated concerning the scope and type of documents to be produced, search terms, and custodians.

54. On March 27, 2026, the Parties exchanged and submitted to the mediator detailed mediation statements addressing issues of liability and damages.

55. A full-day, in-person mediation session with Mr. Melnick was held on April 7, 2026. At the mediation session, the Parties engaged in vigorous settlement negotiations with the assistance of Mr. Melnick. The case did not settle at this session.

56. On April 14, 2026, the Parties filed a letter with the Court regarding a continued stay of discovery pending the outcome of ongoing settlement negotiations. Dkt. No. 96. On April 20, 2026, the Court granted the Parties' request. Dkt. No. 97.

57. The Parties continued to engage in settlement negotiations following the April 7 mediation with the assistance of Mr. Melnick, including several exchanges on both the negotiation of potential financial terms, and substantive issues in the underlying litigation.

58. Following the mediation session, Mr. Melnick made a recommendation that the Parties settle the Action for $19,500,000, which the Parties accepted on April 28, 2026. The terms of the Parties' agreement to settle were memorialized in a Term Sheet executed on May 11, 2026.

59. In the following weeks, the Parties negotiated the full terms of the Settlement and drafted the settlement agreement and related papers, including the notices to be provided to the Settlement Class. On July 2, 2026, the Parties executed the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement (Dkt. No. 99-2), which set forth the complete terms of the Parties' agreement to settle all claims asserted in the Action for $19,500,000, subject to the approval of the Court. On the same day, the Parties also executed a Supplemental Agreement which provides that Kornit has the option to terminate the Settlement if the shareholders who request exclusion from the Settlement Class exceed a certain threshold.

I. The Court Grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement

60. On July 2, 2026, Lead Plaintiffs filed their motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement. Dkt. No. 99.

61. On July 22, 2026, the Court entered the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Proposed Settlement (Dkt. No. 101) (the "Preliminary Approval Order"). The Preliminary Approval Order, among other things: (1) preliminarily approved the Settlement; (2) authorized notice to be given to Settlement Class Members through the mailing of the Postcard Notice to potential Settlement Class Members, posting the Notice and Claim Form on a Settlement Website, and publication of the Summary Notice in *The Wall Street Journal* and over the *PR Newswire*; (3) established procedures and deadlines by which Settlement Class

Members could participate in the Settlement, request exclusion from the Settlement Class, or object to the Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, and/or the fee and expense application; and (4) set a schedule for the filing of opening papers and reply papers in support of the proposed Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and the Fee and Expense Application. The Preliminary Approval Order also scheduled the Settlement Hearing for November 18, 2026 at 3:00 p.m. to determine, among other things, whether the Settlement should be finally approved.

II. RISKS OF CONTINUED LITIGATION

62. The Settlement provides an immediate and certain benefit to the Settlement Class in the form of a $19,500,000 cash payment. Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel believe that the proposed Settlement is a very favorable result for the Settlement Class.

63. As explained below, Lead Plaintiffs faced meaningful risks with respect to proving liability and recovering full damages. To prevail in this case, Lead Plaintiffs had the burden to convince a unanimous jury by a preponderance of the evidence of each of the elements of their claims, including that (1) Defendants made misstatements; (2) the misstatements were material; (3) the misstatements were made with scienter (*i.e.*, knowingly or with deliberate recklessness); (4) investors relied upon the misstatements; and (5) Defendants' fraud caused investors' losses.

64. Absent a settlement, Lead Plaintiffs would need to succeed at each of several additional stages of the litigation, including defeating Defendants' then-pending motion for judgment on the pleadings, certifying the class, defeating Defendants' anticipated motion for summary judgment, and prevailing at trial and on appeal. At each of these stages, Lead Plaintiffs would have faced significant risks related to establishing liability and full damages, including, among other things, overcoming Defendants' falsity, scienter, and loss causation challenges. Even after any trial, Lead Plaintiffs would have faced post-trial motions, including a potential motion for judgment as a matter of law, as well as further appeals that might have prevented Lead Plaintiffs from successfully obtaining a recovery for the Settlement Class.

65. Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel believe that the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action are meritorious. They recognize, however, that this Action presented meaningful risks to establishing Defendants' liability. As discussed further below, Defendants have vigorously argued that their challenged statements were not false or misleading when made and that even if any of their statements were false or misleading, Defendants did not have any intent to mislead investors. Further, Defendants would vigorously argue that the alleged misstatements were not the cause of the price declines at issue in the case.

Therefore, the risks of continued litigation were substantial, and the Settlement Class's ultimate potential for recovery was far from certain.

A. Risks Concerning Liability

1. Falsity

66. Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel recognize that, while the Court sustained certain statements at the motion to dismiss stage, they may have been unable to establish that Defendants' challenged statements were materially false and misleading at trial. The Court's motion to dismiss order significantly narrowed the case, dismissing approximately 90% of the alleged misstatements and all of the Securities Act claims, and the Court noted during the hearing that certain of the sustained statements were a close call. Because the case had already been significantly narrowed, the loss of any remaining statement at any stage would have had a material impact on loss causation and damages.

67. For example, there was a risk that the Court or jury might ultimately find that certain of the alleged misstatements were immaterial, vague, or aspirational statements, were accurate statements about Kornit's business and operations, or were otherwise not actionable under the securities laws. Defendants would argue that they made no false statements regarding the length and mandatory nature of Kornit's service contracts, the health of Kornit's business, the revenue "pull-forward," and demand for Kornit's products. As to the service contract

statement, Defendants had argued, and would continue to argue, that Kornit's service contracts contained automatic renewal provisions that rendered them "multiple year" agreements in practice, that Kornit maintained a high "attach rate," and that the Company's SEC filings disclosed the terms of those contracts such that no reasonable investor could have been misled by the statements. As to Defendant Samuel's positive statement about the health of Kornit's business, Defendants argued, and would continue to argue, that the statement constituted corporate puffery and, in any event, that the decline in demand for Kornit's products did not emerge until after the statement was made. As to the "pull-forward" statement, Defendants argued, and would continue to argue, that the revenue pull-forward did not violate accounting rules and that Defendant Rozner had answered the analyst's question accurately from an accounting perspective.

68. While Lead Plaintiffs believed that they had responses to these challenges, they presented a significant risk at future stages of the litigation.

2. Scienter

69. Even if Lead Plaintiffs were able to prove that Defendants' statements were materially false or misleading, they would still need to prove to a jury that Defendants made the alleged false statements with the intent to mislead investors or with deliberate recklessness, *i.e.*, that Defendants subjectively believed their statements were false or were deliberately reckless in making the challenged

statements. Defendants would continue to argue that they did not act with fraudulent intent and that the challenged statements reflected the honestly held beliefs and expectations of the Individual Defendants about Kornit's business and operations at the time they made those statements.

70. Lead Plaintiffs also faced risks that the Court or jury might find that Defendants lacked scienter on a complete record at summary judgment or trial. For instance, as to the statement regarding the health of Kornit's business in February 2022, Lead Plaintiffs anticipate that Defendants would argue that Defendant Samuel subjectively believed that Kornit was in a better position than ever, that he had a good faith basis for his opinion, and that he did not know about the Company's declining performance until after making the statement. Proving such subjective intent would be difficult. As to the pull-forward statement, Lead Plaintiffs anticipate that Defendants would continue to argue that the pull-forward of revenue did not involve a *per se* accounting violation, and Lead Plaintiffs would need to prove that Defendant Rozner knew or was reckless in not knowing that the timing of the revenue recognized in the first quarter was a departure from industry practice.

71. Lead Plaintiffs anticipate that Defendants would also maintain that Defendants had no motive to mislead the market.

B. Risks Related to Loss Causation and Damages

72. Even assuming that Lead Plaintiffs overcame Defendants' arguments and established falsity and scienter, Lead Plaintiffs would have still confronted additional challenges in establishing loss causation and damages.

73. Defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings, which was pending at the time the Parties reached a settlement. In that motion, Defendants argued that the Court should dismiss the February 2021 service contract statement—which misrepresented that all service contracts were for a mandatory two years—on loss causation grounds because none of the alleged corrective disclosures mentioned Kornit's service contracts or revealed any inaccuracy in the statement. If granted, the motion would have reduced the Class Period by nearly a year, such that it would begin in February 2022, thereby reducing recoverable damages by approximately 60%. While Lead Plaintiffs believed that this issue was not appropriate for resolution on the pleadings, the motion posed real risk. Even if the motion were denied, the Court could have severed this statement at class certification or summary judgment, with the same effect on damages.

74. Further, there was a risk that the Court might eliminate from recovery one or more of the alleged corrective disclosures at class certification, summary judgment, or trial. Defendants were expected to contend that these misstatements cannot be certified as part of a class action under the U.S. Supreme Court's decision

in *Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. v. Arkansas Teacher Retirement System*, 594 U.S. 113 (2021). *Goldman* held that a class should not be certified if the defendant convinces the court that the alleged misstatements are too "generic" and vague, and thus the alleged misrepresentation could not have impacted the price of the stock, or if there is a substantial "mismatch" between the alleged misrepresentation and the disclosure that caused the price decline. *Id.* at 123. The statements that remain in this Action—including, for example, Defendant Samuel's statement that Kornit had "never been in a better position as a company"—were potentially vulnerable to a *Goldman* argument.

75. There was also a meaningful risk that the Court or a jury would find that significant portions of the stock price declines on the alleged corrective disclosure dates were due to factors unrelated to the alleged fraud. In this case, both of the alleged corrective disclosures coincided with Kornit providing earnings information to investors. For example, on May 11, 2022, Kornit reported disappointing financial results for Q1 2022, reflecting a decline in revenue, a net loss of $5.2 million (compared to a profit of $5.1 million the prior year), and a GAAP operating loss. Kornit also issued weaker-than-expected revenue guidance for Q2 2022. Lead Plaintiffs allege that these financial results partially revealed that Defendants' statements trumpeting Kornit's business and operations were false and misleading. Lead Plaintiffs anticipate that Defendants would argue that some or all

of the stock price decline associated with this disclosure was driven by non-fraud related information, such as the impact of deteriorating macroeconomic conditions or increased competition. Accordingly, the need to "disaggregate" fraud-related damages from the overall stock price declines on the corrective disclosure dates was likely to materially lower the amounts of potential recovery in this case.

76. In sum, Lead Plaintiffs recognized that Defendants' arguments regarding loss causation and damages posed meaningful risks for investors' eventual recovery.

C. The Settlement Amount Compared to the Likely Maximum Damages that Could Be Proved at Trial

77. The $19,500,000 Settlement is also a favorable result for the Settlement Class when it is considered in relation to the maximum amount of damages that could be established at trial, in the event that Lead Plaintiffs prevailed on class certification and liability issues, including falsity and scienter.

78. Assuming Lead Plaintiffs prevailed on all class certification and liability issues (which was far from certain), the theoretical maximum damages that Lead Plaintiffs could establish at trial was approximately $522 million, according to Lead Plaintiffs' expert analysis.

79. However, as discussed above, Lead Plaintiffs would face serious hurdles in proving each of these issues, and would face further loss causation challenges that might reduce any realistic recoveries at either summary judgment

or trial substantially below those maximums. More realistic assumptions of the potential trial recovery, after accounting for disaggregation, range from approximately $131 million, assuming the original Class Period is sustained, or approximately $103 million if the class period were shortened to begin on February 15, 2022 (after the second sustained alleged false statement).

80. Accordingly, the Settlement Amount represents between approximately 15% and 19% of the likely recoverable damages for the Settlement Class. If the class period were to be shortened further, to begin in connection with the "pull-forward" statements on May 12, 2022, the likely damages would have been reduced to approximately $51 million.

81. This result is well within the range of acceptable outcomes in a securities fraud class action in the Third Circuit. *See, e.g., In re Wilmington Tr. Sec. Litig.*, 2018 WL 6046452, at *8 (D. Del. Nov. 19, 2018) (noting "Third Circuit median recovery of 5% of damages in class action securities litigation"); *Schuler v. Meds. Co.*, 2016 WL 3457218, at *8 (D.N.J. June 24, 2016) (recovery of 4% of estimated recoverable damages "falls squarely within the range of previous settlement approvals"); *In re Hemispherx Biopharma, Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 2011 WL 13380384, at *6 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 14, 2011) (approving settlement representing 5.2% of damages and finding it "falls squarely within the range of reasonableness approved in other securities class action settlements"); *In re Am. Bus. Fin. Servs.*

Inc. Noteholders Litig., 2008 WL 4974782, at *7 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 21, 2008) (approving settlement representing 2.5% of damages).

82. Finally, Lead Plaintiffs also faced a possibility that any potential recovery could be reduced due to ability-to-pay considerations, because any recovery through litigation would not occur for several years and Kornit's financial condition at that time could not be accurately predicted and because Defendants' remaining available insurance was being consumed, and might eventually be depleted by the ongoing litigation.

83. Considering the foregoing risks, and the immediacy and amount of the $19,500,000 recovery for the Settlement Class, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Settlement Class.

III. LEAD PLAINTIFFS' COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER REQUIRING ISSUANCE OF NOTICE

84. The Court's Preliminary Approval Order authorized Lead Counsel to retain JND Legal Administration ("JND") as the Claims Administrator "to supervise and administer the notice procedure in connection with the proposed Settlement as well as the processing of Claims[.]" Dkt. No. 101, ¶ 7. In accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, JND, working in conjunction with Lead Counsel: (i) mailed the Postcard Notice to potential Settlement Class Members identified by

brokers and nominees;[3] (ii) mailed a copy of the long-form Notice and Claim Form (together, the "Notice Packet") to the Nominees contained in JND's Nominee database and to potential Settlement Class Members upon request; (iii) published the Summary Notice in *The Wall Street Journal* and transmitted the same over *PR Newswire*; and (iv) established the Settlement Website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, from which copies of the Notice and Claim Form can be downloaded and Claims be submitted electronically. Segura Decl. ¶¶ 2-15.

85. The Postcard Notice contains important information concerning the Settlement and, along with the Summary Notice, directs recipients to the Settlement Website for additional information regarding the Settlement (and the Action), including the long-form Notice, which includes, among other things, details about the Settlement and a copy of the Plan of Allocation as Appendix A.

86. Collectively, the notices provide the Settlement Class definition, a description of the Settlement, information regarding the claims asserted in the Action and information to enable Settlement Class Members to determine whether to: (i) participate in the Settlement by completing and submitting a Claim; (ii) object

---

[3] As is the case in most securities class actions, the great majority of the names and addresses of potential Settlement Class Members were obtained from brokerage firms, banks, institutions, and other nominees ("Nominees") holding Kornit ordinary shares as the record holders for other beneficial owners. Segura Decl. ¶ 3.

to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or the Fee and Expense Application; or (iii) submit a request to be excluded from the Settlement Class. The notices also inform prospective Settlement Class Members of Lead Counsel's intent to (i) apply for attorneys' fees in the amount not to exceed 22% of the Settlement Fund; and (ii) request Litigation Expenses in connection with the institution, prosecution, and resolution of the Action in an amount not to exceed $350,000, which amount may include a request for reimbursement of the reasonable costs incurred by Lead Plaintiffs directly related to their representation of the Settlement Class. *See* Segura Decl. Exs. A, B, C.

87. In accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, JND began disseminating Postcard Notices to potential Settlement Class Members and Notice Packets to Nominees on August 12, 2026. Segura Decl. ¶¶ 2-9. To date, JND has mailed 101,793 Postcard Notices and 4,075 Notice Packets to potential Settlement Class Members and Nominees. *Id*. ¶ 11. In addition, JND caused the Summary Notice to be published in *The Wall Street Journal* and transmitted over *PR Newswire* on August 26, 2026. *Id*. ¶ 12.[4]

88. JND also established and maintains a dedicated settlement website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, to provide Settlement Class Members and

4 Defendants have informed Lead Counsel that they issued notice of the Settlement pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715 ("CAFA") on July 24, 2026.

other interested parties with information concerning the Settlement and important dates and deadlines in connection therewith, as well as downloadable copies of the Notice, Claim Form, Stipulation, Preliminary Approval Order, Complaint, and other relevant documents. Segura Decl. ¶ 15. In addition, Settlement Class Members can file their Claim on the website via an online portal if they wish to do so. The website became operational on August 12, 2026. *Id*. Lead Counsel also made copies of the Notice and Claim Form and other documents available on its own website, www.blbglaw.com. Lead Counsel and JND will continue to monitor and to update the Settlement Website as the settlement process continues. For example, Lead Plaintiffs' papers in support of their motion for final approval of the Settlement and Lead Counsel's papers in support of its motion for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses will be made available on the website after they are filed, and any orders entered by the Court in connection with the motions will also be posted.

89. Additionally, JND established and maintains a dedicated toll-free telephone number to respond to inquiries regarding the Settlement, (855) 961-0955, and Settlement Class Members with questions can also contact JND by email at info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

90. As set forth in the notices, the deadline for Settlement Class Members to request exclusion from the Settlement Class or to submit an objection to the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or the Fee and Expense Application is

October 28, 2026. To date, no objections and no requests for exclusion have been received. Segura Decl. ¶ 17. Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel will address any requests for exclusion and objections that may be received in their reply submission to be filed on or before November 11, 2026.

IV. ALLOCATION OF THE PROCEEDS OF THE SETTLEMENT

91. Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, and as set forth in the Postcard Notice and Notice, all Settlement Class Members who want to be eligible to participate in the distribution of the Net Settlement Fund must submit a valid Claim Form with all required information postmarked (if mailed) or submitted online no later than December 10, 2026. The Net Settlement Fund will be distributed among Settlement Class Members who submit eligible claims according to the plan of allocation approved by the Court.

92. Lead Counsel consulted with Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert in developing the proposed plan of allocation for the Net Settlement Fund (the "Plan of Allocation"). Lead Counsel believes that the Plan of Allocation provides a fair and reasonable method to equitably allocate the Net Settlement Fund among Settlement Class Members who suffered losses as a result of the conduct alleged in the Action.

93. The Plan of Allocation is set forth in pages 18 to 23 of the Notice. *See* Segura Decl., Ex. B at 18-23. As described in the Notice, calculations under the

Plan of Allocation are intended as a method to weigh the claims of Settlement Class Members against one another for the purpose of making an equitable allocation of the Net Settlement Fund. *See* Notice ¶ 79.

94. In developing the Plan of Allocation, Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert calculated the estimated amount of artificial inflation in the per-share closing price of Kornit ordinary shares that allegedly was proximately caused by Defendants' alleged materially false and misleading statements and omissions during the Class Period. *See* Notice ¶ 80. In calculating the estimated artificial inflation allegedly caused by those misrepresentations and omissions, Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert considered the price changes in Kornit ordinary shares in reaction to certain public announcements allegedly revealing the truth concerning Defendants' alleged misrepresentations and material omissions, adjusting for price changes that were attributable to market or industry forces on those days, and adjusting for risks associated with Lead Plaintiffs' ability to prove liability, loss causation and damages. *Id*.

95. In order to have recoverable damages in connection with purchases or acquisitions of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period, disclosure of the alleged misrepresentations or omissions must be the cause of the decline in the price of the Kornit ordinary shares. In this case, Lead Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false statements and omitted material facts during the Class Period (from

February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive), which had the effect of artificially inflating the prices of Kornit ordinary shares. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that corrective information was released to the market on May 11, 2022 and July 5, 2022, which removed the artificial inflation from the price of Kornit ordinary shares on May 11, 2022 and July 6, 2022. Notice ¶ 81. In order to be eligible under the Plan of Allocation, Kornit ordinary shares must have been purchased or otherwise acquired during the Class Period and held through at least one of the dates where new corrective information was released to the market and partially removed the artificial inflation from the price of Kornit ordinary shares. *Id*.

96. Recognized Loss Amounts are calculated under the Plan of Allocation for each purchase or acquisition of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period that is listed on a Claimant's Claim Form and for which adequate documentation is provided. Notice ¶ 83. For shares purchased during the Class Period and sold before the close of trading on May 10, 2022 (that is, before the initial alleged corrective disclosure), the Recognized Loss Amount is zero, because, as discussed above, those shares were not damaged by the alleged fraud. *Id.* ¶¶ 84.A, 85.E. For shares sold from May 11, 2022 through the end of the Class Period, Recognized Loss Amounts will be the lesser of: (i) the amount of artificial inflation per share on the date of purchase *minus* the amount of artificial inflation per share on the date of sale; or (ii) the difference between the purchase price and the sale price. *Id.* ¶ 85.F.

For shares sold in the 90-day period after the end of the Class Period, the Recognized Loss Amount is the least of: (i) the artificial inflation per share on the date of purchase; (ii) the purchase price *minus* the sales price; or (iii) the purchase price *minus* the average closing price of the stock from July 6, 2022 through the date of sale, consistent with the PSLRA. *Id*. ¶¶ 84.C, 85.G. For shares still held as of the close of trading on October 3, 2022 (the end of the 90-day period following the end of the Class Period), Recognized Loss Amounts will be the lesser of (i) the estimated artificial inflation on the date of purchase; or (ii) the purchase price *minus* $28.67, the average closing price for Kornit ordinary shares during the 90-day period. *Id*. ¶¶ 84.D, 85.H.

97. In addition, in recognition of the additional difficulties affecting claims on purchases of Kornit ordinary shares between February 17, 2021 and February 14, 2022, which would have related to both liability and loss causation, adjusted Recognized Loss Amounts have been applied to purchases in this portion of the Class Period. *See* Notice ¶¶ 82, 84. Specifically, Claimants who purchased or acquired Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021 through February 14, 2022 and held those shares until the end of the Class Period will have a maximum Recognized Loss Amount of $1.24 per share (equal to 15% of the $8.28 decline in alleged artificial inflation removed on July 6, 2022), and Claimants who purchased or acquired Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021 through February 14,

2022 and sold those shares from May 11, 2022 through July 5, 2022 (holding over only the first alleged corrective disclosure) will have a maximum Recognized Loss Amount of 20% of that amount, or $0.25 per share. *See* Notice ¶ 82 n.5.

98. The sum of a Claimant's Recognized Loss Amounts for all of his, her, or its purchases of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period is the Claimant's "Recognized Claim." Notice ¶ 86. The Plan of Allocation also limits Claimants' Recognized Claim based on whether they had an overall market loss in their transactions in Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period. A Claimant's Recognized Claim will be limited to the amount of his, her, or its market loss in Kornit ordinary shares transactions during the Class Period, and Claimants who have an overall market gain are not eligible for a recovery. *Id*. ¶¶ 93-94.

99. The Net Settlement Fund will be allocated to Authorized Claimants on a *pro rata* basis based on the relative size of their Recognized Claims. Notice ¶ 95. If an Authorized Claimant's *pro rata* distribution amount calculates to less than ten dollars, no payment will be made to that Authorized Claimant. *Id*. ¶ 96. Those funds will be included in the distribution to the Authorized Claimants whose payments exceed the ten-dollar minimum.

100. One hundred percent of the Net Settlement Fund will be distributed to Authorized Claimants. If any funds remain after the initial *pro rata* distribution, as a result of uncashed or returned checks or other reasons, subsequent cost-effective

distributions to Authorized Claimants will be conducted. Notice ¶ 97. Only when the residual amount left for re-distribution to Settlement Class Members is so small that a further re-distribution would not be cost effective (for example, where the administrative costs of conducting the additional distribution would largely subsume the funds available), will those funds be donated to one or more non-sectarian, not-for-profit, 501(c)(3) organizations to be selected by Lead Counsel and approved by the Court.

101. The Plan of Allocation was designed to fairly and rationally allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund among Settlement Class Members based on damages they suffered on purchases of Kornit ordinary shares that were attributable to the misconduct alleged in the Action. To date, no objections to the proposed Plan of Allocation have been received.

V. THE FEE AND EXPENSE APPLICATION

102. In addition to seeking final approval of the Settlement and Plan of Allocation, Lead Counsel is applying to the Court, on behalf of all Plaintiffs' Counsel, for an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of 22% of the Settlement Fund (the "Fee Application"). Lead Counsel also requests payment for litigation expenses incurred by Plaintiffs' Counsel in connection with the prosecution and settlement of the Action in the amount of $136,695.22. Lead Counsel further requests reimbursement to Lead Plaintiffs in the aggregate amount of $22,500 for

costs that Lead Plaintiffs incurred directly related to their representation of the Settlement Class, as permitted by the PSLRA, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(4). The requested attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and PSLRA awards are to be paid from the Settlement Fund. The legal authorities supporting the requested fee and expenses are discussed in Lead Counsel's Fee Memorandum. The primary factual bases for the requested fee and expenses are summarized below.

A. The Fee Application

103. For the efforts of Plaintiffs' Counsel on behalf of the Settlement Class, Lead Counsel is applying for a fee award to be paid from the Settlement Fund on a percentage basis. As discussed in the accompanying Fee Motion, the percentage method is the standard and appropriate method of fee recovery because it aligns the lawyers' interest in being paid a fair fee with the interests of the Settlement Class in achieving the maximum recovery in the shortest amount of time required under the circumstances. Use of the percentage method has been recognized as appropriate by the Supreme Court and Third Circuit in comparable cases where an all-cash common fund has been recovered for a class.

104. Based on the quality of the result achieved, the extent and quality of the work performed by Lead Counsel and Liaison Counsel, the significant risks of the litigation, and the fully contingent nature of the representation, Lead Counsel respectfully submits that the requested fee award is reasonable and should be

approved. As discussed in the Fee Memorandum, a 22% fee award is fair and reasonable for attorneys' fees in common fund cases such as this and is well within the range of percentages awarded in securities class actions in this District and Circuit with comparable settlements.

1. Lead Plaintiffs Have Authorized and Support the Fee Application

105. The Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs are sophisticated institutional investors that closely supervised and monitored the prosecution and settlement of this Action. *See* Kramer Decl. (Ex. 1), at ¶ 4; Calic Decl. (Ex. 2), at ¶ 4; Kahalani Decl. (Ex. 3), at ¶ 4. Each of Lead Plaintiffs has evaluated the Fee Application and fully supports the fee requested. Lead Plaintiffs believe that the proposed fee of 22% is fair and reasonable in light of the result obtained for the Settlement Class, the amount and quality of the work performed by counsel, and the significant litigation risk counsel faced. *See* Kramer Decl. ¶ 6; Calic Decl. ¶ 6; Kahalani Decl. ¶ 6.

2. The Favorable Settlement Achieved

106. Courts consider the quality of plaintiff's counsel's performance and the result achieved in making a fee award. *See* Fee Memorandum at 15-18. As discussed above, the $19.5 million settlement is a favorable outcome for the Settlement Class when considered in view of the substantial risks and obstacles to obtaining a larger recovery (or, any recovery) were the Action to continue towards trial. *See supra*

¶¶ 62-83. Here, the Settlement avoids substantial risks to recovery in the absence of settlement and, as a result, numerous Settlement Class Members will benefit and receive compensation for their losses.

3. The Time and Labor Devoted to the Action by Plaintiffs' Counsel

107. Over the course of more than three years, Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted substantial time to the investigation, prosecution, and resolution of the Action. As more fully described above, Plaintiffs' Counsel's efforts included: (1) conducting an extensive investigation into the claims asserted, which included a detailed review of public documents, interviews with dozens of former Kornit employees, and consultation with experts; (2) drafting the detailed Consolidated Complaint and Amended Complaint; (3) researching, briefing, and arguing Lead Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' two rounds of motions to dismiss; (4) researching and fully briefing Lead Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings; (5) initiating discovery, including drafting a protective order, ESI protocol, Joint Discovery Plan, initial disclosures, requests for production of documents, and interrogatories; and responding to Defendants' requests for production of documents and interrogatories; and (6) engaging in extensive arm's-length settlement negotiations to achieve the Settlement, including pre-mediation discovery, detailed mediation briefing, and a formal mediation session.

108. The time and labor expended by Plaintiffs' Counsel in pursuing this Action and achieving the Settlement also support the reasonableness of the requested fee. Attached in support of the motion for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses as Exhibits 5A and 5B are (a) my declaration on behalf of BLB&G and (b) the declaration of James E. Cecchi on behalf of Liaison Counsel Carella Byrne (collectively, the "Fee and Expense Declarations"). The first page of Exhibit 5 contains a summary chart of the hours expended and lodestar amounts for each firm, as well as a summary of each firm's litigation expenses.

109. Included within the Fee and Expense Declarations are schedules that summarize the time expended by the attorneys and professional support staff employees at each firm, as well as the firm's expenses ("Fee and Expense Schedules"). The Fee and Expense Schedules report the amount of time spent by each attorney and professional support staff employee who worked on the Action through July 2, 2026 (the date the Stipulation was executed) and their resulting "lodestar," *i.e.*, their hours multiplied by their current hourly rates.

110. The hourly rates of Lead Counsel here range from $1,100 per hour to $1,700 per hour for partners and senior counsel, $425 per hour to $875 per hour for associates, $325 per hour to $475 per hour for paralegals and case managers, and $400 per hour to $650 per hour for in-house investigators. *See* Ex. 5A-1.

111. In total, from the inception of this Action through July 2, 2026, Lead Counsel and Liaison Counsel expended a total of 4,236.65 hours on the investigation, prosecution, and resolution of the claims asserted in the Action for a total lodestar of $3,782,065. The requested fee of 22% of the Settlement Fund represents $4,290,000 (plus interest accrued at the same rate as the Settlement Fund), and therefore represents a multiplier of only 1.1 of Plaintiffs' Counsel's lodestar. As discussed in further detail in the Fee Motion, the requested multiplier cross-check is at the bottom end of the range of multipliers typically seen in comparable securities class actions and in other class actions involving significant contingency fee risk, in this Circuit and elsewhere.

4. The Skill and Experience of Plaintiffs' Counsel

112. The skill and expertise of Plaintiffs' Counsel also support the requested fee. As demonstrated by its resume, attached as Exhibit 5A-3, BLB&G is among the most experienced and skilled law firms in the securities litigation field, with a long and successful track record representing investors in such cases, and it is consistently ranked among the top plaintiffs' firms in the country. For example, BLB&G served as Lead Counsel in *In re WorldCom, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 1:02-cv-03288 (S.D.N.Y.), in which settlements were obtained for the class totaling in excess of $6 billion. BLB&G also secured a resolution of $2.43 billion for the class in *In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation,*

No. 1:09-md-02058 (S.D.N.Y.); a $1.06 billion recovery for the class in *In re Merck & Co., Inc. Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation*, No. 2:05-cv-01151 (D.N.J.); and a $1 billion recovery for the class in *In re Wells Fargo & Co. Securities Litigation*, No. 1:20-cv-04494-GHW-SN (S.D.N.Y.).

113. Liaison Counsel Carella Byrne is also highly skilled and extremely knowledgeable counsel with a wealth of experience in this District. Lead Counsel believes that the firms' extensive experience in the field and the ability of their attorneys added valuable leverage during the settlement negotiations. Indeed, we believe that the favorable result achieved for the Settlement Class here reflects the superior quality of Plaintiffs' Counsel's representation.

5. Standing and Caliber of Defendants' Counsel

114. The quality of the work performed by Lead Counsel in attaining the Settlement should also be evaluated in light of the quality of the opposition. Defendants were represented in the Action by a team of extremely able counsel from Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, who vigorously litigated the Action. In the face of this skillful and well-financed opposition, Lead Counsel was nonetheless able to develop a case that was sufficiently strong to persuade Defendants and their counsel to settle the case on terms that are highly favorable to the Settlement Class.

6. The Risks of Litigation and the Need to Ensure the Availability of Competent Counsel in High-Risk Contingent Cases

115. The prosecution of these claims was undertaken entirely on a contingent-fee basis, and the considerable risks assumed by Lead Counsel in bringing this Action to a successful conclusion are described above. The risks assumed by Lead Counsel here, and the time and expenses incurred by Lead Counsel without any payment, were extensive.

116. From the outset, Lead Counsel understood that it was embarking on a complex, expensive, lengthy, and hard-fought litigation with no guarantee of ever being compensated for the substantial investment of time and the outlay of money that the prosecution of the case would require. In undertaking that responsibility, Lead Counsel was obligated to ensure that sufficient resources (in terms of attorney and support staff time) were dedicated to the litigation, and that Lead Counsel would further advance all of the costs necessary to pursue the case vigorously on a fully contingent basis, including funds to compensate vendors and consultants and to cover the considerable out-of-pocket costs that a case such as this typically demands. Because complex shareholder litigation often proceeds for several years before reaching a conclusion, the financial burden on contingent-fee counsel is far greater than on a firm that is paid on an ongoing basis. Indeed, Lead Counsel has

received no compensation during the course of this Action and no reimbursement of any out-of-pocket expenses.

117. Lead Counsel also bore the risk that no recovery would be achieved in the Action. As discussed above, this case presented a number of significant trial risks and uncertainties from the outset, including challenges in proving the materiality and falsity of Defendants' statements, establishing scienter, and establishing loss causation and damages. These risks were elevated in this case. Defendants vigorously denied making any false statements and denied that the price declines at issue were caused by revelation of the truth related to the challenged statements. Moreover, Kornit never restated any of its financial statements and there was no parallel SEC enforcement action or any criminal prosecution here concerning the claims asserted.

118. The Settlement was reached only after Lead Counsel had conducted a substantial investigation, overcame two rounds of Defendants' motions to dismiss, opposed Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings, conducted pre-mediation discovery, and engaged in arm's-length settlement negotiations. Lead Counsel's persistent efforts in the face of significant risks and uncertainties have resulted in a significant and certain recovery for the Settlement Class.

7. The Reaction of the Settlement Class to the Fee Application

119. As noted above, as of October 13, 2026, over 101,793 Postcard Notices and 4,075 Notice Packets had been sent to potential Settlement Class Members and Nominees advising them that Lead Counsel would apply for attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 22% of the Settlement Fund. *See* Segura Decl. ¶ 11 and Ex. A (Postcard Notice at 1), Ex. B (Notice ¶¶ 5, 58). In addition, the Court-approved Summary Notice was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and transmitted over the *PR Newswire* on August 26, 2026. *See* Segura Decl. ¶ 12. To date, no objections to the request for attorneys' fees have been received.

B. The Expense Application

120. Lead Counsel also seeks payment from the Settlement Fund of $136,695.22 in litigation expenses that Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably incurred in connection with commencing, litigating and settling the claims asserted in the Action.

121. From the outset of the Action, Plaintiffs' Counsel have been aware that they might not recover any of the expenses they incurred if the litigation was unsuccessful, and, further, if there were to be reimbursement of expenses, it would not occur until the Action was successfully resolved, often a period lasting several years. Plaintiffs' Counsel also understood that, even assuming that the case was ultimately successful, reimbursement of expenses would not necessarily

compensate them for the lost use of funds advanced by them to prosecute the Action. Consequently, Plaintiffs' Counsel were motivated to, and did, take significant steps to minimize expenses whenever practicable without jeopardizing the vigorous and efficient prosecution of the case.

122. As set forth in the Fee and Expense Declarations included in Exhibit 5, Plaintiffs' Counsel have incurred a total of $136,695.22 in litigation expenses in connection with the prosecution of the Action. The expenses are summarized in Exhibit 6, which identifies each category of expense, *e.g.*, expert costs, mediation fees, on-line legal and factual research, telephone, and court fees, and the amount incurred for each category. These expenses are reflected on the books and records maintained by Plaintiffs' Counsel, which are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred. These expense items are billed separately by Plaintiffs' Counsel, and such charges are not duplicated in Plaintiffs' Counsel's hourly rates.

123. Of the total amount of expenses, $41,665.85, or approximately 30%, was expended for the retention of experts. As noted above, Lead Counsel consulted with financial economics experts concerning loss causation and damages issues during its investigation and the preparation of the Amended Complaint and Complaint, during the course of discovery, in preparation for settlement negotiations, and in connection with preparing the Plan of Allocation. These

experts' advice was instrumental in Lead Counsel's appraisal of the claims and in helping achieve the favorable result in the Action.

124. Plaintiffs' Counsel also incurred a total of $16,644.23 for the costs of on-line factual research needed to investigate the potential claims and $38,744.01 for costs of on-line legal research to litigate the motions to dismiss and motion for judgment on the pleadings. Together, these on-line research costs accounted for approximately 41% of the total expenses.

125. Lead Plaintiffs' share of the mediation costs paid to JAMS for the services of Mr. Melnick totaled $25,638.13 or 19% of Lead Counsel's Litigation Expenses. As noted above, the Parties retained Mr. Melnick, an experienced mediator of securities class actions and other complex litigation, to assist with settlement negotiations in the Action, including a formal mediation session on April 7, 2026. The mediation expenses were divided evenly between Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants.

126. The other expenses for which Lead Counsel seeks payment are the types of expenses that are necessarily incurred in litigation and routinely charged to clients billed by the hour. These expenses include, among others, court fees, postage, telephone charges, and court reporting. All of the litigation expenses incurred by Lead Counsel were reasonable and necessary to the successful litigation

of the Action, and have been approved by Lead Plaintiffs. *See* Kramer Decl. ¶ 6; Calic Decl. ¶ 6; Kahalani Decl. ¶ 6.

127. In addition, Lead Plaintiffs seek reimbursement of a total of $22,500 for the reasonable costs and expenses that they incurred directly in connection with their representation of the Settlement Class, based on the time dedicated to the Action by their employees. Specifically, each Lead Plaintiff seeks $7,500 based on a conservative estimate of at least 30 hours that its employees dedicated to the Action. *See* Kramer Decl. ¶ 8; Calic Decl. ¶ 8; Kahalani Decl. ¶ 8. As discussed in the declarations submitted by each Lead Plaintiff, Lead Plaintiffs have been fully committed to pursuing the Settlement Class's claims since they became involved in the Action. Lead Plaintiffs' efforts included regular communications with Plaintiffs' Counsel concerning significant developments in the litigation and case strategy, reviewing and commenting on significant pleadings and briefs filed in the Action, and participating in the settlement negotiations. These are precisely the types of activities courts have found to support reimbursement of class representatives, and fully support Lead Plaintiffs' request for reimbursement here. Such payments are expressly authorized and anticipated by the PSLRA, as more fully discussed in the Fee Memorandum at 27-30.

128. The notices informed the Settlement Class that Lead Counsel would apply for Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $350,000, which amount

might include a request for reimbursement of the reasonable costs incurred by Lead Plaintiffs directly related to their representation of the Settlement Class. The total amount of Litigation Expenses requested, $159,195.22, including $136,695.22 in Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses and $22,500.00 requested by Lead Plaintiffs, is well below the expense amount set forth in the notices. To date, there have been no objections to the maximum amount of Litigation Expenses set forth in the notices.

129. Attached as Exhibit 7 is a compendium of true and correct copies of the unpublished opinions and authority cited in the Fee and Expense Motion.

VI. CONCLUSION

130. For all the reasons set forth above, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel respectfully submit that the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation should be approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. Lead Counsel further submits that the requested fee in the amount of 22% of the Settlement Fund should be approved as fair and reasonable, and the request for Lead Counsel's Litigation Expenses in the amount of $136,695.22, and Lead Plaintiffs' costs in the amount of $22,500 should also be approved.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 14, 2026.

James A. Harrod

Exhibit 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF KARL KRAMER, CHAIRPERSON OF GENESEE COUNTY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM, IN SUPPORT OF: (I) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (II) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

I, Karl Kramer, declare as follows:

1. I am the Chairperson of the Genesee County Employees' Retirement System ("Genesee County"), one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in this securities class action (the "Action"). I submit this Declaration in support of (i) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (ii) Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, including an award to Genesee County pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the "PSLRA") to reimburse Genesee County for the time that Genesee County trustees and employees

dedicated to the Action.[1] I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration and, if called upon, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. Genesee County is a multi-employer defined benefit plan that provides retirement and survivor benefits for employees of Genesee County, Michigan. As of December 31, 2025, Genesee County managed over $535 million in assets for its beneficiaries. Genesee County purchased Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period and suffered damages as a result of the violations of the federal securities laws alleged in the Action.

I. Genesee County's Oversight of the Action

3. I am aware of and understand the requirements and responsibilities of a lead plaintiff in a securities class action, including those set forth in the PSLRA.

4. On behalf of Genesee County, the trustees and employees of Genesee County had regular communications with Genesee County's counsel, VMT Law, P.C. ("VMT Law") and communications with Lead Counsel Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP. Genesee County, through our active and continuous involvement, closely supervised, carefully monitored, and was actively involved in all material aspects of the prosecution and resolution of the Action. We received

[1] Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms have the meanings set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 previously filed with the Court. *See* Dkt No. 99-2.

regular status reports from VMT Law and Lead Counsel on case developments and participated in regular discussions with counsel concerning the prosecution of the Action, the strengths of and risks to the claims, and potential settlement. In particular, throughout the course of this Action, I and my colleagues: (i) regularly communicated with VMT Law and Lead Counsel by email and telephone calls regarding the posture and progress of the case; (ii) reviewed and commented on all significant pleadings and briefs filed in the Action; (iii) responded to discovery requests; (iv) consulted with counsel concerning the settlement negotiations, including those that occurred at, and following, the mediation session that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and (v) evaluated and approved the proposed Settlement for $19,500,000.

II. Genesee County Endorses Approval of the Settlement

5. Based on its involvement throughout the prosecution of the Action, Genesee County believes that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and in the best interest of the Settlement Class. Genesee County believes that the proposed Settlement represents a favorable recovery for the Settlement Class, particularly given the risks in continued litigation, and it endorses approval of the Settlement by the Court.

III. Genesee County Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for of Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

6. Genesee County also believes that Lead Counsel's request for attorneys' fees in the amount of 22% of the Settlement Fund is fair and reasonable. Genesee County has evaluated Lead Counsel's fee request in light of the work performed, the risks of the litigation, the fees awarded in similar securities class action litigation, the result achieved, the skill required and the quality of work performed, and other relevant factors. Genesee County understands that Lead Counsel will also devote additional time in the future to administering the Settlement. Genesee County further believes that the Litigation Expenses requested by counsel are reasonable and represent the costs and expenses that were necessary for the successful prosecution and resolution of this case. Based on the foregoing, Genesee County fully supports Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses.

7. In connection with Lead Counsel's request for Litigation Expenses, Genesee County seeks reimbursement for the time that its trustees and employees dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class, which was time that ordinarily would have been dedicated to the work of Genesee County.

8. As discussed above, the trustees and employees of Genesee County diligently oversaw the prosecution of the Action, including communicating with counsel, reviewing pleadings and participating in the settlement process. Based

upon a review of the work we participated in throughout the case to supervise and contribute to the litigation, we conservatively estimate that we have spent in excess of 30 hours on the litigation. We request payment at a rate of $250 per hour for the time these professionals dedicated to the Action, which rate is similar to rates that have been accepted for awards to Lead Plaintiffs under the PSLRA. Accordingly, Genesee County seeks a total of $7,500 for the time our trustees and employees dedicated to representing the Settlement Class throughout the litigation.

IV. Conclusion

9. In conclusion, Genesee County was closely involved throughout the prosecution and settlement of the claims in the Action and strongly endorses the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes it represents a favorable recovery for the Settlement Class. Genesee County further supports Lead Counsel's attorneys' fee and expense request, in light of the work performed, the recovery obtained for the Settlement Class, and the attendant litigation risks.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I have authority to execute this declaration on behalf of Genesee County.

Executed this 9th day of October, 2026.

Karl Kramer

Board Chairperson, Genesee County Employees' Retirement System

Exhibit 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF DONNIE CALIC ON BEHALF OF KRANOT HISHTALMUT LE MORIM TICHONIIM HAVERA MENAHELET LTD AND KRANOT HISHTALMUT LE MORIM VE GANANOT HAVERA MENAHELET LTD., IN SUPPORT OF: (I) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (II) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

I, Donnie Calic, declare as follows:

1. I am the Chief Financial Officer of Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD and Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD (together, the "Teachers Funds"), two of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in this securities class action (the "Action"). I submit this Declaration support of (i) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (ii) Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, including an award to the Teachers Funds pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the "PSLRA") to reimburse the Teachers Funds for the time that I and other

employees of the Teachers Funds dedicated to the Action.[1] I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration and, if called upon, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. The Teachers Funds are investment funds based in Israel that are operated for the benefit of Israeli teachers. The Teachers Funds purchased Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period and suffered damages as a result of the violations of the federal securities laws alleged in the Action.

I. The Teachers Fund's Oversight of the Action

3. I am aware of and understand the requirements and responsibilities of a lead plaintiff in a securities class action, including those set forth in the PSLRA.

4. I and other employees of the Teachers Funds had regular communications with Lead Counsel Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP. The Teachers Funds, through our active and continuous involvement, closely supervised, carefully monitored, and were actively involved in all material aspects of the prosecution and resolution of the Action. We received regular status reports from Lead Counsel on case developments and participated in regular discussions with Lead Counsel concerning the prosecution of the Action, the strengths of and

[1] Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms have the meanings set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 previously filed with the Court. *See* Dkt No. 99-2.

risks to the claims, and potential settlement. In particular, throughout the course of this Action, I and my colleagues: (i) regularly communicated with Lead Counsel by email and telephone calls regarding the posture and progress of the case; (ii) reviewed and commented on all significant pleadings and briefs filed in the Action; (iii) consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations, including those that occurred at, and following, the mediation session that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and (iv) evaluated and approved the proposed Settlement for $19,500,000.

II. The Teachers Funds Endorse Approval of the Settlement

5. Based on their involvement throughout the prosecution of the Action, the Teachers Funds believe that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and in the best interest of the Settlement Class. The Teachers Funds believe that the proposed Settlement represents a favorable recovery for the Settlement Class, particularly given the risks in continued litigation, and it endorses approval of the Settlement by the Court.

III. The Teachers Funds Support Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

6. The Teacher Funds also believe that Lead Counsel's request for attorneys' fees in the amount of 22% of the Settlement Fund is fair and reasonable. The Teacher Funds have evaluated Lead Counsel's fee request in light of the work performed, the risks of the litigation, the fees awarded in similar securities class

action litigation, the result achieved, the skill required and the quality of work performed, and other relevant factors. The Teacher Funds understand that Lead Counsel will also devote additional time in the future to administering the Settlement. The Teacher Funds further believe that the Litigation Expenses requested by counsel are reasonable and represent the costs and expenses that were necessary for the successful prosecution and resolution of this case. Based on the foregoing, the Teacher Funds fully support Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses.

7. In connection with Lead Counsel's request for Litigation Expenses, the Teacher Funds seek reimbursement for the time that their employees dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class, which was time that ordinarily would have been dedicated to the work of the Teacher Funds.

8. As discussed above, my colleagues and I diligently oversaw the prosecution of the Action, including communicating with counsel and reviewing pleadings. Based upon a review of the work I and my colleagues did to supervise and contribute to the litigation, we conservatively estimate that we have spent in excess of 30 hours on the litigation. We request reimbursement at a rate of $250 per hour for the time the professionals of the Teacher Funds dedicated to the Action, which rate is based on typical rates for professionals of similar experience

in Israel. Accordingly, the Teacher Funds seek a total of $7,500 for the time our employees dedicated to representing the Settlement Class throughout the litigation.

IV. Conclusion

9. In conclusion, the Teacher Funds were closely involved throughout the prosecution and settlement of the claims in the Action and strongly endorse the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believe it represents a favorable recovery for the Settlement Class. The Teacher Funds further support Lead Counsel's attorneys' fee and expense request, in light of the work performed, the recovery obtained for the Settlement Class, and the attendant litigation risks.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I have authority to execute this declaration on behalf of the Teacher Funds.

Executed this 11th day of October, 2026.

DONNIE CALIC

Chief Financial Officer of Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD and Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD

Exhibit 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF SAGI KAHALANI ON BEHALF OF HACHSHARA INSURANCE COMPANY LTD., IN SUPPORT OF: (I) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (II) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

I, Sagi Kahalani, declare as follows:

1. I am the Deputy General Manager, General Counsel and Company Secretary of Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. ("Hachshara"), one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in this securities class action (the "Action"). I submit this Declaration support of (i) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (ii) Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, including an award to Hachshara pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the "PSLRA") to reimburse Hachshara for the time that I and other Hachshara

employees dedicated to the Action.[1] I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration and, if called upon, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. Hachshara is an insurance company based in Israel. Hachshara purchased Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period and suffered damages as a result of the violations of the federal securities laws alleged in the Action.

I. Hachshara's Oversight of the Action

3. I am aware of and understand the requirements and responsibilities of a lead plaintiff in a securities class action, including those set forth in the PSLRA.

4. On behalf of Hachshara, I and other Hachshara employees had regular communications with Lead Counsel Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP. Hachshara, through our active and continuous involvement, closely supervised, carefully monitored, and was actively involved in all material aspects of the prosecution and resolution of the Action. We received regular status reports from Lead Counsel on case developments and participated in regular discussions with Lead Counsel concerning the prosecution of the Action, the strengths of and risks to the claims, and potential settlement. In particular, throughout the course of this

[1] Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms have the meanings set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 previously filed with the Court. *See* Dkt No. 99-2.

Action, I and my colleagues: (i) regularly communicated with Lead Counsel by email and telephone calls regarding the posture and progress of the case; (ii) reviewed and commented on all significant pleadings and briefs filed in the Action; (iii) consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations, including those that occurred at, and following, the mediation session that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and (iv) evaluated and approved the proposed Settlement for $19,500,000.

II. Hachshara Endorses Approval of the Settlement

5. Based on its involvement throughout the prosecution of the Action, Hachshara believes that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and in the best interest of the Settlement Class. Hachshara believes that the proposed Settlement represents a favorable recovery for the Settlement Class, particularly given the risks in continued litigation, and it endorses approval of the Settlement by the Court.

III. Hachshara Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for of Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

6. Hachshara also believes that Lead Counsel's request for attorneys' fees in the amount of 22% of the Settlement Fund is fair and reasonable. Hachshara has evaluated Lead Counsel's fee request in light of the work performed, the risks of the litigation, the fees awarded in similar securities class action litigation, the result achieved, the skill required and the quality of work performed, and other

relevant factors. Hachshara understands that Lead Counsel will also devote additional time in the future to administering the Settlement. Hachshara further believes that the Litigation Expenses requested by counsel are reasonable and represent the costs and expenses that were necessary for the successful prosecution and resolution of this case. Based on the foregoing, Hachshara fully supports Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses.

7. In connection with Lead Counsel's request for Litigation Expenses, Hachshara seeks reimbursement for the time that its employees dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class, which was time that ordinarily would have been dedicated to the work of Hachshara.

8. As discussed above, my colleagues and I diligently oversaw the prosecution of the Action, including communicating with counsel and reviewing pleadings. Based upon a review of the work I and my colleagues did to supervise and contribute to the litigation, we conservatively estimate that we have spent in excess of 30 hours on the litigation. We request reimbursement at a rate of $250 per hour for the time the professionals of Hachshara dedicated to the Action, which rate is based on typical rates for professionals of similar experience in Israel. Accordingly, Hachshara seeks a total of $7,500 for the time our employees dedicated to representing the Settlement Class throughout the litigation.

IV. Conclusion

9. In conclusion, Hachshara was closely involved throughout the prosecution and settlement of the claims in the Action and strongly endorses the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes it represents a favorable recovery for the Settlement Class. Hachshara further supports Lead Counsel's attorneys' fee and expense request, in light of the work performed, the recovery obtained for the Settlement Class, and the attendant litigation risks.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I have authority to execute this declaration on behalf of Hachshara.

Executed this 8 day of October, 2026.

SAGI KAHALANI

Deputy General Manager, General Counsel and Company Secretary of Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd.

Exhibit 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF LUIGGY SEGURA REGARDING:
(A) DISSEMINATION OF POSTCARD NOTICE AND NOTICE PACKET;
(B) PUBLICATION OF THE SUMMARY NOTICE; AND
(C) REPORT ON REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION RECEIVED TO DATE

I, Luiggy Segura, hereby declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am the Vice President of Securities Class Actions at JND Legal Administration ("JND"). Pursuant to the Court's Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Authorizing Dissemination of Notice of Settlement (Dkt. No. 101) ("Preliminary Approval Order"), Lead Counsel was authorized to retain JND as the Claims Administrator in connection with the proposed settlement of the above-captioned action ("Action").[1] I am over 21 years of age and am not a party to the Action. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and, if called as a witness, could and would testify competently thereto.

[1] All capitalized terms used in this declaration that are not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement, dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-2).

DISSEMINATION OF POSTCARD NOTICE AND NOTICE PACKET

2. Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, JND is responsible for disseminating notice of the Settlement. Specifically, JND mailed the Postcard Notice to potential Settlement Class Members and mailed the Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses ("Notice") and Proof of Claim and Release Form ("Claim Form" and, together with the Notice, the "Notice Packet") to nominees as well as potential Settlement Class Members upon request. Copies of the Postcard Notice and Notice Packet are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

3. As in most securities class actions, the vast majority of potential Settlement Class Members are beneficial purchasers whose securities are held in "street name," *i.e.*, the securities are purchased by brokerage firms, banks, institutions, or other third-party nominees ("Nominees") in the name of the Nominee, on behalf of the beneficial purchasers. JND maintains a proprietary database with the names and addresses of the most common Nominees ("Nominees Database").[2] At the time of the initial mailing, JND's Nominee Database contained 4,075 mailing records. On August 12, 2026, JND caused the Notice Packet to be

[2] JND's Nominee Database is updated from time to time as new Nominees are identified, and others merge or cease to exist.

mailed via First-Class mail, postage prepaid, to the 4,075 mailing records contained in JND's Nominees Database.

4. The Notice directed all those who purchased or otherwise acquired ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit") from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive, for the benefit of persons or entities other than themselves to, within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the Notice, either: (a) request from JND sufficient copies of the Postcard Notice to forward to all such beneficial owners and within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of those Postcard Notices forward them to all such beneficial owners; or (b) provide a list of the names, addresses, and email addresses, if available, of all such beneficial owners to JND.

5. JND also researched filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on Forms 13-F to identify additional entities that may have purchased ordinary shares of Kornit during the Settlement Class Period. As a result of these efforts, JND located 564 mailing records for potential Settlement Class Members. On August 12, 2026, JND caused the Postcard Notice to be mailed by First-Class mail, postage prepaid, to these 564 entities.[3]

---

3 In addition, on July 28, 2026, JND received two data files that had been sent by Defendants' Counsel containing lists of the names of purchasers of record of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period. However, due to lack of mailing address information provided in those data files, JND was unable to mail the Postcard Notice to the investors contained in the files provided by Defendants' Counsel. At JND's request, Lead Counsel asked Defendants' Counsel if Kornit had any additional information that they could provide. Defendants' Counsel informed Lead Counsel

6. JND also provided a copy of the Notice to the Depository Trust Company ("DTC") for posting on its Legal Notice System ("LENS"). The LENS may be accessed by any Nominee that is a participant in DTC's security system. The Notice was posted on the DTC's LENS on August 11, 2026.

9. In total, 564 Postcard Notices and 4,075 Notice Packets, were sent to potential Settlement Class Members and Nominees on August 12, 2026, in connection with the above-described initial mailing process ("Initial Mailing").

10. Since the Initial Mailing, JND has received an additional 9,196 unique names and addresses of potential Settlement Class Members from individuals or Nominees requesting that the Postcard Notice be mailed to such potential Settlement Class Members. JND has also received requests from Nominees for 92,033 Postcard Notices, in bulk, for forwarding directly to their customers. JND will continue to disseminate Postcard Notices and Notice Packets in a timely manner in response to any further requests.

11. As a result of the efforts described above, as of October 13, 2026, JND has mailed an aggregate of 101,793 Postcard Notices and 4,075 Notice Packets to potential Settlement Class Members and Nominees. In addition, JND has promptly

---

that the files provided were the only records they had. JND believes that, given the publication of the Summary Notice, the creation of the Settlement Website, the results of the research discussed herein, and the process for mailing of notice by nominees, that any such record owners have been afforded the best notice practicable.

re-mailed 258 Postcard Notices to persons whose original mailings were returned by the U.S. Postal Service ("USPS") as undeliverable and for whom updated addresses were provided to JND by the USPS.

PUBLICATION OF THE SUMMARY NOTICE

12. Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, JND caused the Summary Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses ("Summary Notice") to be published in *The Wall Street Journal* and transmitted over *PR Newswire* on August 26, 2026. Copies of proof of publication of the Summary Notice in *The Wall Street Journal* and over *PR Newswire* are attached hereto as Exhibit C.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CALL CENTER SERVICES

13. In connection with the Initial Mailing, JND established, and since then has continued to maintain, a case-specific, toll-free telephone helpline, 1-855-961-0955, with an interactive voice response system and live operators, to accommodate questions about the Action and the Settlement. The telephone helpline is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The automated attendant answers calls to the helpline and presents callers with a series of choices to respond to basic questions. Callers requiring further assistance have the option to be transferred to a live operator during business hours. The toll-free telephone number is set forth in the Postcard Notice,

Notice, Summary Notice, Claim Form, and on the Settlement Website. The toll-free telephone helpline became operational on August 12, 2026.

14. JND will continue to maintain the telephone helpline and will update the interactive voice response system as necessary throughout the administration of the Settlement.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT WEBSITE

15. In connection with the Initial Mailing and in order to further assist potential Settlement Class Members, JND established, and since then has continued to maintain, a dedicated website for the Settlement, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com ("Settlement Website"). The address for the Settlement Website was set forth in the Postcard Notice, Notice, Summary Notice, and Claim Form. The Settlement Website became operational on August 12, 2026, and is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The Settlement Website lists the exclusion, objection, and Claim submission deadlines, as well as the date and time of the Court's final Settlement Hearing. The Settlement Website also contains links to copies of the Notice and Claim Form, as well as copies of the Stipulation, Preliminary Approval Order, and Complaint. In addition, the Settlement Website provides Settlement Class Members with the ability to submit their Claim Form online and includes detailed instructions for institutions submitting their Claims electronically.

16. JND will continue operating, maintaining, and, as appropriate, updating the Settlement Website until the conclusion of the administration.

REPORT ON REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION RECEIVED TO DATE

17. The notices and Settlement Website inform potential Settlement Class Members that requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class must be sent to the Claims Administrator, such that they are received no later than October 28, 2026. The Notice also sets forth the information that must be included in each request for exclusion. As of October 13, 2026, JND has received no requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class. JND will submit a supplemental declaration after the October 28, 2026 exclusion deadline, which will include a full report on all exclusion requests received.

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

Executed on October 14, 2026.

Luiggy Segura

Luiggy Segura

EXHIBIT A

Important Legal Notice Authorized by the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

The parties in the action *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,* Case No. 2:23-cv-888-MCA-AME (D.N.J.) have reached a proposed settlement of $19,500,000.

If you are a Settlement Class Member, your legal rights may be affected by a proposed settlement of this securities class action, and you may be eligible for a cash payment. Please read this Postcard Notice carefully.

For more information, please visit www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com or call toll free 1-855-961-0955.

Kornit Securities Litigation
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box 91050
Seattle, WA 98111

Postal Service: Please do not mark or cover barcode

THIS POSTCARD PROVIDES ONLY LIMITED INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.
Please visit www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com or call 1-855-961-0955 for more information.

The parties in the securities class action *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 2:23-cv-888-MCA-AME (D.N.J.) (the "Action") have reached a proposed Settlement. If approved by the Court, the Settlement will resolve the Action in its entirety. In the Action, the Complaint alleges that Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit") and certain of its officers (together, "Defendants") made materially misleading statements about Kornit's business from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period"). Defendants deny any liability or wrongdoing. You received this notice because you may be a member of the following Settlement Class**: all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired ordinary shares of Kornit (i) during the Class Period and/or (ii) pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021**.

Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendants have agreed to pay $19,500,000.00 in cash, which, after deducting Court-awarded fees and expenses, notice and administration costs, and taxes, will **be allocated among Settlement Class Members who submit valid claims**, in exchange for the Settlement and the release of all claims asserted in the Action and related claims. For additional information regarding the Settlement, please review the full Notice available at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. If you are a Settlement Class Member, your *pro rata* share of the Settlement will depend on the number of valid claims submitted, and the number, size, and timing of your transactions in Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period. If all Settlement Class Members elect to participate in the Settlement, the estimated average recovery will be $0.53 per eligible Kornit ordinary share before deducting any fees and expenses. Your actual share of the Settlement will be determined pursuant to the Plan of Allocation set forth in the full Notice, or other plan of allocation ordered by the Court.

To be eligible for a payment, you must submit a valid Claim Form. The Claim Form can be found and submitted at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or you can request that one be mailed to you. **Claims must be postmarked (if mailed), or submitted online, by December 10, 2026**. If you do not want to be legally bound by any releases, judgments, or orders in the Action, you must exclude yourself from the Settlement Class **by October 28, 2026**. If you exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you may be able to sue Defendants about the claims being resolved in the Action, but you cannot get money from the Settlement. If you want to object to any aspect of the Settlement, you must file an objection with the district court **by October 28, 2026**. The full Notice provides instructions on how to submit a Claim, how to exclude yourself, and how to object, and you must comply with all those instructions.

The Court will hold a hearing on **November 18, 2026 at 3:00 p.m**. **Eastern Time**, to consider, among other things, whether to approve the Settlement and a request by the lawyers representing the Settlement Class for attorneys' fees of up to 22% of the Settlement Fund and Litigation Expenses of no more than $350,000 (which together equal an estimated cost of $0.13 per eligible Kornit ordinary share). You may attend the hearing, but you do not have to. Please check www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com for any updates or changes to the hearing.

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

NOTICE OF (I) PENDENCY OF CLASS ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT; (II) SETTLEMENT HEARING; AND (III) MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

A Federal Court authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF CLASS ACTION: Please be advised that your rights may be affected by the above-captioned securities class action (the "Action") pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (the "Court"), if you purchased or otherwise acquired the ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit" or the "Company") (i) during the period from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period"); and/or (ii) pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021.[1]

NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT: Please also be advised that the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs Genesee County Employees' Retirement System, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD, and Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. ("Lead Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class (as defined in ¶ 25 below), have reached a proposed settlement of the Action for **$19,500,000** in cash that, if approved, will resolve all claims in the Action (the "Settlement").

PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. This Notice explains important rights you may have, including the possible receipt of cash from the Settlement. If you are a member of the Settlement Class, your legal rights will be affected whether or not you act.

If you have any questions about this Notice, the proposed Settlement, or your eligibility to participate in the Settlement, please DO NOT contact the Court, the Office of the Clerk of the Court, Kornit, any other Defendants in the Action, or their counsel. All questions should be directed to Lead Counsel or the Claims Administrator (*see* ¶ 76 below).

1. **Description of the Action and the Settlement Class:** This Notice relates to a proposed Settlement of claims in a pending securities class action brought by investors alleging that Kornit and certain of its executives during the relevant time period—Chief Executive Officer, Ronen Samuel, and Chief Financial Officer, Alon Rozner (together, the "Individual Defendants")—violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements during the Class Period concerning Kornit's business. A more detailed description of the Action is set forth in paragraphs 10-24 below. If the Court approves the proposed

[1] All capitalized terms used in this Notice that are not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (the "Stipulation"), which is available at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

Settlement, the Action will be dismissed and members of the Settlement Class (defined in paragraph 25 below) will settle and release all Released Plaintiffs' Claims (defined in paragraph 39 below).

2. **Statement of the Settlement Class's Recovery:** Subject to Court approval, Lead Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, have agreed to settle the Action in exchange for a settlement payment of $19,500,000 in cash (the "Settlement Amount") to be deposited into an escrow account. The Net Settlement Fund (*i.e.*, the Settlement Amount plus any and all interest earned thereon (the "Settlement Fund") less (a) any Taxes, (b) any Notice and Administration Costs, (c) any Litigation Expenses awarded by the Court, (d) any attorneys' fees awarded by the Court, and (e) any other costs or fees approved by the Court) will be distributed in accordance with a plan of allocation that is approved by the Court, which will determine how the Net Settlement Fund shall be allocated among members of the Settlement Class. The proposed plan of allocation (the "Plan of Allocation") is attached hereto as Appendix A.

3. **Estimate of Average Amount of Recovery Per Share:** Based on Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert's estimate of the number of Kornit ordinary shares purchased during the Class Period that may have been affected by the misstatements alleged in the Action and assuming that all Settlement Class Members elect to participate in the Settlement, the estimated average recovery (before the deduction of any Court-approved fees, expenses and costs as described herein) is $0.53 per eligible share. Settlement Class Members should note, however, that the foregoing average recovery per share is only an estimate. Some Settlement Class Members may recover more or less than this estimated amount depending on, among other factors, when and at what prices they purchased or sold their Kornit ordinary shares, and the total number and value of valid Claims submitted. Distributions to Settlement Class Members will be made based on the Plan of Allocation set forth in Appendix A or such other plan of allocation as may be ordered by the Court.

4. **Average Amount of Damages Per Share:** The Parties do not agree on the average amount of damages per share that would be recoverable if Lead Plaintiffs were to prevail in the Action. Among other things, Defendants expressly deny that Lead Plaintiffs have asserted any valid claims as to any of them, and expressly deny any and all allegations of fault, liability, wrongdoing, or damages whatsoever.

5. **Attorneys' Fees and Expenses Sought:** Plaintiffs' Counsel, which have been prosecuting the Action on a wholly contingent basis, have not received any payment of attorneys' fees for their representation of the Settlement Class and have advanced the funds to pay expenses necessarily incurred to prosecute this Action. Court-appointed Lead Counsel, Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP, will apply to the Court for an award of attorneys' fees for all Plaintiffs' Counsel in an amount not to exceed 22% of the Settlement Fund.[2] In addition, Lead Counsel will apply for payment of Litigation Expenses incurred in connection with the institution, prosecution, and resolution of the Action, in an amount not to exceed $350,000, which may include an application for reimbursement of the reasonable costs and expenses incurred by Lead Plaintiffs directly related to their representation of the Settlement Class, pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA"). Any fees and expenses awarded by the Court will be paid from the Settlement Fund. Settlement Class Members are not personally liable for any such fees or expenses. The estimated average cost per affected Kornit ordinary share, if the Court approves Lead Counsel's fee and expense application, is $0.13 per share.

6. **Identification of Attorneys' Representatives:** Lead Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class are represented by James A. Harrod of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP, 1251 Avenue of the Americas, 44th Floor, New York, NY 10020, (800) 380-8496, settlements@blbglaw.com.

[2] Plaintiffs' Counsel means Lead Counsel; Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.; and VMT Law P.C.

7. **Reasons for the Settlement:** Lead Plaintiffs' principal reason for entering into the Settlement is the substantial immediate cash benefit for the Settlement Class without the risk or the delays inherent in further litigation. Moreover, the substantial cash benefit provided under the Settlement must be considered against the significant risk that a smaller recovery—or indeed no recovery at all—might be achieved after further contested motions, a trial of the Action and the likely appeals that would follow a trial. This process could be expected to last several years. Defendants, who, as stated above, deny all allegations of wrongdoing or liability whatsoever, are entering into the Settlement solely to eliminate the uncertainty, burden, and expense of further protracted litigation.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THE SETTLEMENT:	
SUBMIT A CLAIM FORM *POSTMARKED OR SUBMITTED ONLINE* NO LATER THAN DECEMBER 10, 2026.	This is the only way to be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement Fund. If you are a Settlement Class Member and you remain in the Settlement Class, you will be bound by the Settlement as approved by the Court and you will give up any Released Plaintiffs' Claims (defined in ¶ 39 below) that you have against Defendants and the other Released Defendants' Parties (defined in ¶ 40 below), so it is in your interest to submit a Claim Form.
EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT CLASS BY SUBMITTING A WRITTEN REQUEST FOR EXCLUSION SO THAT IT IS *RECEIVED* NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 28, 2026.	If you exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you will not be eligible to receive any payment from the Settlement Fund. This is the only option that allows you ever to be part of any other lawsuit against any of the Defendants or the other Released Defendants' Parties concerning the Released Plaintiffs' Claims. Please note, if you decide to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you may be time barred from asserting the claims covered by the Action by a statute of limitations or statute of repose.
OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT BY SUBMITTING A WRITTEN OBJECTION SO THAT IT IS *RECEIVED* NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 28, 2026.	If you do not like the proposed Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, or the request for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, you may write to the Court and explain why you do not like them. You cannot object to the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, or the fee and expense request unless you are a Settlement Class Member and do not exclude yourself from the Settlement Class.
ATTEND A HEARING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2026 AT 3:00 P.M. EASTERN TIME, AND FILE A NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPEAR SO THAT IT IS *RECEIVED* NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 28, 2026.	Filing a written objection and notice of intention to appear by October 28, 2026 allows you to speak in Court, at the discretion of the Court, about the fairness of the proposed Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or the request for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. If you submit a written objection, you may (but you do not have to) attend the hearing and, at the discretion of the Court, speak to the Court about your objection.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THE SETTLEMENT:	
DO NOTHING.	If you are a member of the Settlement Class and you do not submit a valid Claim Form, you will not be eligible to receive any payment from the Settlement Fund. You will, however, remain a member of the Settlement Class, which means that you give up your right to sue about the claims that are resolved by the Settlement and you will be bound by any judgments or orders entered by the Court in the Action.

These rights and options—and the deadlines to exercise them—are further explained in this Notice. Please Note: the date and time of the Settlement Hearing—currently scheduled for November 18, 2026 at 3:00 p.m. Eastern time—is subject to change without further notice to the Settlement Class. If you plan to attend the hearing, you should check the Settlement website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or with Lead Counsel as set forth above to confirm that no change to the date and/or time of the hearing has been made.

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

Why Did I Get This Notice? ..... Page 4
What Is This Case About? ..... Page 5
How Do I Know If I Am Affected By The Settlement?
Who Is Included In The Settlement Class? ..... Page 6
What Are Lead Plaintiffs' Reasons For The Settlement? ..... Page 7
What Might Happen If There Were No Settlement? ..... Page 8
How Are Settlement Class Members Affected By The Action
And The Settlement? ..... Page 9
How Do I Participate In The Settlement? What Do I Need To Do? ..... Page 11
How Much Will My Payment Be? ..... Page 11
What Payment Are The Attorneys For The Settlement Class Seeking?
How Will The Lawyers Be Paid? ..... Page 12
What If I Do Not Want To Be A Member Of The Settlement Class?
How Do I Exclude Myself? ..... Page 13
When And Where Will The Court Decide Whether To Approve The Settlement?
Do I Have To Come To The Hearing? May I Speak At The Hearing If I
Don't Like The Settlement? ..... Page 13
What If I Bought Shares On Someone Else's Behalf? ..... Page 15
Can I See The Court File? Whom Should I Contact If I Have Questions? ..... Page 16
Appendix A: Plan of Allocation of the Net Settlement Fund ..... Page 18

WHY DID I GET THIS NOTICE?

8. The purpose of this Notice is to inform potential Settlement Class Members of the existence of this case, that it is a class action, how you (as a Settlement Class Member) might be affected, and how to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class if you wish to do so. This Notice is also intended to inform you of the terms of the proposed Settlement, and of a hearing to be held by the Court to consider the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, and the motion by Lead Counsel for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses (the "Settlement Hearing"). *See* ¶¶ 64-65 below for details about the Settlement Hearing, including the date and location of the hearing.

9. The issuance of this Notice is not an expression of any opinion by the Court concerning the merits of any claim in the Action, and the Court still has to decide whether to approve the Settlement. If the Court approves the Settlement and a plan of allocation, then payments to Authorized Claimants will be made after any appeals are resolved and after the completion of all claims processing. Please be patient, as this process can take some time to complete.

WHAT IS THIS CASE ABOUT?

10. Kornit is an Israel-based company that manufactures and sells commercial textile printers and the ink and supplies needed to use them. Kornit ordinary shares were listed on and have traded on the NASDAQ under the ticker symbol "KRNT" at all times relevant to this Action. This Action involves allegations that, during the Class Period (from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive), Kornit and the Individual Defendants made material misrepresentations and omissions related to Kornit's business and operations. Lead Plaintiffs allege that these alleged misrepresentations and omissions caused the price of Kornit ordinary shares to be inflated during the Class Period, and that the price declined when the truth was disclosed through disclosures on May 11, 2022 and July 5, 2022.

11. On February 15, 2023, an initial class action complaint was filed in the Court alleging violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act") and SEC Rule 10b-5.

12. On August 30, 2023, the Court appointed Lead Plaintiffs as Lead Plaintiffs, approved Lead Plaintiffs' selection of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP as Lead Counsel for the class, and captioned the action *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation.*

13. On October 27, 2023, Lead Plaintiffs filed the Consolidated Class Action Complaint. Among other things, the Consolidated Class Action Complaint alleged false and misleading statements related to Kornit's business and operations. The Consolidated Class Action Complaint asserted claims under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and SEC Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5, promulgated thereunder, against all Defendants; claims under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78t(a), against the Individual Defendants; and claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77k, 77l, and 77o, against the Company, the Former Underwriter Defendants, and the Individual Defendants.

14. On December 21, 2023, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the Consolidated Class Action Complaint. Following an oral argument, on August 15, 2024, the Court entered an Order granting without prejudice the motion to dismiss.

15. On November 8, 2024, Lead Plaintiffs filed the Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint (the "Complaint"). Among other things, the Complaint alleged false and misleading statements related to Kornit's business and operations. The Complaint asserted claims under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and SEC Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5, promulgated thereunder, against all Defendants; claims under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78t(a), against the Individual Defendants; and claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77k, 77l, and 77o, against the Company, the Former Underwriter Defendants, and the Individual Defendants.

16. On January 24, 2025, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the Complaint. Following oral argument, on September 4, 2025, the Court entered an Order granting in part and denying in part the motion to dismiss.

17. Following the denial of Defendants' motion to dismiss, the Parties submitted a proposed scheduling order to the Court and began discovery, including the exchange of requests for the production

of documents. On December 30, 2025, the Court entered the Parties' proposed schedule in a Pretrial Scheduling Order.

18. On December 4, 2025, Defendants filed an Answer to the Complaint and filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings, which was fully briefed and was still pending at the time the settlement was reached.

19. On March 6, 2026, the Parties filed a letter to the Court informing the Court of the Parties' agreement to conduct a private mediation before Jed D. Melnick of JAMS. On March 11, 2026, the Court granted the Parties' request to stay discovery pending the outcome of their private mediation.

20. The Parties engaged in pre-mediation document discovery, with Defendants making a production of documents directed at key liability issues in the case. Thereafter, the Parties exchanged mediation briefs and participated in an in-person mediation before Mr. Melnick on April 7, 2026. The case did not settle at that session but the parties continued to negotiate through Mr. Melnick.

21. On April 14, 2026, the Parties filed a letter to the Court, regarding a continued stay of discovery pending the outcome of ongoing settlement negotiations. On April 20, 2026, the Court granted the Parties' request.

22. Following the mediation session, Mr. Melnick made a recommendation that the Action be settled for $19.5 million, which the Parties accepted on April 28, 2026. The terms of the Parties' agreement to settle were memorialized in a Confidential Term Sheet executed on May 11, 2026.

23. On July 2, 2026, the Parties entered into a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement (the "Stipulation"), which sets forth the terms and conditions of the Settlement. The Stipulation can be viewed at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

24. On July 21, 2026, the Court preliminarily approved the Settlement, authorized that notice of the Settlement be disseminated to potential Settlement Class Members, and scheduled the Settlement Hearing to consider whether to grant final approval to the Settlement.

HOW DO I KNOW IF I AM AFFECTED BY THE SETTLEMENT? WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT CLASS?

25. If you are a member of the Settlement Class, you are subject to the Settlement, unless you timely request to be excluded. The Settlement Class consists of:

> all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired ordinary shares of Kornit (i) during the period from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period"); and/or (ii) pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) Defendants; (b) the Immediate Family Members of the Individual Defendants; (c) the Former Underwriter Defendants;[3] (d) the subsidiaries and affiliates of Kornit and the Former Underwriter Defendants; (e) any person who is an officer, director or controlling person of Kornit; (f) any entity in which any Defendant or Former Underwriter Defendant has a controlling interest; (g) Defendants' directors' and officers' liability insurance carriers, and any affiliates or subsidiaries thereof; (h) the Former Amazon Defendants;[4] and (i) the legal representatives, heirs,

[3] The "Former Underwriter Defendants" are Citigroup Global Markets Inc., Barclays Capital Inc., Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC, and Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC.

[4] The "Former Amazon Defendants" are Amazon.com NV Investment Holdings LLC and Amazon.com, Inc.

successors or assigns of any such excluded party. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any investment company or business entity, or pooled investment fund, including but not limited to, mutual fund families, exchange traded funds, fund of funds, and hedge funds, in which the Former Underwriter Defendants, or any of them, have, has or may have a direct or indirect interest, or as to which their respective affiliates may act as an investment advisor, but in which any Former Underwriter Defendant alone or together with its respective affiliates, is not a majority owner or does not hold a majority beneficial interest, shall not be excluded from the Settlement Class.

26. Also excluded from the Settlement Class are any persons or entities who or which exclude themselves by submitting a request for exclusion that is accepted by the Court in accordance with the requirements set forth in this Notice. *See* "What If I Do Not Want To Be A Member Of The Settlement Class? How Do I Exclude Myself?," on page 13 below.

Please Note: Receipt of this Notice or the mailed Postcard Notice does not mean that you are a Settlement Class Member or that you will be entitled to receive proceeds from the Settlement.

If you are a Settlement Class Member and you wish to be eligible to participate in the distribution of proceeds from the Settlement, you are required to submit a Claim Form and the required supporting documentation as set forth therein postmarked (or submitted online) no later than December 10, 2026.

WHAT ARE LEAD PLAINTIFFS' REASONS FOR THE SETTLEMENT?

27. Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel believe that the claims asserted against Defendants have merit. They recognize, however, the significant expense and length of the continued proceedings that would be necessary to pursue their claims against Defendants through the completion of discovery, certification of the class, summary judgment, trial, and appeals, as well as the substantial risks they would face in establishing liability and damages and in recovering a substantial judgment against Defendants. The Court's decision on Defendants' motion to dismiss the Complaint significantly narrowed the scope of Lead Plaintiffs' and the Settlement Class's claims—while allowing the case to proceed on five statements, it dismissed more than 90% of the alleged misstatements and all of the Securities Act claims. Additionally, the Court specifically noted during the motion to dismiss hearing that certain of the sustained statements were a "close call." That decision limited Lead Plaintiffs' liability claims and affected the scope of the damages and loss causation arguments that could be asserted on behalf of the Settlement Class. Notwithstanding the limitations on the scope of the Complaint that the Court sustained, Defendants have argued, and would continue to argue concerning the remaining claims, that they did not violate the federal securities laws. Among other things, Defendants have argued, and would continue to argue, that (1) they did not make any false or misleading statements, (2) they did not act with "scienter," or fraudulent intent, and (3) Lead Plaintiffs could not prove damages or loss causation with respect to any alleged false or misleading statements.

28. For example, Defendants would continue to assert that even as to the sustained claims they made no false or misleading statements regarding the length and mandatory nature of Kornit's service contracts, the health of Kornit's business, the revenue "pull-forward," and demand for Kornit's products. As to the service contract statement, Defendants had argued, and would continue to argue, that Kornit's service contracts contained automatic renewal provisions that rendered them "multiple year" agreements in practice, that Kornit maintained a high "attach rate," and that the Company's SEC filings disclosed the terms of those contracts such that no reasonable investor could have been misled. As to Defendant Samuel's positive statement about the health of Kornit's business, Defendants argued, and would continue to argue, that the statement constituted corporate puffery and that the decline in demand for Kornit's

products did not emerge until after the statement was made. As to the "pull-forward" statement, Defendants argued, and would continue to argue, that the pull-forward did not violate accounting rules and that Defendant Rozner answered the analyst's question accurately from an accounting perspective. Indeed, these risks were highlighted by the fact that the Court's motion to dismiss order significantly narrowed the case.

29. Defendants also would continue to argue that they did not act with fraudulent intent, and that there was no scheme in place to defraud investors. Defendants would continue to assert, among other things, that the challenged statements reflected the honestly held beliefs and expectations of Defendants about Kornit's business and operations at the time they made those statements. For example, as to the statement regarding the health of Kornit's business in February 2022, Defendants would continue to assert that Mr. Samuel subjectively believed that Kornit's business was in a better position than ever, that he had a good-faith basis for his opinion, and that he did not know of the Company's declining performance until after making the statement.

30. Lead Plaintiffs also faced risks with respect to proving loss causation and damages. Defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings, which was pending at the time the Parties reached a settlement, arguing that the Court should dismiss the February 2021 service contract statement on loss-causation grounds because none of the alleged corrective disclosures mentioned Kornit's service contracts or revealed any inaccuracy in that statement. If granted, that motion would have reduced the alleged Class Period by nearly a year (such that it would begin in February 2022) and reduced recoverable damages significantly. Additionally, Defendants challenged whether the two alleged corrective disclosures were sufficiently connected to the remaining alleged false and misleading statements, such that those statements could be considered the cause of any damages to the Class. Moreover, Defendants were expected to vigorously dispute what portion (if any) of Kornit's stock price declines following each of the alleged corrective disclosures was attributable to the sustained alleged misstatements—as opposed to other factors affecting Kornit's business.

31. Finally, Lead Plaintiffs faced a possibility that any available recovery would be reduced, including because Defendants' remaining available insurance was being consumed by the ongoing litigation. The proposed Settlement avoids these risks and, if approved, will provide a prompt and certain benefit to the Settlement Class.

32. In light of these and other risks, the amount of the Settlement, and the immediacy of recovery to the Settlement Class, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel believe that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. The Settlement provides a substantial benefit to the Settlement Class, namely $19,500,000 in cash (less the various deductions described in this Notice), as compared to the risk that the claims in the Action would produce a smaller recovery, or no recovery at all, after further proceedings on Lead Plaintiffs' motion for class certification and likely summary judgment motions, trial, and appeals, possibly years in the future.

33. Defendants have denied the claims asserted against them in the Action and deny that the Settlement Class was harmed or suffered any damages as a result of the conduct alleged in the Action. Defendants have agreed to the Settlement solely to eliminate the burden and expense of continued litigation. Accordingly, the Settlement may not be construed as an admission of any wrongdoing by Defendants.

WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IF THERE WERE NO SETTLEMENT?

34. If there were no Settlement and Lead Plaintiffs failed to establish any essential legal or factual element of their claims against Defendants, neither Lead Plaintiffs nor the other members of the Settlement Class would recover anything from Defendants. Also, if Defendants were successful in proving any of

their defenses, either at summary judgment, at trial, or on appeal, the Settlement Class could recover less than the amount provided in the Settlement, or nothing at all.

HOW ARE SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBERS AFFECTED BY THE ACTION AND THE SETTLEMENT?

35. As a Settlement Class Member, you are represented by Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel, unless you enter an appearance through counsel of your own choice at your own expense. You are not required to retain your own counsel, but if you choose to do so, such counsel must file a notice of appearance on your behalf and must serve copies of his or her appearance on the attorneys listed in the section entitled, "When And Where Will The Court Decide Whether To Approve The Settlement?," on page 13 below.

36. If you are a Settlement Class Member and do not wish to remain a Settlement Class Member, you may exclude yourself from the Settlement Class by following the instructions in the section entitled, "What If I Do Not Want To Be A Member Of The Settlement Class? How Do I Exclude Myself?," on page 13 below.

37. If you are a Settlement Class Member and you wish to object to the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, or Lead Counsel's application for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, and if you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you may present your objection(s) by following the instructions in the section entitled, "When And Where Will The Court Decide Whether To Approve The Settlement?," on page 13 below.

38. If you are a Settlement Class Member and you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you will be bound by any orders issued by the Court. If the Settlement is approved, the Court will enter a judgment (the "Judgment"). The Judgment will dismiss with prejudice the claims against Defendants and will provide that, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, Lead Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective successors, assigns, executors, administrators, representatives, attorneys, and agents, in their capacities as such, will have fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim (as defined in ¶ 39 below) against Defendants and the other Released Defendants' Parties (as defined in ¶ 40 below), and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Released Defendants' Parties.

39. "Released Plaintiffs' Claims" means all claims, actions, causes of action, demands, losses, rights, duties, obligations, debts, sums of money, suits, contracts, agreements, judgments, matters, issues, promises, damages and liabilities of every nature and description, whether known or Unknown Claims, whether arising under federal, state, common, foreign or other applicable law, rule, or regulation that Lead Plaintiffs, former plaintiff Indiana State Police Pension Trust, any other member of the Settlement Class, or any other Releasing Plaintiffs' Party: (i) asserted in the Complaint, or (ii) could have asserted in any forum that arise out of, are based on, or relate in any way to, directly or indirectly, any of the allegations, acts, transactions, facts, events, matters, occurrences, representations or omissions involved, set forth, alleged or referred to, in the Complaint, and which arise out of, are based upon, or relate in any way, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or acquisition of Kornit ordinary shares by any members of the Settlement Class during the Class Period. This release shall not include (i) any claims relating to the enforcement of the Settlement; and (ii) any claims of any person or entity who or which submits a request for exclusion from the Settlement Class that is accepted by the Court.

40. "Released Defendants' Parties" means (i) each Defendant; (ii) Defendants' directors' and officers' liability insurance carriers, and any affiliates or subsidiaries thereof; (iii) the Immediate Family Members of the Individual Defendants; (iv) direct or indirect parent entities, direct and indirect subsidiaries, related

entities, and all affiliates of the Company; (v) any trust of which any Individual Defendant is the settlor or which is for the benefit of any Individual Defendant and/or his or her Immediate Family Members; (vi) any entity in which a Defendant has a controlling interest; (vii) the Former Underwriter Defendants; (viii) the Former Amazon Defendants; and (ix) for any of the persons or entities listed in parts (i) through (viii), as applicable, their respective past, present, and future general partners, limited partners, principals, shareholders, joint venturers, officers, directors, managers, managing directors, supervisors, employees, contractors, consultants, experts, auditors, accountants, financial advisors, insurers, reinsurers, indemnitors, trustees, trustors, agents, attorneys, predecessors, successors, assigns, heirs, executors, administrators, estates, and any controlling person thereof; all in their capacities as such.

41. "Unknown Claims" means any and all Released Plaintiffs' Claims against the Released Defendants' Parties that Lead Plaintiffs or any other Settlement Class Member does not know or suspect to exist in his, her, or its favor at the time of the release of such claims, and any Released Defendants' Claims against the Released Plaintiffs' Parties that any Defendant does not know or suspect to exist in his or its favor at the time of the release of such claims, including without limitation those that, if known by such Lead Plaintiff, Settlement Class Member or Defendant, might have affected his, her, or its decision(s) with respect to this Settlement or the Releases. With respect to any and all Released Claims, the Parties stipulate and agree that, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants shall expressly waive, and each of the other Settlement Class Members shall be deemed to have waived, and by operation of the Judgment or the Alternate Judgment, if applicable, shall have expressly waived, any and all provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States, or principle of common law, which is similar, comparable, or equivalent to California Civil Code § 1542, which provides:

> **A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release and that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party**.

Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants acknowledge, and each of the Settlement Class Members shall be deemed by operation of law to have acknowledged, that the foregoing waiver was separately bargained for and a key element of the Settlement.

42. The Judgment will also provide that, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, Defendants, on behalf of themselves, and their respective successors, assigns, executors, administrators, representatives, attorneys, and agents, in their capacities as such, will have fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendants' Claim (as defined in ¶ 43 below) against Lead Plaintiffs and the other Released Plaintiffs' Parties (as defined in ¶ 44 below), and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendants' Claims against any of the Released Plaintiffs' Parties.

43. "Released Defendants' Claims" means all claims and causes of action of every nature and description, whether known or Unknown Claims, whether arising under federal, state, common, or foreign law, that arise out of or relate in any way to the institution, prosecution, or settlement of the claims asserted in the Action. This release does not cover, include, or release any claims relating to the enforcement of the Settlement.

44. "Released Plaintiffs' Parties" means (i) Lead Plaintiffs, and former plaintiff Indiana State Police Pension Trust, all Settlement Class members, any other plaintiffs in the Action and their counsel, Lead Counsel and Plaintiffs' Counsel, and Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC (counsel for former plaintiff Indiana State Police Pension Trust), and (ii) each of their respective Immediate Family Members, and their

respective partners, general partners, limited partners, principals, shareholders, joint venturers, members, officers, directors, managing directors, supervisors, employees, contractors, consultants, experts, auditors, accountants, financial advisors, insurers, investigators, trustees, trustors, agents, attorneys, predecessors, successors, assigns, heirs, executors, administrators, and any controlling person thereof, all in their capacities as such. Nothing in this paragraph shall affect any claims, demands, rights, or causes of action and liabilities: (a) between or among Defendants; or (b) between Defendants and their insurers.

HOW DO I PARTICIPATE IN THE SETTLEMENT? WHAT DO I NEED TO DO?

45. To be eligible for a payment from the Settlement, you must be a member of the Settlement Class and you must timely complete and return a Claim Form with adequate supporting documentation ***postmarked (if mailed), or submitted online*** **at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com no later than December 10, 2026**. You may obtain a Claim Form from the website maintained by the Claims Administrator for the Settlement, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. You may also request that a Claim Form be mailed to you by calling the Claims Administrator toll free at 1-855-961-0955 or by emailing the Claims Administrator at info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. **Please retain all records of your ownership of and transactions in Kornit ordinary shares, as they will be needed to document your Claim.** The Parties and Claims Administrator do not have information about your transactions in Kornit ordinary shares.

46. If you request exclusion from the Settlement Class or do not submit a timely and valid Claim Form, you will not be eligible to share in the Net Settlement Fund.

HOW MUCH WILL MY PAYMENT BE?

47. At this time, it is not possible to make any determination as to how much any individual Settlement Class Member may receive from the Settlement.

48. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendants have agreed to cause $19,500,000 in cash (the "Settlement Amount") to be paid into an escrow account. The Settlement Amount plus any interest earned thereon is referred to as the "Settlement Fund." If the Settlement is approved by the Court and the Effective Date occurs, the "Net Settlement Fund" (that is, the Settlement Fund less (a) all federal, state and/or local taxes on any income earned by the Settlement Fund and the reasonable costs incurred in connection with determining the amount of and paying taxes owed by the Settlement Fund (including reasonable expenses of tax attorneys and accountants); (b) the costs and expenses incurred in connection with providing notice to Settlement Class Members and administering the Settlement on behalf of Settlement Class Members; (c) any attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses awarded by the Court; and (d) any other costs or fees approved by the Court) will be distributed to Settlement Class Members who submit valid Claim Forms, in accordance with the proposed Plan of Allocation or such other plan of allocation as the Court may approve.

49. The Net Settlement Fund will not be distributed unless and until the Court has approved the Settlement and a plan of allocation, and the time for any petition for rehearing, appeal or review, whether by certiorari or otherwise, has expired.

50. Neither Defendants nor any other person or entity that paid any portion of the Settlement Amount on their behalf are entitled to get back any portion of the Settlement Fund once the Court's order or judgment approving the Settlement becomes Final. Defendants shall not have any liability, obligation, or responsibility for the administration of the Settlement, the disbursement of the Net Settlement Fund, or the plan of allocation.

51. Approval of the Settlement is independent from approval of a plan of allocation. Any determination with respect to a plan of allocation will not affect the Settlement, if approved.

52. Unless the Court otherwise orders, any Settlement Class Member who fails to submit a Claim Form postmarked (or submitted online) on or before December 10, 2026 shall be fully and forever barred from receiving payments pursuant to the Settlement but will in all other respects remain a Settlement Class Member and be subject to the provisions of the Stipulation, including the terms of any Judgment entered and the releases given. This means that each Settlement Class Member releases the Released Plaintiffs' Claims (as defined in ¶ 39 above) against the Released Defendants' Parties (as defined in ¶ 40 above) and will be enjoined and prohibited from prosecuting any of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Released Defendants' Parties whether or not such Settlement Class Member submits a Claim Form.

53. Participants in and beneficiaries of any employee retirement and/or benefit plan covered by ERISA ("ERISA Plan") should NOT include any information relating to shares of Kornit ordinary shares purchased through the ERISA Plan in any Claim Form they submit in this Action. They should include ONLY shares of Kornit ordinary shares purchased during the Class Period outside of an ERISA Plan. Claims based on any ERISA Plan's purchases of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period may be made by the plan's trustees.

54. The Court has reserved jurisdiction to allow, disallow, or adjust on equitable grounds the Claim of any Settlement Class Member.

55. Each Claimant shall be deemed to have submitted to the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to his, her or its Claim Form.

56. Only Settlement Class Members or persons authorized to submit a claim on their behalf will be eligible to share in the distribution of the Net Settlement Fund. Persons and entities that are excluded from the Settlement Class by definition or that exclude themselves from the Settlement Class pursuant to request will not be eligible to receive a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund and should not submit Claim Forms. The only securities that are included in the Settlement are Kornit ordinary shares.

57. Appendix A to this Notice sets forth the Plan of Allocation for allocating the Net Settlement Fund among Authorized Claimants, as proposed by Lead Plaintiffs. At the Settlement Hearing, Lead Plaintiffs will request that the Court approve the Plan of Allocation. The Court may modify the Plan of Allocation, or approve a different plan of allocation, without further notice to the Settlement Class.

WHAT PAYMENT ARE THE ATTORNEYS FOR THE SETTLEMENT CLASS SEEKING? HOW WILL THE LAWYERS BE PAID?

58. Plaintiffs' Counsel have not received any payment for their services in pursuing claims against the Defendants on behalf of the Settlement Class, nor have Plaintiffs' Counsel been reimbursed for their out-of-pocket expenses. Before final approval of the Settlement, Lead Counsel will apply to the Court for an award of attorneys' fees for all Plaintiffs' Counsel in an amount not to exceed 22% of the Settlement Fund. At the same time, Lead Counsel also intends to apply for payment of Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $350,000, which may include an application for reimbursement of the reasonable costs and expenses incurred by Lead Plaintiffs directly related to their representation of the Settlement Class, pursuant to the PSLRA. The Court will determine the amount of any award of attorneys' fees or Litigation Expenses. Such sums as may be approved by the Court will be paid from the Settlement Fund. Settlement Class Members are not personally liable for any such fees or expenses.

WHAT IF I DO NOT WANT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS? HOW DO I EXCLUDE MYSELF?

59. Each Settlement Class Member will be bound by all determinations and judgments in this lawsuit, whether favorable or unfavorable, unless such person or entity mails or delivers a written Request for Exclusion from the Settlement Class, addressed to *Kornit Securities Litigation*, EXCLUSIONS, c/o JND Legal Administration, P.O. Box 91050, Seattle, WA 98111. The Request for Exclusion must be ***received*** **no later than October 28, 2026**. You will not be able to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class after that date. Each Request for Exclusion must: (i) state the name, address, and telephone number of the person or entity requesting exclusion, and in the case of entities, the name and telephone number of the appropriate contact person; (ii) state that such person or entity "requests exclusion from the Settlement Class in *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 2:23-cv-888-MCA-AME (D.N.J.)"; (iii) state the number of Kornit ordinary shares that the person or entity requesting exclusion (A) held as of the opening of trading on February 17, 2021 and (B) purchased/acquired and/or sold from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive, as well as the date, number of shares, and prices of each such purchase/acquisition and sale; and (iv) be signed by the person or entity requesting exclusion or an authorized representative. A Request for Exclusion shall not be effective unless it provides all the information called for in this paragraph and is received within the time stated above, or is otherwise accepted by the Court.

60. If you do not want to be part of the Settlement Class, you must follow these instructions for exclusion even if you have pending, or later file, another lawsuit, arbitration, or other proceeding relating to any Released Plaintiffs' Claim against any of the Released Defendants' Parties.

61. If you ask to be excluded from the Settlement Class, you will not be eligible to receive any payment out of the Net Settlement Fund. If you validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class you will retain the right to individually pursue any legal claims that you may have against any Defendants with respect to the claims asserted in the Action. However, Defendants will have the right to assert any defenses to your claims. **Please note, if you decide to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you may be time-barred from asserting claims covered by the Action by a statute of limitation or statute of repose.**

62. Kornit has the right to terminate the Settlement if valid requests for exclusion are received from persons and entities entitled to be members of the Settlement Class in an amount that exceeds an amount agreed to by the Parties.

WHEN AND WHERE WILL THE COURT DECIDE WHETHER TO APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT? DO I HAVE TO COME TO THE HEARING? MAY I SPEAK AT THE HEARING IF I DON'T LIKE THE SETTLEMENT?

63. **Settlement Class Members do not need to attend the Settlement Hearing. The Court will consider any submission made in accordance with the provisions below even if a Settlement Class Member does not attend the hearing. You can participate in the Settlement without attending the Settlement Hearing**.

64. **Please Note**: The date and time of the Settlement Hearing may change without further written notice to the Settlement Class. The Court may decide to allow Settlement Class Members to appear at the hearing by phone, without further written notice to the Settlement Class. **In order to determine whether the date and time of the Settlement Hearing have changed, it is important that you monitor the Court's docket and the Settlement website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, before making**

any plans to attend the Settlement Hearing. Any updates regarding the Settlement Hearing, including any changes to the date or time of the hearing or updates regarding in-person or remote appearances at the hearing, will be posted to the Settlement website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

65. The Settlement Hearing will be held on **November 18, 2026 at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time**, before the Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, either in person in Courtroom 4A of the Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse, 50 Walnut Street, Newark, NJ 07101, or by telephone or videoconference (in the discretion of the Court). At the Settlement Hearing, the Court will consider: (a) whether the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and should be finally approved; (b) whether a Judgment substantially in the form attached as Exhibit B to the Stipulation should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice against Defendants; (c) whether the Settlement Class should be certified for purposes of the Settlement; (d) whether the proposed Plan of Allocation for the proceeds of the Settlement is fair and reasonable and should be approved; (e) whether the motion by Lead Counsel for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses should be approved; and (f) other matters that may properly be brought before the Court in connection with the Settlement. The Court reserves the right to approve the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, and/or any other matter related to the Settlement at or after the Settlement Hearing without further notice to the members of the Settlement Class.

66. Any Settlement Class Member that does not request exclusion may object to the Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, and/or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. Objections must be in writing. You must file any written objection, together with copies of all other papers and briefs supporting the objection, electronically with the Court or by letter mailed to the Clerk's Office at the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, at the address set forth below **on or before October 28, 2026**. You must also serve the objection and supporting papers on Lead Counsel and on Defendants' Counsel at the addresses set forth below so that the objection and supporting papers are ***received*** **on or before October 28, 2026.**

Clerk's Office	Lead Counsel	Defendants' Counsel
United States District Court District of New Jersey Clerk of the Court Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse 50 Walnut Street, Room 4015 Newark, NJ 07101	**Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP** James A. Harrod 1251 Avenue of the Americas 44th Floor New York, NY 10020	**Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP** Edmund Polubinski III 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017

67. Any objection must include: (a) the name of this proceeding, *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 2:23-cv-888-MCA-AME (D.N.J.); (b) the objector's full name, current address, email address (if applicable), and telephone number; (c) the objector's signature; (d) a statement providing the specific reasons for the objection, including a detailed statement of the specific legal and factual basis for each and every objection and whether the objection applies only to the objector, to a specific subset of the Settlement Class, or to the entire Settlement Class; and (e) documents sufficient to prove membership in the Settlement Class, including documents showing the number of Kornit ordinary shares that the objecting Settlement Class Member (i) held as of the opening of trading on February 17, 2021, (ii) purchased/acquired and/or sold from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive, and (iii) the date, number of shares, and prices of each such purchase/acquisition and sale. The documentation

establishing membership in the Settlement Class must consist of copies of trade confirmations or monthly account statements, or an authorized statement from your broker or financial institution containing the transactional and holding information found in a trade confirmation or account statement.

68. You may not object to the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses if you exclude yourself from the Settlement Class or if you are not a member of the Settlement Class.

69. You may file a written objection without having to appear at the Settlement Hearing. You may not, however, appear at the Settlement Hearing to present your objection unless you first file and serve a written objection in accordance with the procedures described above, unless the Court orders otherwise.

70. If you wish to be heard orally at the hearing in opposition to the approval of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, and if you timely file and serve a written objection as described above, you must also file a notice of appearance with the Clerk's Office so that it is ***received*** **on or before October 28, 2026**. Such persons may be heard orally at the discretion of the Court. Objectors who enter an appearance and desire to present evidence at the Settlement Hearing in support of their objection must include in their written objection or notice of appearance the identity of any witnesses they may call to testify and any exhibits they intend to introduce into evidence at the hearing.

71. You are not required to hire an attorney to represent you in making written objections or in appearing at the Settlement Hearing. However, if you decide to hire an attorney, it will be at your own expense, and that attorney must file a notice of appearance with the Court so that the notice is ***received*** **on or before October 28, 2026**.

72. The Settlement Hearing may be adjourned by the Court without further written notice to the Settlement Class, other than a posting of the adjournment on the Settlement website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. If you plan to attend the Settlement Hearing, you should confirm the date and time with Lead Counsel.

73. **Unless the Court orders otherwise, any Settlement Class Member who does not object in the manner described above will be deemed to have waived any objection and shall be forever foreclosed from making any objection to the proposed Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation and/or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. Settlement Class Members do not need to appear at the Settlement Hearing or take any other action to indicate their approval.**

WHAT IF I BOUGHT SHARES ON SOMEONE ELSE'S BEHALF?

74. If you purchased Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive, for the beneficial interest of persons or organizations other than yourself, you must either: (a) within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of this Notice, request from the Claims Administrator sufficient copies of the Postcard Notice to forward to all such beneficial owners and, within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of those Postcard Notices, forward them to all such beneficial owners; or (b) within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of this Notice, provide a list of the names, mailing addresses and, if available, email addresses of all such beneficial owners to *Kornit Securities Litigation*, c/o JND Legal Administration, P.O. Box 91050, Seattle, WA 98111, or KDLSecurities@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. If you choose the second option, the Claims Administrator will send a copy of the Postcard Notice to the beneficial owners. Upon full compliance with these directions, such nominees may seek payment of their reasonable expenses actually incurred, by providing the Claims Administrator with proper documentation supporting the expenses for which reimbursement is sought. **Brokers, nominees, and their agents shall forward the Postcard Notice**

to (or identify names, mailing addresses, and e-mail addresses of) *all* beneficial owners who purchased Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period, regardless of whether or not those beneficial owners have enrolled in a claim-filing program with their broker or financial institution. Reasonable expenses shall not exceed $0.05 per mailing record provided to the Claims Administrator; $0.05 per unit for each Postcard Notice actually mailed plus postage at the rate used by the Claims Administrator; and $0.05 per Postcard Notice sent via email. Such properly documented expenses incurred by nominees in compliance with these directions shall be paid from the Settlement Fund, with any disputes as to the reasonableness or documentation of expenses incurred subject to review by the Court.

75. Copies of this Notice and the Claim Form may also be obtained from the website maintained by the Claims Administrator, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or by calling the Claims Administrator toll free at 1-855-961-0955.

CAN I SEE THE COURT FILE? WHOM SHOULD I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

76. This Notice contains only a summary of the terms of the proposed Settlement. For more detailed information about the matters involved in this Action, you are referred to the papers on file in the Action, including the Stipulation, which may be reviewed by accessing the Court docket in this case through the Court's Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system at https://ecf.njd.uscourts.gov, or by visiting the office of the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse, 50 Walnut Street, Room 4015, Newark, NJ 07101. Additionally, copies of the Stipulation and any related orders entered by the Court will be posted on the website maintained by the Claims Administrator, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

All inquiries concerning this Notice and the Claim Form should be directed to:

Kornit Securities Litigation
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box 91050
Seattle, WA 98111

1-855-961-0955
www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com

or

James A. Harrod
BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER
& GROSSMANN LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas, 44th Floor
New York, NY 10020
800-380-8496
settlements@blbglaw.com

DO NOT CALL OR WRITE THE COURT, THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT, DEFENDANTS OR THEIR COUNSEL REGARDING THIS NOTICE.

Dated: August 12, 2026

By Order of the Court
United States District Court
District of New Jersey

Appendix A

PLAN OF ALLOCATION OF THE NET SETTLEMENT FUND

77. As discussed above, the Settlement provides $19,500,000 in cash for the benefit of the Settlement Class. The Settlement Amount and any interest it earns constitute the "Settlement Fund." The Settlement Fund, after deduction of Court-approved attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, Notice and Administration Costs, Taxes, and any other fees or expenses approved by the Court, is the "Net Settlement Fund." If the Settlement is approved by the Court, the Net Settlement Fund will be distributed to eligible Authorized Claimants, i.e., members of the Settlement Class who timely submit valid Claim Forms that are accepted for payment by the Court, in accordance with a plan of allocation to be adopted by the Court. Settlement Class Members who do not timely submit valid Claim Forms will not share in the Net Settlement Fund, but will otherwise be bound by the Settlement.

78. The Plan of Allocation (the "Plan") set forth herein is the plan that is being proposed to the Court for approval by Lead Plaintiffs after consultation with their damages expert. The Court may approve the Plan with or without modification, or approve another plan of allocation, without further notice to the Settlement Class. Any Orders regarding a modification to the Plan will be posted to www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. Defendants have had, and will have, no involvement or responsibility for the terms or application of the Plan.

79. The objective of the Plan of Allocation is to equitably distribute the Net Settlement Fund among Authorized Claimants who suffered economic losses as a proximate result of the alleged wrongdoing. The calculations made pursuant to the Plan of Allocation are not intended to be estimates of, nor indicative of, the amounts that Settlement Class Members might have been able to recover after a trial. Nor are the calculations pursuant to the Plan of Allocation intended to be estimates of the amounts that will be paid to Authorized Claimants pursuant to the Settlement. The computations under the Plan of Allocation are only a method to weigh the claims of Authorized Claimants against one another for the purposes of making *pro rata* allocations of the Net Settlement Fund.

80. The Plan of Allocation was created with the assistance of Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert and reflects the assumption that Defendants' alleged false and misleading statements and material omissions proximately caused the price of Kornit ordinary shares to be artificially inflated throughout the Class Period. In calculating the estimated artificial inflation allegedly caused by Defendants' alleged misrepresentations and omissions, Lead Plaintiffs' damages expert considered price changes in Kornit ordinary shares in reaction to certain public announcements allegedly revealing the truth concerning Defendants' alleged misrepresentations and material omissions, adjusting for price changes on those days that were attributable to market or industry forces and adjusting for risks associated with Lead Plaintiffs' ability to prove liability, loss causation and damages.

81. In order to have recoverable damages, the disclosure of the allegedly misrepresented information must be the cause of the decline in the price of Kornit ordinary shares. In this case, Lead Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false statements and omitted material facts during the Class Period, which had the effect of artificially inflating the price of Kornit ordinary shares. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that corrective information was released to the market on May 11, 2022 and July 5, 2022, which removed the artificial inflation from the price of Kornit ordinary shares on May 11, 2022 and July 6, 2022.

82. Recognized Loss Amounts are based primarily on the difference in the amount of alleged artificial inflation in the prices of Kornit ordinary shares at the time of purchase or acquisition and at the time of sale, or the difference between the actual purchase price and sale price. Accordingly, in order to have a Recognized Loss Amount under the Plan of Allocation, a Settlement Class Member that purchased or

otherwise acquired Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period must have held those shares through at least one of the dates where new corrective information was released to the market and partially removed the artificial inflation from the price of Kornit ordinary shares. In addition, in recognition of the additional difficulties affecting claims on purchases of Kornit ordinary shares between February 17, 2021 and February 14, 2022, which would have related to both liability and loss causation, adjusted Recognized Loss Amounts have been applied to purchases in this portion of the Class Period.[5]

CALCULATION OF RECOGNIZED LOSS AMOUNT

83. Based on the formula stated below, a "Recognized Loss Amount" will be calculated for each purchase or acquisition of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period that is listed on the Claim Form and for which adequate documentation is provided. If a Recognized Loss Amount calculates to a negative number or zero under the formula below, that Recognized Loss Amount will be zero.[6]

84. For each Kornit ordinary share purchased or otherwise acquired from February 17, 2021, through February 14, 2022, and:

A. Sold prior to the close of trading on May 10, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be $0.00.

B. Sold from May 11, 2022 through the close of trading on July 5, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be ***the lesser of***: (i) $0.25 per share; or (ii) the purchase/acquisition price minus the sale price.

C. Sold from July 6, 2022 through the close of trading on October 3, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be ***the least of***: (i) $1.24 per share; (ii) the purchase/acquisition price minus the average closing price from July 6, 2022 through the date of sale as stated in Table B below; or (iii) the purchase/acquisition price minus the sale price.

D. Held as of the close of trading on October 3, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be ***the lesser of***: (i) $1.24 per share, or (ii) the purchase/acquisition price *minus* $28.67.[7]

---

[5] Specifically, Claimants who purchased or acquired Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021 through February 14, 2022 and held those shares until the end of the Class Period will have a maximum Recognized Loss Amount of $1.24 per share (equal to 15% of the $8.28 decline in alleged artificial inflation removed on July 6, 2022). Claimants who purchased or acquired Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021, through February 14, 2022 and sold those shares from May 11, 2022 through July 5, 2022 (holding over only the first alleged corrective disclosure) will have a maximum Recognized Loss Amount of 20% of that amount, or $0.25 per share.

[6] Any transactions in Kornit ordinary shares executed outside of regular trading hours for the U.S. financial markets shall be deemed to have occurred during the next regular trading session.

[7] Pursuant to Section 21D(e)(1) of the Exchange Act, "in any private action arising under this title in which the plaintiff seeks to establish damages by reference to the market price of a security, the award of damages to the plaintiff shall not exceed the difference between the purchase or sale price paid or received, as appropriate, by the plaintiff for the subject security and the mean trading price of that security during the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the information correcting the misstatement or omission that is the basis for the action is disseminated to the market." Consistent with the requirements of the Exchange Act, Recognized Loss Amounts are reduced to an appropriate extent by taking into account the

85. For each Kornit ordinary share purchased or otherwise acquired from February 15, 2022, through July 5, 2022, and:

E. Sold prior to the close of trading on May 10, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be $0.00.

F. Sold from May 11, 2022 through the close of trading on July 5, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be ***the lesser of***: (i) the amount of artificial inflation per share on the date of purchase/acquisition as stated in Table A below *minus* the amount of artificial inflation per share on the date of sale as stated in Table A below; or (ii) the purchase/acquisition price minus the sale price.

G. Sold from July 6, 2022 through the close of trading on October 3, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be ***the least of***: (i) the amount of artificial inflation per share on the date of purchase/acquisition as stated in Table A below; (ii) the purchase/acquisition price minus the average closing price from July 6, 2022 through the date of sale as stated in Table B below; or (iii) the purchase/acquisition price minus the sale price.

H. Held as of the close of trading on October 3, 2022, the Recognized Loss Amount will be ***the lesser of***: (i) the amount of artificial inflation per share on the date of purchase/acquisition as stated in Table A below, or (ii) the purchase/acquisition price *minus* $28.67.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

86. **Calculation of Claimant's "Recognized Claim":** A Claimant's "Recognized Claim" will be the sum of his, her, or its Recognized Loss Amounts as calculated under ¶¶ 84 and 85 above.

87. **FIFO Matching:** If a Claimant made more than one purchase/acquisition or sale of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period, all purchases/acquisitions and sales will be matched on a First In, First Out ("FIFO") basis. Class Period sales will be matched first against any holdings at the beginning of the Class Period and then against purchases/acquisitions in chronological order, beginning with the earliest purchase/acquisition made during the Class Period.

88. **Purchase/Sale Prices:** For the purposes of calculations in ¶¶ 84 and 85 above, "purchase/acquisition price" means the actual price paid, excluding any fees, commissions, and taxes, and "sale price" means the actual amount received, not deducting any fees, commissions, and taxes.

89. **"Purchase/Acquisition/Sale" Dates:** Purchases or acquisitions and sales of Kornit ordinary shares will be deemed to have occurred on the "contract" or "trade" date as opposed to the "settlement" or "payment" date. The receipt or grant by gift, inheritance, or operation of law of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period will not be deemed a purchase, acquisition, or sale of Kornit ordinary shares for the calculation of a Claimant's Recognized Loss Amount, nor will the receipt or grant be deemed an assignment of any claim relating to the purchase/acquisition/sale of Kornit ordinary shares unless (i) the donor or decedent purchased or otherwise acquired or sold such Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period; (ii) the instrument of gift or assignment specifically provides that it is intended to transfer such

---

closing prices of Kornit ordinary shares during the "90-day look-back period," from July 6, 2022, through October 3, 2022. The mean (average) closing price for Kornit ordinary shares during this period was $28.67.

rights; and (iii) no Claim was submitted by or on behalf of the donor, on behalf of the decedent, or by anyone else with respect to shares of such shares of Kornit ordinary shares.

90. **Short Sales:** The date of covering a "short sale" is deemed to be the date of purchase or acquisition of the Kornit ordinary shares. The date of a "short sale" is deemed to be the date of sale of the Kornit ordinary shares. In accordance with the Plan of Allocation, however, the Recognized Loss Amount on "short sales" and the purchases covering "short sales" is zero.

91. In the event that a Claimant has an opening short position in Kornit ordinary shares, the earliest purchases or acquisitions of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period will be matched against such opening short position, and not be entitled to a recovery, until that short position is fully covered.

92. **Ordinary Shares Purchased/Sold Through the Exercise of Options:** Option contracts are not securities eligible to participate in the Settlement. With respect to Kornit ordinary shares purchased or sold through the exercise of an option, the purchase/sale date of the ordinary shares is the exercise date of the option and the purchase/sale price is the exercise price of the option.

93. **Market Gains and Losses:** The Claims Administrator will determine if the Claimant had a "Market Gain" or a "Market Loss" with respect to his, her, or its overall transactions in Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period. For purposes of making this calculation, the Claims Administrator shall determine the difference between (i) the Claimant's Total Purchase Amount[8] and (ii) the sum of the Claimant's Total Sales Proceeds[9] and the Claimant's Holding Value.[10] If the Claimant's Total Purchase Amount *minus* the sum of the Claimant's Total Sales Proceeds and the Holding Value is a positive number, that number will be the Claimant's Market Loss; if the number is a negative number or zero, that number will be the Claimant's Market Gain.

94. If a Claimant had a Market Gain with respect to his, her, or its overall transactions in Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period, the value of the Claimant's Recognized Claim will be zero, and the Claimant will in any event be bound by the Settlement. If a Claimant suffered an overall Market Loss with respect to his, her, or its overall transactions in Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period but that Market Loss was less than the Claimant's Recognized Claim, then the Claimant's Recognized Claim will be limited to the amount of the Market Loss.

95. **Determination of Distribution Amount:** The Net Settlement Fund will be distributed to Authorized Claimants on a *pro rata* basis based on the relative size of their Recognized Claims. Specifically, a "Distribution Amount" will be calculated for each Authorized Claimant, which will be the Authorized Claimant's Recognized Claim divided by the total Recognized Claims of all Authorized Claimants, multiplied by the total amount in the Net Settlement Fund.

---

[8] The "Total Purchase Amount" is the total amount the Claimant paid (excluding all fees, taxes, and commissions) for all shares of Kornit ordinary shares purchased or acquired during the Class Period.

[9] The Claims Administrator shall match any sales of Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period first against the Claimant's opening position in Kornit ordinary shares (the proceeds of those sales will not be considered for purposes of calculating market gains or losses). The total amount received (not deducting any fees, taxes and commissions) for sales of the remaining shares of Kornit ordinary shares sold during the Class Period is the "Total Sales Proceeds."

[10] The Claims Administrator shall ascribe a "Holding Value" of $23.46 to each share of Kornit ordinary shares purchased or acquired during the Class Period that was still held as of the close of trading on July 5, 2022.

96. If an Authorized Claimant's Distribution Amount calculates to less than $10.00, no distribution will be made to that Authorized Claimant. Those funds will be included in the distribution to Authorized Claimants whose Distribution Amount is $10.00 or more.

97. After the initial distribution of the Net Settlement Fund, the Claims Administrator will make reasonable and diligent efforts to have Authorized Claimants cash their distribution checks. To the extent any monies remain in the Net Settlement Fund six (6) months after the initial distribution, if Lead Counsel, in consultation with the Claims Administrator, determines that it is cost-effective to do so, the Claims Administrator will conduct a re-distribution of the funds remaining after payment of any unpaid fees and expenses incurred in administering the Settlement, including for such re-distribution, to Authorized Claimants who have cashed their initial distributions and who would receive at least $10.00 from such re-distribution. Additional re-distributions to Authorized Claimants who have cashed their prior checks may occur thereafter if Lead Counsel, in consultation with the Claims Administrator, determines that additional re-distributions, after the deduction of any additional fees and expenses incurred in administering the Settlement, including for such re-distributions, would be cost-effective. At such time as it is determined that the re-distribution of funds remaining in the Net Settlement Fund is not cost-effective, the remaining balance will be contributed to one or more non-sectarian, not-for-profit, 501(c)(3) organizations to be selected by Lead Counsel and approved by the Court.

98. Payment pursuant to the Plan of Allocation, or such other plan of allocation as may be approved by the Court, will be conclusive against all Claimants. No person shall have any claim against Lead Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' Counsel, Lead Plaintiffs' damages experts, Lead Plaintiffs' consulting experts, Defendants, Defendants' Counsel, or any of the other Released Plaintiff Parties or Released Defendants' Parties, or the Claims Administrator or other agent designated by Lead Counsel arising from distributions made substantially in accordance with the Stipulation, the plan of allocation approved by the Court, or further Orders of the Court. Lead Plaintiffs, Defendants, and their respective counsel, and all other Released Defendants' Parties, shall have no responsibility or liability whatsoever for the investment or distribution of the Settlement Fund or the Net Settlement Fund; the plan of allocation; the determination, administration, calculation, or payment of any Claim or nonperformance of the Claims Administrator; the payment or withholding of Taxes; or any losses incurred in connection therewith.

TABLE A

Estimated Artificial Inflation in Kornit Ordinary Shares February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022	
Date Range	**Estimated Artificial Inflation Per Share**
February 17, 2021, through February 14, 2022	$1.24
February 15, 2022, through May 10, 2022	$20.21
May 11, 2022, through July 5, 2022	$8.28
July 6, 2022, or after	$0.00

TABLE B

90-Day Look-back Table for Kornit Ordinary Shares Closing Price and Average Closing Price July 6, 2022, through October 3, 2022					
Date	**Closing Price**	**Average Closing Price from July 6, 2022, through Date Shown**	**Date**	**Closing Price**	**Average Closing Price from July 6, 2022, through Date Shown**
7/6/2022	$23.46	$23.46	8/19/2022	$31.77	$28.47
7/7/2022	$26.37	$24.92	8/22/2022	$30.60	$28.53
7/8/2022	$26.14	$25.32	8/23/2022	$30.34	$28.58
7/11/2022	$24.11	$25.02	8/24/2022	$30.01	$28.62
7/12/2022	$24.12	$24.84	8/25/2022	$31.79	$28.71
7/13/2022	$24.00	$24.70	8/26/2022	$30.31	$28.75
7/14/2022	$22.17	$24.34	8/29/2022	$30.10	$28.78
7/15/2022	$23.64	$24.25	8/30/2022	$30.58	$28.83
7/18/2022	$25.41	$24.38	8/31/2022	$31.08	$28.88
7/19/2022	$26.98	$24.64	9/1/2022	$29.24	$28.89
7/20/2022	$27.34	$24.89	9/2/2022	$28.89	$28.89
7/21/2022	$27.03	$25.06	9/6/2022	$27.29	$28.85
7/22/2022	$26.19	$25.15	9/7/2022	$28.44	$28.85
7/25/2022	$25.71	$25.19	9/8/2022	$29.28	$28.86
7/26/2022	$25.15	$25.19	9/9/2022	$31.38	$28.91
7/27/2022	$26.13	$25.25	9/12/2022	$31.56	$28.96
7/28/2022	$26.68	$25.33	9/13/2022	$30.42	$28.99
7/29/2022	$27.21	$25.44	9/14/2022	$30.62	$29.03
8/1/2022	$27.29	$25.53	9/15/2022	$30.14	$29.05
8/2/2022	$28.34	$25.67	9/16/2022	$28.33	$29.03
8/3/2022	$29.98	$25.88	9/19/2022	$28.53	$29.02
8/4/2022	$29.58	$26.05	9/20/2022	$27.29	$28.99
8/5/2022	$29.34	$26.19	9/21/2022	$26.98	$28.96
8/8/2022	$31.26	$26.40	9/22/2022	$26.41	$28.91
8/9/2022	$29.67	$26.53	9/23/2022	$25.86	$28.86
8/10/2022	$35.47	$26.88	9/26/2022	$25.37	$28.80
8/11/2022	$35.51	$27.20	9/27/2022	$26.61	$28.76
8/12/2022	$35.25	$27.48	9/28/2022	$28.22	$28.75
8/15/2022	$34.96	$27.74	9/29/2022	$27.25	$28.73
8/16/2022	$34.85	$27.98	9/30/2022	$26.61	$28.69
8/17/2022	$34.27	$28.18	10/3/2022	$27.45	$28.67
8/18/2022	$34.00	$28.36			

PROOF OF CLAIM AND RELEASE FORM

Kornit Securities Litigation
Toll-Free Number: (855) 961-0955
Email: info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com
Website: www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com

To be eligible to receive a share of the Net Settlement Fund in connection with the Settlement of this Action, you must complete and sign this Proof of Claim and Release Form ("Claim Form") and mail it by First-Class Mail to the address below, or submit it online at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, with supporting documentation, ***postmarked*** **(if mailed) or submitted online no later than December 10, 2026**.

Mail to:

Kornit Securities Litigation
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box 91050
Seattle, WA 98111

Failure to submit your Claim Form by the date specified will subject your claim to rejection and may preclude you from being eligible to receive any money in connection with the Settlement.

Do not mail or deliver your Claim Form to the Court, the Parties to the Action, or their counsel. Submit your Claim Form only to the Claims Administrator at the address set forth above.

CONTENTS

02 PART I. CLAIMANT INFORMATION

03 PART II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

06 PART III. SCHEDULE OF TRANSACTIONS IN KORNIT ORDINARY SHARES (NASDAQ: KRNT; CUSIP: M6372Q113)

07 PART IV. RELEASE OF CLAIMS AND SIGNATURE

Need help? If you have questions concerning this Claim Form or need assistance in filling out the Claim Form, you may contact the Claims Administrator at the above mailing address, by email at info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or by toll-free phone at (855) 961-0955, or you can visit the website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

PART I – CLAIMANT INFORMATION

The Claims Administrator will use this information for all communications regarding this Claim Form. If this information changes, you MUST notify the Claims Administrator in writing at the address above. Complete names of all persons and entities must be provided.

Name of the Beneficial Owner of Kornit ordinary shares (see ¶ 9 on page 4 for details)

First Name | MI | Last Name

Joint Owner's Name (*if applicable*)

First Name (*if applicable*) | MI | Last Name (*if applicable*)

If this claim is submitted for an IRA, and if you would like any check that you MAY be eligible to receive made payable to the IRA, please include "IRA" in the "Last Name" box above (*e.g.*, Jones IRA).

Entity Name (if the Owner is not an individual)

Name of Representative, if applicable (*executor, administrator, trustee, c/o, etc.*), if different from Owner

Last 4 digits of Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identification Number

Street Address 1

Street Address 2

City | State/Province | Zip Code

Foreign Postal Code (if applicable) | Foreign Country (if applicable)

Telephone Number (Day) | Telephone Number (Evening)

Email Address (email address is not required, but if you provide it, you authorize the Claims Administrator to use it in providing you with information relevant to this claim):

Type of Beneficial Owner:

☐ Individual ☐ Corporation ☐ UGMA Custodian ☐ IRA

☐ Partnership ☐ Estate ☐ Trust ☐ Other (please specify): _____

PART II – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. It is important that you completely read and understand the Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses ("Notice"), including the proposed Plan of Allocation set forth in the Notice ("Plan of Allocation"). The Notice describes the proposed Settlement, how Settlement Class Members are affected by the Settlement, and the manner in which the Net Settlement Fund will be distributed if the Settlement and Plan of Allocation are approved by the Court. The Notice also contains the definitions of many of the defined terms (which are indicated by initial capital letters) used in this Claim Form. By signing and submitting this Claim Form, you will be certifying that you have read and that you understand the Notice, including the terms of the Releases described therein and provided for herein.

2. This Claim Form is directed to **all persons and entities who purchased or acquired the ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit") from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive ("Class Period"), and/or (ii) pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021 ("Settlement Class")**. Certain persons and entities are excluded from the Settlement Class by definition as set forth in ¶ 25 of the Notice.

3. By submitting this Claim Form, you are making a request to share in the proceeds of the Settlement described in the Notice. If you are not a Settlement Class Member (see the definition of the Settlement Class in ¶ 25 of the Notice), or if you, or someone acting on your behalf, submitted a request for exclusion from the Settlement Class, do not submit a Claim Form. **You may not, directly or indirectly, participate in the Settlement if you are not a Settlement Class Member.** Thus, if you are excluded from the Settlement Class, any Claim Form that you submit, or that may be submitted on your behalf, will not be accepted.

4. **Submission of this Claim Form does not guarantee that you will share in the proceeds of the Settlement. The distribution of the Net Settlement Fund will be governed by the Plan of Allocation set forth in the Notice, if it is approved by the Court, or by such other plan of allocation as the Court approves.**

5. Use the Schedule of Transactions in Part III of this Claim Form to supply all required details of your transaction(s) (including free transfers and deliveries) in and holdings of Kornit ordinary shares. In this Schedule, please provide all of the requested information with respect to your holdings, purchases, acquisitions, and sales of Kornit ordinary shares, whether such transactions resulted in a profit or a loss. **Failure to report all transaction and holding information during the requested time periods may result in the rejection of your claim.**

6. **Please note**: Only ordinary shares of Kornit purchased or acquired during the Class Period (*i.e.*, the period from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive) are eligible under the Settlement. However, because the PSLRA provides for a "90-day look-back period" (described in the Plan of Allocation set forth in the Notice), you must provide documentation related to your purchases, acquisitions, and sales of Kornit ordinary shares during the period from July 6, 2022 through October 3, 2022 (i.e., the 90-day look-back period) in order for the Claims Administrator to calculate your Recognized Loss Amount under the Plan of Allocation and process your claim. **Failure to report all transaction and holding information during the requested time periods may result in the rejection of your claim.**

7. You are required to submit genuine and sufficient documentation for all of your transactions in and holdings of the Kornit ordinary shares set forth in the Schedule of Transactions in Part III of this Claim Form. Documentation may consist of copies of trade confirmations or account statements, or an authorized statement from your broker or other financial institution containing the transactional and holding information found in a trade confirmation or account statement. The Parties and the Claims Administrator do not independently have information about your investments in Kornit ordinary shares. IF SUCH DOCUMENTS ARE NOT IN YOUR POSSESSION, PLEASE OBTAIN COPIES OF THE DOCUMENTS OR EQUIVALENT DOCUMENTS FROM YOUR BROKER. FAILURE TO SUPPLY THIS DOCUMENTATION MAY RESULT IN THE REJECTION OF YOUR CLAIM. DO NOT SEND ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS. **Please keep a copy of all documents that you send to the Claims Administrator. Also, do not highlight any portion of the Claim Form or any supporting documents.**

8. **One Claim Form should be submitted for each separate legal entity or separately managed account.** Separate Claim Forms should be submitted for each separate legal entity (e.g., an individual should not combine his or her IRA transactions with transactions made solely in the individual's name). Generally, a single Claim Form should be submitted on behalf of one legal entity including all holdings and transactions made by that entity on one Claim Form. However, if a single person or legal entity had multiple accounts that were separately managed, separate Claims may be submitted for each such account. The Claims Administrator reserves the right to request information on all the holdings and transactions in Kornit ordinary shares made on behalf of a single beneficial owner.

9. All joint beneficial owners must sign this Claim Form and their names must appear as "Claimants" in Part I of this Claim Form. The complete name(s) of the beneficial owner(s) must be entered. If you purchased or acquired ordinary shares of Kornit during the Class Period and held the shares in your name, you are the beneficial owner as well as the record owner. If you purchased or acquired Kornit ordinary shares during the Class Period and the shares were registered in the name of a third party, such as a nominee or brokerage firm, you are the beneficial owner of these shares/options, but the third party is the record owner. The beneficial owner, not the record owner, must sign this Claim Form.

10. Agents, executors, administrators, guardians, and trustees must complete and sign the Claim Form on behalf of persons represented by them, and they must:

(a) expressly state the capacity in which they are acting;

(b) identify the name, account number, last four digits of the Social Security Number (or Taxpayer Identification Number), address, and telephone number of the beneficial owner of (or other person or entity on whose behalf they are acting with respect to) the Kornit ordinary shares; and

(c) furnish herewith evidence of their authority to bind to the Claim Form the person or entity on whose behalf they are acting. (Authority to complete and sign a Claim Form cannot be established by stockbrokers demonstrating only that they have discretionary authority to trade securities in another person's accounts.)

11. By submitting a signed Claim Form, you will be swearing to the truth of the statements contained therein and the genuineness of the documents attached thereto, subject to penalties of

Questions? Visit www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com or call toll-free (855) 961-0955
To view JND's privacy policy, please visit https://www.jndla.com/privacy-policy

perjury under the laws of the United States of America. The making of false statements, or the submission of forged or fraudulent documentation, will result in the rejection of your claim and may subject you to civil liability or criminal prosecution.

12. If the Court approves the Settlement, payments to eligible Authorized Claimants pursuant to the Plan of Allocation (or such other plan of allocation as the Court approves) will be made after any appeals are resolved, and after the completion of all claims processing. The claims process will take substantial time to complete fully and fairly. Please be patient.

13. **PLEASE NOTE**: As set forth in the Plan of Allocation, each Authorized Claimant shall receive their *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Fund. If the prorated payment to any Authorized Claimant calculates to less than $10.00, it will not be included in the calculation and no distribution will be made to that Authorized Claimant.

14. If you have questions concerning the Claim Form, or need additional copies of the Claim Form or a copy of the Notice, you may contact the Claims Administrator, JND Legal Administration, at the above address, by email at info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or by toll-free phone at 855-961-0955, or you can visit the website maintained by the Claims Administrator, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, where copies of the Claim Form and Notice are available for downloading.

15. **NOTICE REGARDING ELECTRONIC FILES**: Certain claimants with large numbers of transactions may request, or may be requested, to submit information regarding their transactions in electronic files. To obtain the ***mandatory*** electronic filing requirements and file layout, you may visit the website www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or you may email the Claims Administrator's electronic filing department at KDLSecurities@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. **Any file that is not in accordance with the required electronic filing format will be subject to rejection.** No electronic files will be considered to have been properly submitted unless the Claims Administrator issues an email to you to that effect. **Do not assume that your file has been received until you receive this email. If you do not receive such an email within 10 days of your submission, you should contact the Claims Administrator's electronic filing department at KDLSecurities@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com to inquire about your file and confirm it was received.**

IMPORTANT PLEASE NOTE:

YOUR CLAIM IS NOT DEEMED SUBMITTED UNTIL YOU RECEIVE AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT POSTCARD. THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR WILL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF YOUR CLAIM FORM BY MAIL WITHIN 60 DAYS. IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT POSTCARD WITHIN 60 DAYS, CALL THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR TOLL FREE AT 855-961-0955.

PART III – SCHEDULE OF TRANSACTIONS IN KORNIT ORDINARY SHARES

The only eligible securities are the ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit"). Kornit ordinary shares trade on the NASDAQ under the ticker symbol **KRNT** with the CUSIP **M6372Q113**. Do not include information regarding securities other than Kornit ordinary shares. Please include proper documentation with your Claim Form as described in detail in Part II – General Instructions ¶ 7, above.

1. HOLDINGS AS OF FEBRUARY 17, 2021 – State the total number of shares of Kornit ordinary shares held as of the opening of trading on February 17, 2021. (Must be documented.) If none, write "zero" or "0."	**Confirm Proof of Position Enclosed** ☐

2. PURCHASES/ACQUISITIONS FROM FEBRUARY 17, 2021 THROUGH JULY 5, 2022, INCLUSIVE – Separately list each and every purchase or acquisition (including free receipts) of Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021 through the close of trading on July 5, 2022. (Must be documented.)

Date of Purchase/ Acquisition (List Chronologically) (Month/Day/Year)	Number of Shares Purchased/Acquired	Purchase/Acquisition Price Per Share	Total Purchase Price (excluding any taxes, commissions, and fees)	Confirm Proof of Purchase Enclosed
/ /		$	$	☐
/ /		$	$	☐
/ /		$	$	☐
/ /		$	$	☐

3. PURCHASES/ACQUISITIONS FROM JULY 6, 2022 THROUGH OCTOBER 3, 2022, INCLUSIVE – State the total number of shares of Kornit ordinary shares purchased or acquired (including free receipts) from July 6, 2022 through the close of trading on October 3, 2022. If none, write "zero" or "0."

4. SALES FROM FEBRUARY 17, 2021 THROUGH OCTOBER 3, 2022, INCLUSIVE – Separately list each and every sale or disposition (including free deliveries) of Kornit ordinary shares from February 17, 2021 through the close of trading on October 3, 2022. (Must be documented.)	**IF NONE, CHECK HERE** ☐

Date of Sale (List Chronologically) (Month/Day/Year)	Number of Shares Sold	Sale Price Per Share	Total Sale Price (not deducting any taxes, commissions, and fees)	Confirm Proof of Sale Enclosed
/ /		$	$	☐
/ /		$	$	☐
/ /		$	$	☐
/ /		$	$	☐

5. HOLDINGS AS OF OCTOBER 3, 2022 – State the total number of shares of Kornit ordinary shares held as of the close of trading on October 3, 2022. (Must be documented.) If none, write "zero" or "0."	**Confirm Proof of Position Enclosed** ☐

☐	**IF YOU REQUIRE ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR THE SCHEDULE ABOVE, ATTACH EXTRA SCHEDULES IN THE SAME FORMAT. PRINT THE BENEFICIAL OWNER'S FULL NAME AND LAST FOUR DIGITS OF SOCIAL SECURITY/TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON EACH ADDITIONAL PAGE. IF YOU DO ATTACH EXTRA SCHEDULES, CHECK THIS BOX.**

Questions? Visit www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com or call toll-free (855) 961-0955
To view JND's privacy policy, please visit https://www.jndla.com/privacy-policy

PART IV – RELEASE OF CLAIMS AND SIGNATURE

YOU MUST ALSO READ THE RELEASE AND CERTIFICATION BELOW AND SIGN ON PAGE 8 OF THIS CLAIM FORM.

I (We) hereby acknowledge that, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Stipulation, without further action by anyone, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, I (we), on behalf of myself (ourselves) and my (our) (the claimant(s)') respective successors, assigns, executors, administrators, representatives, attorneys, and agents, in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of the judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim against Defendants and the other Released Defendants' Parties, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Released Defendants' Parties.

CERTIFICATION

By signing and submitting this Claim Form, the claimant(s) or the person(s) who represent(s) the claimant(s) agree(s) to the release above and certifies (certify) as follows:

1. that I (we) have read and understand the contents of the Notice and this Claim Form, including the releases provided for in the Settlement and the terms of the Plan of Allocation;

2. that the claimant(s) is a (are) Settlement Class Member(s), as defined in the Notice, and is (are) not excluded by definition from the Settlement Class as set forth in the Notice;

3. that the claimant(s) did ***not*** submit a request for exclusion from the Settlement Class;

4. that I (we) owned the Kornit ordinary shares identified in the Claim Form and have not assigned the claim against any of the Defendants or any of the other Released Defendants' Parties to another, or that, in signing and submitting this Claim Form, I (we) have the authority to act on behalf of the owner(s) thereof;

5. that the claimant(s) has (have) not submitted any other claim covering the same purchases of Kornit ordinary shares and knows (know) of no other person having done so on the claimant's (claimants') behalf;

6. that the claimant(s) has (have) not assigned or transferred or purported to assign or transfer, voluntarily or involuntarily, any Released Plaintiffs' Claim against any of the Released Defendants' Parties;

7. that the claimant(s) submit(s) to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey with respect to claimant's (claimants') claim and for purposes of enforcing the releases set forth herein;

8. that I (we) agree to furnish such additional information with respect to this Claim Form as Lead Counsel, the Claims Administrator, or the Court may require;

9. that the claimant(s) waive(s) the right to trial by jury, to the extent it exists, and agree(s) to the determination by the Court of the validity or amount of this Claim, and waive(s) any right of appeal or review with respect to such determination;

10. that I (we) acknowledge that the claimant(s) will be bound by and subject to the terms of any judgment(s) that may be entered in the Action; and

11. that the claimant(s) is (are) NOT subject to backup withholding under the provisions of Section 3406(a)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code because (i) the claimant(s) is (are) exempt from backup withholding or (ii) the claimant(s) has (have) not been notified by the IRS that he, she, or it is subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest or dividends or (iii) the IRS has notified the claimant(s) that he, she, or it is no longer subject to backup withholding. **If the IRS has notified the claimant(s) that he, she, it, or they is (are) subject to backup withholding, please strike out the language in the preceding sentence indicating that the claim is not subject to backup withholding in the certification above.**

UNDER THE PENALTIES OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, I (WE) CERTIFY THAT ALL OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ME (US) ON THIS CLAIM FORM IS TRUE, CORRECT, AND COMPLETE, AND THAT THE DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED HEREWITH ARE TRUE AND CORRECT COPIES OF WHAT THEY PURPORT TO BE.

Signature of Claimant Date

Print Name of Claimant here

Signature of Joint Claimant, if any Date

Print Name of Claimant here

If the claimant is other than an individual, or is not the person completing this form, the following also must be provided:

Signature of person signing on behalf of Claimant Date

Print Name of person signing on behalf of Claimant here

Capacity of person signing on behalf of claimant, if other than an individual, *e.g.*, executor, president, trustee, custodian, etc. (Must provide evidence of authority to act on behalf of claimant – see ¶ 10 on page 4 of this Claim Form.)

Questions? Visit www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com or call toll-free (855) 961-0955
To view JND's privacy policy, please visit https://www.jndla.com/privacy-policy

REMINDER CHECKLIST



1. Sign the above release and certification. If this Claim Form is being made on behalf of joint claimants, then both must sign.



2. Attach only ***copies*** of acceptable supporting documentation as these documents will not be returned to you.



3. Do not highlight any portion of the Claim Form or any supporting documents.



4. Keep copies of the completed Claim Form and documentation for your own records.



5. The Claims Administrator will acknowledge receipt of your Claim Form by mail, within 60 days. Your claim is not deemed filed until you receive an acknowledgment postcard. **If you do not receive an acknowledgment postcard within 60 days, please call the Claims Administrator toll-free at (855) 961-0955.**



6. If your address changes in the future, or if this Claim Form was sent to an old or incorrect address, you must send the Claims Administrator written notification of your new address. If you change your name, inform the Claims Administrator.

7. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your Claim Form, contact the Claims Administrator at the mailing address below, by email at info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, or by toll-free phone at (855) 961-0955, or you may visit www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com. DO NOT call Kornit, the other Defendants, or their counsel with questions regarding your Claim Form.

This Claim Form must be mailed to the Claims Administrator by First-Class Mail or submitted online at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, postmarked (or submitted online) no later than December 10, 2026. If mailed, the Claim Form should be addressed as follows:

Kornit Securities Litigation
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. 91050
Seattle, WA 98111

Payments to eligible Authorized Claimants will be made only if the Court approves the Settlement, after any appeals are resolved, and after the completion of all claims processing.

You should be aware that it will take a significant amount of time to fully process all of the Claim Forms. Please be patient and notify the Claims Administrator of any change of address.

EXHIBIT C

P2JW238000-0-B00800-1--------CW

ADVERTISEMENT

The Marketplace

To advertise: 800-366-3975 or WSJ.com/classifieds

CLASS ACTION

LEGAL NOTICE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

SUMMARY NOTICE OF (I) PENDENCY OF CLASS ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT; (II) SETTLEMENT HEARING; AND (III) MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

TO: All persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit") (i) from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period"), and/or (ii) pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021 (the "Settlement Class")[1]

PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. YOUR RIGHTS WILL BE AFFECTED BY A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT PENDING IN THIS COURT.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and an Order of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (the "Court"), that the above-captioned securities class action (the "Action") is pending in the Court.

YOU ARE ALSO NOTIFIED that Lead Plaintiffs Genesee County Employees' Retirement System, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD, and Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. ("Lead Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, have reached a proposed settlement of the Action for **$19,500,000** in cash (the "Settlement"). If approved, the Settlement will resolve all claims in the Action.

The Action involves allegations that Kornit and certain of its senior officers violated the federal securities laws. The Complaint alleges, among other things, that during the Class Period, Kornit, and its Chief Executive Officer Ronen Samuel and its Chief Financial Officer Alon Rozner (collectively, the "Individual Defendants") made material misrepresentations and omissions related to Kornit's business, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), and that the Individual Defendants controlled Kornit when the misstatements were made, in violation of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act.[2] Defendants expressly deny that Lead Plaintiffs have asserted any valid claims as to any of them, and expressly deny any and all allegations of fault, liability, wrongdoing, or damages whatsoever. Issues and defenses at issue in the Action include, among others, (i) whether Defendants made materially false statements or omissions; (ii) whether Defendants made the statements with the required state of mind; (iii) whether the alleged misstatements caused class members' losses; and (iv) the amount of damages, if any.

A hearing will be held on **November 18, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time**, before the Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, either in person in Courtroom 4A of the Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse, 50 Walnut Street, Newark, NJ 07101, or by telephone or videoconference (in the discretion of the Court), to determine: (i) whether the proposed Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate; (ii) whether, for purposes of the proposed Settlement only, the Action should be certified as a class action on behalf of the Settlement Class, Lead Plaintiffs should be certified as the Class Representatives for the Settlement Class, and Lead Counsel should be appointed as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class; (iii) whether the Action should be dismissed with prejudice against Defendants, and the Releases specified and described in the Stipulation (and in the Notice) should be granted; (iv) whether the proposed Plan of Allocation should be approved as fair and reasonable; and (v) whether Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses should be approved. If you plan to attend the hearing, you should check the Settlement website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, to confirm that no change to the date and/or time of the hearing has been made.

If you are a member of the Settlement Class, your rights will be affected by the pending Action and the Settlement, and you may be entitled to share in the Net Settlement Fund. This notice provides only a summary of the information contained in the full Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses (the "Notice"). You may obtain copies of the Notice and Claim Form on the Settlement Website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com; by contacting the Claims Administrator at: Kornit Securities Litigation, c/o JND Legal Administration, P.O. Box 91050, Seattle, WA 98111; by calling toll free (855) 961-0955; or by emailing info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

If you are a member of the Settlement Class, in order to be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement, you must submit a Claim Form ***postmarked*** **(if mailed) or online by no later than December 10, 2026**. If you are a Settlement Class Member and do not submit a proper Claim Form, you will not be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement, but you will nevertheless be bound by any judgments or orders entered by the Court in the Action.

If you are a member of the Settlement Class and wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you must submit a request for exclusion such that it is ***received*** **no later than October 28, 2026**, in accordance with the instructions set forth in the Notice. If you properly exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you will not be bound by any judgments or orders entered by the Court in the Action and you will not be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement.

Any objections to the proposed Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses must be filed with the Court and delivered to Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel such that they are ***received*** **no later than October 28, 2026**, in accordance with the instructions set forth in the Notice.

Please do not contact the Court, the Office of the Clerk of the Court, Defendants, or their counsel regarding this notice. All questions about this notice, the proposed Settlement, or your eligibility to participate in the Settlement should be directed to the Claims Administrator or Lead Counsel.

Requests for the Notice and Claim Form should be made to:

Kornit Securities Litigation
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box 91050
Seattle, WA 98111
(855) 961-0955
info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com
www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com

Inquiries, other than requests for the Notice and Claim Form, should be made to Lead Counsel:

James A. Harrod
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas, 44th Floor
New York, NY 10020
(800) 380-8496
settlements@blbglaw.com

By Order of the Court

1 Certain persons and entities are excluded from the Settlement Class by definition, as set forth in the full Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses (the "Notice"), available at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

2 Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meaning as in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 ("Stipulation"). The Stipulation can be viewed and/or obtained at www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com **(855) 961-0955**

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

Loans for Sale

Family owned finance company has 26 loans well secured, real estate backed, delinquent and performing loans for sale. 1st position, with low LTV. $18.5 million

Call 561-322-7709

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

MORTGAGE REIT
8%-9% RETURN
TAX EFFICIENCY
REAL ESTATE SECURED
GROWTH / INCOME
SEEKING RIA'S &
ACCREDITED INVESTORS
866-700-0600
ALLIANCE MORTGAGE FUND
120 Vantis Dr., Ste. 585 • Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
www.AlliancePortfolio.com
RE Broker • CA DRE • 02066955 Broker License ID

COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE

N 38°8'37" W 76° 38'7"
Tired of paying those very expensive slip rentals, and being way out on the dock ?
Consider buying **White Point Creek Marina**, where you have 50+ Slips, 35 Covered and a Railway Shop that can accommodate a boat up to 100 feet – **3.9M Buy or Lease**
whitepointcreek@gmail.com | 804-466-0828

RV Parks, Arizona. Two Parks one owner. Both properties have been fully renovated. 172 Sites. Mesa 92 sites (8 Cap) Casa Grande 80 Sites (7.8 Cap) $12.5 M. Cash
Cooper Cardinal LLC
Jeffrey Ferenz, Managing Director,
Call: 602-989-0923

NOTICE OF SALE

BRAUN INTERNATIONAL AUCTION OF SHEET METAL FACILITY BY SECURED PARTY

AUCTION DATE: September 2, 2026

AUCTION TIME: 10:00 AM PT

Place: The auction will be conducted via ZOOM. Details can be found at the URL Auction site web address below.

Description of Items Being Sold: All right, title and interest of Weiss Sheet Metal Company ("Weiss") in and to the following described personal property assets:

(a) all accounts and all inventory whose sale, lease, or other disposition has given rise to accounts and have been returned to, or repossessed or stopped in transit by, such grantor; (b) all chattel paper, instruments, documents and general intangibles (including all intellectual property, software, franchises, customer lists, tax refund claims, claims against carriers and shippers, guarantee claims, contract rights, payment intangibles, supporting obligations, security interests, security deposits and rights to indemnification); (c) all goods including equipment, fixtures and inventory; (d) all investment property; (e) all deposit accounts, bank accounts and all deposits and cash; (f) all letter-of-credit rights; (g) all commercial tort claims; (h) any other property of now or hereafter in the possession, custody, or control of the secured party or any agent or any affiliate of the secured party or any participant with secured party in the loan made pursuant to the loan agreement, for any purpose (whether for safekeeping, deposit, collection, custody, pledge, transmission or otherwise); and (i) all additions and accessions to, substitutions for, and replacements, products and proceeds of the foregoing property, including proceeds of all insurance policies insuring the foregoing property, and all of such grantor's books and records relating to any of the foregoing and to such grantor's business.

For QUALIFIED BIDDERS who will not be able to participate via ZOOM, a telephone connection will be available. For all others, a listen only link will be provided.

More information regarding the Auction can be found at the Braunco Auction URL weblink address:

www.braunco.com/weiss

IMPORTANT NOTICE: In order to access the On-Line Web Based Data Room with details of the virtual public auction to take place via ZOOM, including the access to the ZOOM site place of sale, description of items to be sold, and Terms of Sale, you must first download/print the Confidentiality Agreement from the above Braunco Auction URL weblink address and thereafter fill in the prospective bidder company name, name and title of the person signing, date, sign, scan and return the completed Confidentiality Agreement to Braunco, Inc. Please email the completed confidentiality agreement to info@braunco.com.

Once you have returned the completed Confidentiality Agreement, you will be given access to the On Line Web Based Data Room and Terms of Sale detailing how to become a Qualified Bidder at the virtual public auction to be conducted via ZOOM.

You must comply with the instructions to become a Qualified Bidder in order to bid at the Auction via ZOOM. Only Qualified Bidders will be given access information to participate in or view the Auction Sale via ZOOM. Your failure to timely satisfy all the conditions to become a Qualified Bidder means you will not be able to bid at the virtual Auction to be conducted via ZOOM.

CONTACT BRAUN INTERNATIONAL AT 310 798 3123 X 100. bond LPM7664049. Braunco.com

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.
SHOWROOM
ADVERTISE TODAY
(800) 366-3975
sales.showroom@wsj.com
For more information visit:
wsj.com/classifieds



© 2026 Dow Jones & Company, Inc.
All Rights Reserved.

NOTICE OF SALE

NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 PUBLIC SALE BY SECURED PARTY

On September 11, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. Pacific Time, via videoconference, a public sale (the "Public Sale") will be conducted of substantially all assets constituting collateral (the "Sale Assets") of Debtor (defined below), in accordance with Section 9-610 of the New York Uniform Commercial Code and other applicable law. Access details will be provided to qualified bidders.

The debtor and certain of its subsidiaries (collectively, "Debtor") is a healthcare data analytics and integration business that provides software, equipment, and related services for surgical and perioperative use. Its installed base of devices and equipment at hospital sites captures and supplies the data underlying these scalable, higher-margin services. The business serves an established customer base and derives revenue from recurring subscriptions, service arrangements, and equipment-related offerings.

The Public Sale is being conducted by the secured party ("Secured Party") to enforce its rights in the collateral under a secured term loan facility ("Facility"). Debtor granted Secured Party a security interest in the Sale Assets to secure the secured obligations under the Facility. The secured obligations outstanding as of the Public Sale date will be not less than $55,000,000.

The Sale Assets consist primarily of substantially all assets of Debtor, including inventory, intellectual property and other general intangibles and other personal property collateral. Additional information will be made available upon request to qualified bidders, subject to customary non-disclosure agreements and bid procedures.

The Sale Assets may be sold in one or more lots, on an "AS IS, WHERE IS" basis, with all faults and without recourse or any representation or warranty, express or implied, as to the Sale Assets, including as to title, value, condition, merchantability or fitness. The Public Sale will be for cash, credit against outstanding indebtedness under the Facility, or other consideration subject to Secured Party's prior approval in Secured Party's discretion, and subject to commercially reasonable bid procedures and other requirements, which will be available upon request. Interested parties must submit a bid, proposed asset purchase agreement, and proof of ability to fund no later than September 9, 2026, at 2 p.m. Pacific Time (the "Bid Deadline"). Secured Party intends to sell the Sale Assets to the qualified bidder submitting the highest or otherwise best bid, as determined according to Secured Party's valuation, at the Public Sale. Secured Party reserves the right to credit bid for some or all of the Sale Assets and to modify the terms, conditions, or procedures for the Public Sale, withdraw all or any portion of the Sale Assets, or continue the Public Sale to a future date for any reason.

Any inquiries regarding the Public Sale or the Sale Assets should be directed to the sale agent hlipton@rockcreekfa.com by the Bid Deadline.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.
THE MARKETPLACE
ADVERTISE TODAY
(800) 366-3975
For more information visit:
wsj.com/classifieds



© 2026 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved. DOW JONES

NEW HIGHS AND LOWS

The following explanations apply to the New York Stock Exchange, NYSE Arca, NYSE American and Nasdaq Stock Market stocks that hit a new 52-week intraday high or low in the latest session. **% CHG**-Daily percentage change from the previous trading session.

Tuesday, August 25, 2026

Highs

Stock	Sym	52-Wk Hi/Lo	% Chg
AMCGlobalMedia	AMCX	12.93	3.5
ARCGroupAcqnlA	ARCL	10.01	-0.1
AbCelleraBio	ABCL	12.50	17.8
AcadianAsset	AAMI	94.11	1.7
AclarisTherap	ACRS	6.60	3.6
ActivateEnergy	AEAQ	10.10	0.5
AdamasPfdD	ADAMN	25.05	0.2
AdaptiveBiotech	ADPT	26.49	2.7
AeonAcqnl	AESPU	10.20	0.5
AeonAcqnl	AESP	9.97	0.1
AlgonquinNt2079	AQNB	26.28	0.2
AltoNeurosci	ANRO	37.48	0.2
AmerIntegrityIns	AII	26.61	0.7
AmerStWater	AWR	91.72	-0.9
Amgen	AMGN	447.03	-0.4
Andersen	ANDG	52.31	4.4
ApertureAC	APUR	9.99	0.1
ArtTechAcqn	ARTC	10.00	0.3
AtegritySpecIns	ASIC	26.93	2.2
AvitaMedical	RCEL	10.77	6.0
BBB Foods	TBBB	51.62	0.2
BHAVAcqn	BHAV	10.03	0.1
BHP Group	BHP	98.71	1.6
BW LPG	BWLP	25.48	0.8
BankNovaScotia	BNS	93.44	7.2
Biodesix	BDSX	30.00	10.6
Biogen	BIIB	222.85	1.2
Bio-RadLab A	BIO	390.83	2.2
BitMinelmPfdA	BMNP	95.00	0.9
BleichroederII	BBCQ	11.43	-1.9
BleichroederIII	BCCQ	10.12	1.6
BleichroederWt	BCCQW	1.24	146.6
BlossomHill	BLSM	18.80	14.9
BreezeAcqnll	BREZ	10.01	0.6
BrinkerIntl	EAT	254.99	-2.1
CalRedwoodA	CRAQ	10.37	0.4
CandelTherap	CADL	13.95	5.8
CardiolTherap	CRDL	2.02	7.5
CareDx	CDNA	51.13	6.9
CarMax	KMX	64.59	2.3
CharlesRiverLabs	CRL	300.59	-0.3
ChathamLodging	CLDT	13.89	...
ChinaAutoSys	CAAS	5.45	12.3
CitigroupPfdII	CpR	25.94	0.6
ClimbBio	CLYM	18.33	8.8
Coca-Cola Femsa	KOF	117.01	1.8
ContineumTherap	CTNM	17.51	2.5
CorceptTherap	CORT	126.38	0.3
CrineticsPharm	CRNX	84.86	0.1
Cronos	CRON	3.56	2.9
CullinanTherap	CGEM	23.06	5.2
CumberlandPharm	CPIX	8.70	11.0
Cybin	HELP	14.35	7.4
Danaos	DAC	152.98	1.4
DivrsHlthcrNts42	DHCNI	18.77	-0.6
DrugsMadeAmII	DMII	10.21	...
ECB Bancorp	ECBK	20.99	0.2
EroCopper	ERO	40.54	4.8
EthosTech	LIFE	38.94	5.0
EuroDry	EDRY	53.93	3.8
Evolus	EOLS	9.12	2.2
FirstCash	FCFS	238.93	-2.9
Flanigans	BDL	51.99	0.4
FreeportMcM	FCX	79.95	2.7
FutureMoney	FMAC	10.07	0.1
FutureCorpIWt	FTRA.WS	1.25	-39.6
GSRIVAcqn	GSRF	10.22	0.1
GenerateBiomed	GENB	22.67	15.0
GlobalSelfStorage	SELF	5.75	-0.4
GlobalShipLease	GSL	45.45	1.5
GrupoCibest	CIB	103.46	1.4
HalozymeTherap	HALO	109.55	0.6
HarvardAveA	HAVA	10.20	0.1
Heartflow	HTFL	51.19	-0.6
HyperliquidStrat	PURR	12.10	11.6
IDEAYA Bio	IDYA	42.68	6.1
IDT	IDT	69.80	1.6
Invesco	IVZ	32.99	0.8
Illumina	ILMN	226.84	0.8
ImmixBiopharma	IMMX	15.10	6.3
InteractiveBrkrs	IBKR	98.75	5.5
InvestorsTitle	ITIC	303.48	2.0
JABAcqnlA	JAB	9.99	...
JazzPharm	JAZZ	266.38	2.3
HancockDivIncm	HEQ	11.92	0.8
Kaspi.kz	KSPI	108.99	2.2
KY FirstFedBncp	KFFB	5.83	4.2
KronosWorldwide	KRO	9.17	2.3
KuraOncology	KURA	13.90	9.6
LB Pharm	LBRX	50.16	1.2
LGL Group	LGL	7.88	3.0
LaunchTwoAcqnA	LPBB	10.81	0.1
M&TBkPfdL	MTBpL	25.46	0.6
MakoMining	MAKO	11.10	1.2
Maplebear	CART	52.05	-0.5
MaravaiLifeSci	MRVI	9.06	6.8
MatchGroup	MTCH	42.49	1.1
MedallionFinl	MFIN	11.98	2.8
Merck	MRK	156.92	3.8
MesaLabs	MLAB	128.69	2.4
MeshflowAcqn	MESH	10.07	...
MetallaRoyalty	MTA	11.60	0.4
MideraFood	MFP	51.88	5.6
MuzeroAcqn	MUZE	10.04	0.5
NIQGlbIntel	NIQ	19.37	0.3
NMP Acqn	NMP	10.36	...
Natera	NTRA	337.12	2.7
NatlHlthcrPfdA	NHPAP	25.23	...
NatlPrestoInds	NPK	158.17	1.1
NaviosMaritime	NMM	91.96	1.3
Neutron	LIME	43.14	2.7
NewPacificMetals	NEWP	7.08	4.1
Newmont	NEM	135.29	2.5
Omeros	OMER	19.65	-0.2
OmniAb	OABI	4.78	-1.1
OramedPharm	ORMP	5.25	8.1
OrionEnergySys	OESX	25.70	19.2
OspreyAcqnIII	OSPRU	10.46	0.1
OxfordLaneNts2027	OXLCZ	25.02	0.2
ParkHotels	PK	16.20	2.0
Paysign	PAYS	14.43	3.6
PeaceAcqn	PECE	10.01	0.5
PelicanAcqnIIA	PLCI	9.89	0.2
PlainsGP	PAGP	27.48	-0.4
Precigen	PGEN	7.55	1.5
PrivateBncpAmerica	PBAM	89.10	...
ProvidentFin	PROV	18.50	0.2
PulseBiosciences	PLSE	50.90	-0.3
Pyrophyte II A	PAII	10.30	0.1
RFAcqnIIUn	RFAIU	52.94	1.7
RUM Group	RUM	10.60	9.3
RapportTherap	RAPP	51.38	3.7
Reading A	RDI	1.97	6.0
RenovoRx	RNXT	1.56	13.6
Replimune	REPL	15.89	7.4
RsrchAllianceIVA	RACD	13.00	4.8
RhinebeckBncp	RBKB	13.00	-0.9
Roku	ROKU	159.89	1.0
RoyaltyPharma	RPRX	62.46	1.2
SCIIAcqnA	SCII	10.13	0.3
SSR Mining	SSRM	39.42	1.6
SachemCapPfdA	SACHpA	22.26	0.6
SafeBulkers	SB	8.76	0.6
ScholarRock	SRRK	59.48	0.1
SensientTech	SXT	138.52	-0.4
Sinda	SIND	18.95	3.3
SolariusCapA	SOCA	10.35	0.1
Solventum	SOLV	92.05	0.4
SophiaGenetics	SOPH	8.85	2.4
SPACSphereAcqn	SSACU	10.31	-0.4
StandardNuclear	STDN	14.90	16.8
StarBulkCarriers	SBLK	31.25	1.3
StoneBridgeAcqnII	APAC	10.24	0.1
SunshineSilver	SSMR	19.61	-1.8
TWFG	TWFG	31.30	2.9
Team	TISI	24.64	4.9
TeckResourcesB	TECK	71.63	2.0
10xGenomics	TXG	66.94	1.4
TevaPharm	TEVA	38.11	3.2
ThermoFisher	TMO	647.00	-0.1
TrailblazerAcqnA	BLZR	10.20	0.2
TravereTherap	TVTX	67.34	2.7
TrekorMetals	TGB	9.61	1.8
TwistBiosci	TWST	154.96	7.5
UMH Prop	UMH	16.77	-0.4
USCB Financial	USCB	23.89	-0.1
Usio	USIO	3.00	2.8
UtzBrands	UTZ	14.27	0.3
Valhi	VHI	18.44	-0.6
VertexPharm	VRTX	555.69	1.0
Visa	V	384.20	0.5
Vogenx	VOGX	35.50	2.6
WestinAcqn	WSTN	10.20	0.4
WillametteValIPfA	WVVIP	14.99	25.7
WisdomTree	WT	24.22	1.2
X3Acqn	XCBE	10.00	0.1
Xencor	XNCR	30.61	1.1
Zymeworks	ZYME	30.50	-4.5

Lows

Stock	Sym	52-Wk Hi/Lo	% Chg
ABVC Bio	ABVC	0.78	-4.8
ARCGroupAcqnlWt	ARCLW	0.05	-33.1
ARKRestaurants	ARKR	4.81	-11.9
abrdnIncmPfdA	ACPpA	18.87	-0.5
AddexTherap	ADXN	3.73	-3.7
AethlonMedical	AEMD	2.33	-9.1
AlaunosTherap	TCRT	1.69	4.1
AltisourcePtfWt	ASPSW	0.19	29.0
AmerStratInvt	NYC	6.25	-1.2
Amrize	AMRZ	43.69	-2.1
ApartmtInv	AIV	2.57	-0.8
AppliedAerospace	AADX	14.02	-0.8
AptevoTherap	APVO	2.30	2.1
Aptiv	APTV	46.08	-1.5
ArborRealtyPfdE	ABRpE	15.45	-0.7
ArcherAviationWt	ACHR.WS	0.01	27.5
AtlanticAmerican	AAME	1.27	-0.8
Bio-key	BKYI	2.88	1.7
BWX Tech	BWXT	147.74	0.1
BeyondAir	XAIR	4.37	1.4
BigBear.aiWt	BBAI.WS	0.12	-1.7
BingEx	FLX	1.77	-3.2
BioXcelTherap	BTAI	0.71	-2.4
BlackTitan	BTTC	0.51	-7.9
BoydGroupServices	BGSI	84.30	-1.6
Braskem	BAK	1.62	-11.4
CDT Equity	CDT	1.92	-17.7
CadrenalTherap	CVKD	1.50	-2.5
Capri	CPRI	13.21	-2.8
comScore	SCOR	4.60	1.6
ContextTherap	CNTX	0.40	-6.4
DecoyTherap	DCOY	2.93	-4.2
DeepFission	FISN	6.78	-2.8
Dick's	DKS	124.00	-30.7
DocGo	DCGO	0.35	0.2
EIDP$3.50Pfd	CTApA	52.10	0.4
EHang	EH	4.57	-7.1
EntergyTX PfdA	ETIp	22.39	-3.9
Evotec	EVO	1.87	...
FTC Solar	FTCI	1.99	-6.6
FaradayFuture	FFAI	2.65	-8.0
FedExFreight	FDXF	128.71	-1.9
FifthThirdPfdB	FITBpA	21.90	-1.0
FingerMotion	FNGR	0.16	-12.5
FirstBreach	FBDT	1.26	-30.2
FlashSports&Media	FLZH	0.09	-56.5
Founder	FGL	0.12	-23.8
FreightTech	FRGT	1.47	-5.6
GDEV Wt	GDEVW	0.00	-86.2

Continued on Page B10

AUCTION RESULTS

Here are the results of Tuesday's Treasury auctions. All bids are awarded at a single price at the market-clearing yield. Rates are determined by the difference between that price and the face value.

SIX-WEEK BILLS

Applications	$262,159,612,600
Accepted bids	$99,279,272,200
" noncompetitively	$1,371,814,800
" foreign noncompetitively	$2,000,000,000
Auction price (rate)	99.574167 (3.650%)
Coupon equivalent	3.717%
Bids at clearing yield accepted	27.88%
Cusip number	912797UJ4

The bills, dated Aug. 27, 2026, mature on Oct. 8, 2026.

TWO-YEAR NOTES

Applications	$188,193,782,100
Accepted bids	$77,870,538,900
" noncompetitively	$737,951,900
" foreign noncompetitively	$155,000,000
Auction price (rate)	99.849966 (4.204%)
Interest rate	4.125%
Bids at clearing yield accepted	85.68%
Cusip number	91282CRH6

The notes, dated Aug. 31, 2026, mature on Aug. 31, 2028.

BANKRATE.COM® MMA, Savings and CDs

Average Yields of Major Banks

Tuesday, August 25, 2026

Type	MMA	1-MO	2-MO	3-MO	6-MO	1-YR	2-YR	2.5YR	5YR
National average									
Savings	0.44	0.92	1.08	1.38	1.88	2.03	1.81	1.60	1.74
Jumbo	1.14	0.51	0.50	1.44	1.68	2.00	1.81	1.50	1.68
Weekly change									
Savings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Jumbo	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00

Consumer Savings Rates

Below are the top federally insured offers available nationwide according to Bankrate.com's weekly survey of highest yields. For latest offers and reviews of these financial institutions, please visit bankrate.com/banking/reviews. Information is believed to be reliable, but not guaranteed.

High yield savings

Bank Phone number	Minimum	Yield (%)
Money market account		
Newtek Bank 888-681-7238	$0	4.20
PiBank 877-678-0888	$0	4.10
Peak Bank 866-484-5705	$100	4.01
One-month CD		
EagleBank 301-986-1800	$1,000	3.65
FinWise Bank 801-545-6000	$500	2.68
Lone Star Bank 713-358-9400	$1,000	0.20
Two-month CD		
State Bank of India California 877-707-1995	$1,000	3.75
FinWise Bank 801-545-6000	$500	2.68
Lone Star Bank 713-358-9400	$1,000	0.20
Three-month CD		
Northern Bank Direct 844-348-8996	$500	4.00
WebBank 844-994-2265	$2,500	3.96
Merrick Bank 866-638-6851	$25,000	3.96

Bank Phone number	Minimum	Yield (%)
Six-month CD		
Quorum Federal Credit Union 800-874-5544	$100	4.30
EagleBank 301-986-1800	$1,000	4.20
LendingClub Bank 800-242-0272	$500	4.20
One-year CD		
Quorum Federal Credit Union 800-874-5544	$100	4.35
EagleBank 301-986-1800	$1,000	4.35
CFG Bank 888-205-8388	$500	4.30
Two-year CD		
Popular Direct 800-274-5696	$10,000	4.45
LendingClub Bank 800-242-0272	$500	4.40
Sallie Mae Bank 877-346-2756	$2,500	4.35
Five-year CD		
Popular Direct 800-274-5696	$10,000	4.50
Sallie Mae Bank 877-346-2756	$2,500	4.40
BTG Pactual Bank 212-652-7200	$500	4.40

High yield jumbos - Minimum is $100,000

Money market account		
Credit One Bank, NA 877-825-3242	$100,000	4.00
EverBank 888-882-EVER	$100,000	3.80
BankFive 508-679-8551	$100,000	3.65
One-month CD		
Bank of Hope 855-325-2226	$100,000	0.20
Lone Star Bank 713-358-9400	$100,000	0.20
USAA Federal Savings Bank 800-531-8722	$100,000	0.05
Two-month CD		
Lone Star Bank 713-358-9400	$100,000	0.20
Applied Bank 888-839-7952	$100,000	0.05
Citizens Trust Bank 888-214-3099	$100,000	0.01
Three-month CD		
Luana Savings Bank 800-666-2012	$100,000	3.80
Washington Savings Bank 978-458-7999	$100,000	3.60
Lone Star Bank 713-358-9400	$100,000	2.80

Six-month CD		
Quorum Federal Credit Union 800-874-5544	$100,000	4.30
Credit One Bank, NA 877-825-3242	$100,000	4.25
Luana Savings Bank 800-666-2012	$100,000	4.09
One-year CD		
Quorum Federal Credit Union 800-874-5544	$100,000	4.30
Credit One Bank, NA 877-825-3242	$100,000	4.25
Luana Savings Bank 800-666-2012	$100,000	4.09
Two-year CD		
Credit One Bank, NA 877-825-3242	$100,000	4.30
E*Trade 800-387-2331	$100,000	4.30
Luana Savings Bank 800-666-2012	$100,000	4.19
Five-year CD		
E*Trade 800-387-2331	$100,000	4.35
Credit One Bank, NA 877-825-3242	$100,000	4.15
Quorum Federal Credit Union 800-874-5544	$100,000	4.15

Notes: Accounts are federally insured up to $250,000 per person. Yields are based on method of compounding and rate stated for the lowest required opening deposit to earn interest. CD figures are for fixed rates only. MMA: Allows six (6) third-party transfers per month, three (3) of which may be checks. Rates are subject to change.

Source: Bankrate.com, a publication of Bankrate, Inc., Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410
Internet: www.bankrate.com

Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP Announces Notice of Pendency and Proposed Settlement Involving All Persons and Entities Who Purchased or Otherwise Acquired Ordinary Shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. From February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, Inclusive

NEWS PROVIDED BY
JND Legal Administration ➞
Aug 26, 2026, 09:26 ET

SEATTLE, Aug. 26, 2026 /PRNewswire/ -- /**JND Legal Administration**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

SUMMARY NOTICE OF (I) PENDENCY OF CLASS ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT; (II) SETTLEMENT HEARING; AND (III) MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

TO: All persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit") (i) from February 17, 2021 through July 5, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period"), and/or (ii) pursuant and/or traceable to Kornit's secondary offering of ordinary shares in November 2021 (the

"Settlement Class")[1]

PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. YOUR RIGHTS WILL BE AFFECTED BY A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT PENDING IN THIS COURT.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and an Order of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (the "Court"), that the above-captioned securities class action (the "Action") is pending in the Court.

YOU ARE ALSO NOTIFIED that Lead Plaintiffs Genesee County Employees' Retirement System, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD, and Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. ("Lead Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, have reached a proposed settlement of the Action for **$19,500,000** in cash (the "Settlement"). If approved, the Settlement will resolve all claims in the Action.

The Action involves allegations that Kornit and certain of its senior officers violated the federal securities laws. The Complaint alleges, among other things, that during the Class Period, Kornit, and its Chief Executive Officer Ronen Samuel and its Chief Financial Officer Alon Rozner (collectively, the "Individual Defendants") made material misrepresentations and omissions related to Kornit's business, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), and that the Individual Defendants controlled Kornit when the misstatements were made, in violation of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act.[2] Defendants expressly deny that Lead Plaintiffs have asserted any valid claims as to any of them, and expressly deny any and all allegations of fault, liability, wrongdoing, or damages whatsoever. Issues and defenses at issue in the Action include, among others, (i) whether Defendants made materially false statements or omissions; (ii) whether Defendants made the statements with the required state of mind; (iii) whether the alleged misstatements caused class members' losses; and (iv) the amount of damages, if any.

A hearing will be held on **November 18, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time**, before the Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, either in person in Courtroom 4A of the Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse, 50 Walnut Street, Newark, NJ 07101, or by telephone or videoconference (in the discretion of the Court), to determine: (i) whether the proposed Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate; (ii) whether, for purposes of the proposed Settlement only, the Action should be certified as a class action on behalf of the Settlement Class, Lead Plaintiffs should be certified as the Class Representatives for the Settlement Class, and Lead Counsel should be appointed as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class; (iii) whether the Action should be dismissed with prejudice against Defendants, and the Releases specified and described in the Stipulation (and in the Notice) should be granted; (iv) whether the proposed Plan of Allocation should be approved as fair and reasonable; and (v) whether Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and

expenses should be approved. If you plan to attend the hearing, you should check the Settlement website, **www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com**, to confirm that no change to the date and/or time of the hearing has been made.

If you are a member of the Settlement Class, your rights will be affected by the pending Action and the Settlement, and you may be entitled to share in the Net Settlement Fund. This notice provides only a summary of the information contained in the full Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses (the "Notice"). You may obtain copies of the Notice and Claim Form on the Settlement Website, **www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com**; by contacting the Claims Administrator at: *Kornit Securities Litigation*, c/o JND Legal Administration, P.O. Box 91050, Seattle, WA 98111; by calling toll free (855) 961-0955; or by emailing info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com.

If you are a member of the Settlement Class, in order to be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement, you must submit a Claim Form ***postmarked*** **(if mailed) or online by no later than December 10, 2026**. If you are a Settlement Class Member and do not submit a proper Claim Form, you will not be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement, but you will nevertheless be bound by any judgments or orders entered by the Court in the Action.

If you are a member of the Settlement Class and wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you must submit a request for exclusion such that it is ***received*** **no later than October 28, 2026**, in accordance with the instructions set forth in the Notice. If you properly exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you will not be bound by any judgments or orders entered by the Court in the Action and you will not be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement.

Any objections to the proposed Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses must be filed with the Court and delivered to Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel such that they are ***received*** **no later than October 28, 2026**, in accordance with the instructions set forth in the Notice.

Please do not contact the Court, the Office of the Clerk of the Court, Defendants, or their counsel regarding this notice. All questions about this notice, the proposed Settlement, or your eligibility to participate in the Settlement should be directed to the Claims Administrator or Lead Counsel.

Requests for the Notice and Claim Form should be made to:

Kornit Securities Litigation
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box 91050

Seattle, WA 98111

(855) 961-0955
info@KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com
www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com

Inquiries, other than requests for the Notice and Claim Form, should be made to Lead Counsel:

James A. Harrod
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas, 44th Floor
New York, NY 10020
(800) 380-8496
settlements@blbglaw.com

By Order of the Court

[1] Certain persons and entities are excluded from the Settlement Class by definition, as set forth in the full Notice of (I) Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement; (II) Settlement Hearing; and (III) Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses (the "Notice"), available at **www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com**.

[2] Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meaning as in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 ("Stipulation"). The Stipulation can be viewed and/or obtained at **www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com**.

SOURCE JND Legal Administration

21%

more press release
views with

Request a Demo

Exhibit 5

EXHIBIT 5

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

SUMMARY OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL'S HOURS, LODESTAR, AND EXPENSES

Exhibit	FIRM	HOURS	LODESTAR	EXPENSES
5A	Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP	4,178.75	$3,733,837.50	$134,822.05
5B	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	57.90	$48,227.50	$1,873.17
	TOTAL:	**4,236.65**	**$3,782,065.00**	**$136,695.22**

Exhibit 5A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF JAMES A. HARROD IN SUPPORT OF LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES, ON BEHALF OF BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP

I, James A. Harrod, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a partner in the law firm of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP ("BLB&G"). I submit this declaration in support of Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees in connection with services rendered in the above-captioned class action (the "Action") as well as for payment of Litigation Expenses incurred by my firm in connection with the Action.[1] Unless otherwise stated, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and, if called upon, could and would testify thereto.

2. My firm, as Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class, was involved in all aspects of the prosecution and resolution of the Action, as set

[1] Unless otherwise defined in this Declaration, all capitalized terms have the meanings set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-2) (the "Stipulation").

forth in the Declaration of James A. Harrod in Support of (I) Lead Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Settlement and Plan of Allocation, and (II) Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses (the "Harrod Decl.").

3. The schedule attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a detailed summary of the amount of time spent by each BLB&G attorney and professional support staff employee who devoted ten (10) or more hours to the Action from its inception through and including July 2, 2026, and the lodestar calculation for those individuals based on their current hourly rates. For personnel who are no longer employed by my firm, the lodestar calculation is based upon the hourly rates for such personnel in their final year of employment with my firm. The schedule was prepared from contemporaneous daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by BLB&G. All time expended in preparing this application for fees and expenses has been excluded.

4. The number of hours expended by BLB&G in the Action, from inception through July 2, 2026, as reflected in Exhibit 1, is 4,178.75. The lodestar for my firm, as reflected in Exhibit 1, is $3,733,837.50.

5. The hourly rates for the BLB&G attorneys and professional support staff employees included in Exhibit 1 are their standard current rates and are the same as, or comparable to, the rates submitted by my firm and accepted by courts for lodestar cross-checks in other class action fee applications in this Circuit and

elsewhere. *See, e.g.*, *In re Celgene Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 2:18-cv-04772 (MEF) (JBC) (D.N.J. May 8, 2026), Dkt. No. 495 (approving fee based on lodestar cross-check using BLB&G's current rates); *In re AdaptHealth Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 2:23-cv-04104-MRP (E.D. Pa. June 10, 2026), Dkt. No. 104 (same); *In re Doximity, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2026 WL 1697594, at *1-2 (N.D. Cal. June 11, 2026) (same); *Genesee Cnty. Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Driven Brands Holdings Inc.*, No. 3:23-cv-00895-MOC-DCK (W.D.N.C. July 30, 2026), Dkt. No. 88 (same); *see also In re EQT Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Case No.: 2:19-cv-00754-RJC (W.D. Pa. Nov. 4, 2025), Dkt. No. 566 (approving fee based on lodestar cross-check using BLB&G's 2025 rates); *In re Turquoise Hill Resources, Ltd. Sec. Litig.*, No. 1:20-cv-8585-LJL (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 23, 2025), Dkt. No. 493 (same).

6. My firm's rates are set based on periodic analysis of rates used by firms performing comparable work and that have been approved by courts. Different timekeepers within the same employment category (e.g., Partners, Associates, Paralegals, etc.) may have different rates based on a variety of factors, including years of practice, years at the firm, year in the current position (e.g., years as a Partner), relevant experience, relative expertise, and the rates of similarly experienced peers at our firm or other firms.

7. BLB&G reviewed its time and expense records to prepare this Declaration. The purpose of this review was to confirm both the accuracy of the

time entries and expenses and the necessity for, and reasonableness of, the time and expenses committed to the litigation. As a result of this review, reductions were made to both time and expenses in the exercise of billing judgment. I believe that the time reflected in the firm's lodestar calculation and the expenses for which payment is sought as stated in this Declaration are reasonable in amount and were necessary for the effective and efficient prosecution and resolution of the litigation.

8. As set forth in Exhibit 2 hereto, BLB&G is seeking payment for $134,822.05 in expenses incurred in connection with the prosecution and resolution of the Action. Expense items are reported separately and are not duplicated in my firm's hourly rates. The following is additional information regarding certain of these expenses:

(a) **Experts & Consultants** ($41,665.85). As detailed in the Harrod Declaration, Lead Counsel retained experts to assist at various stages of the litigation. The following expert expenses were incurred by Lead Counsel:

Econic Partners US LLC ($38,478.35). Dr. Eugene Orlov of Econic Partners was Lead Plaintiffs' principal expert on financial economics issues. Lead Counsel worked with Dr. Orlov and his team concerning loss causation and damages issues, including concerning the impact of Defendants' alleged misstatements and omissions on the

price of Kornit's ordinary shares and the damages suffered by Kornit shareholders. Lead Plaintiffs consulted with Dr. Orlov in connection with settlement negotiations, and in preparing the mediation briefing. After the Settlement was reached, Lead Counsel worked with Dr. Orlov and his team in developing the proposed Plan of Allocation.

Forensic Economics, Inc. ($3,187.50). BLB&G also consulted with Forensic Economics, Inc. as a consulting expert on financial economics issues, including analysis of loss causation and damages issues, earlier in the Action.

(b) **Mediation Fees** ($25,638.13). The Parties retained Jed Melnick of JAMS, an experienced mediator of securities class actions and other complex litigation, to assist with settlement negotiations in the Action, including a formal mediation session on April 7, 2026 and the following discussions. The mediation expenses were split between the Parties and BLB&G paid $25,638.13 of the total amount on behalf of Lead Plaintiffs.

(c) **Online Factual Research** ($16,644.23) and **Online Legal Research** ($38,744.01). The charges reflected are for out-of-pocket payments to vendors such as Westlaw, Lexis/Nexis, Refinitiv, Bureau of National Affairs, Court Alert, and PACER for research done in connection with this litigation. These resources were used to obtain access to court

filings, to conduct legal research and cite-checking of briefs, and to obtain factual information regarding the claims asserted. These expenses represent the actual expenses incurred by BLB&G for use of these services in connection with this litigation. There are no administrative charges included in these figures. Online research is billed to each case based on actual usage at a charge set by the vendor. When BLB&G utilizes online services provided by a vendor with a flat-rate contract, access to the service is by a billing code entered for the specific case being litigated. At the end of each billing period, BLB&G's costs for such services are allocated to specific cases based on the percentage of use in connection with that specific case in the billing period.

(d) **Independent Witness Counsel and Witness Expenses** ($8,540.00). Lead Counsel incurred $5,740.00 in attorneys' fees for the retention of independent counsel, Slarskey LLC, to represent a former Kornit employee that Lead Counsel had contacted during its investigation and who wished to be represented by independent counsel. Similar expenses have routinely been approved by courts. *See, e.g.*, *In re Celgene Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 2:18-cv-04772 (MEF) (JBC) (D.N.J. May 8, 2026), Dkt. No. 495 (awarding expenses reimbursing class counsel for the costs of paying for independent counsel for non-party witnesses); *Allegheny Cnty. Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Energy Transfer LP*, Case No. 2:20-cv-00200-GAM (E.D. Pa. Oct. 8,

2025), Dkt. No. 285 (same); *In re Grand Canyon Educ., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 20-639-JHL-CJB (D. Del. Aug. 22, 2024), Dkt. No. 155 (same). This category also includes $2,800 paid to that former Kornit employee in reimbursement for the costs of his time spent in reviewing and gathering documents and preparing for potential testimony.

(e) **Working Meals** ($587.55). In-office working meals are capped at $25 per person for lunch and $40 per person for dinner.

9. The expenses incurred by BLB&G in the Action are reflected on the books and records of my firm. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred. I believe these expenses were reasonable and expended for the benefit of the Settlement Class in the Action.

10. With respect to the standing of my firm, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a firm resume, which includes information about my firm and biographical information concerning the firm's attorneys who worked on this matter.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing facts are true and correct. Executed on October 14, 2026.

James A. Harrod

EXHIBIT 1

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP

TIME REPORT

Inception through and including July 2, 2026

NAME	HOURS	HOURLY RATE	LODESTAR
Partners			
Scott Foglietta	34.00	$1,500	$51,000.00
James A. Harrod	779.50	$1,600	$1,247,200.00
Avi Josefson	88.00	$1,700	$149,600.00
Senior Counsel			
Alec Coquin	716.50	$1,100	$788,150.00
David L. Duncan	31.50	$1,100	$34,650.00
Associates			
Girolamo Brunetto	51.75	$875	$45,281.25
Mathews de Carvalho	607.75	$875	$531,781.25
Andrea Dorado	47.50	$425	$20,187.50
Julissa Ramirez	242.75	$500	$121,375.00
Director of Investor Services			
Adam Weinschel	50.50	$650	$32,825.00
Financial Analysts			
Nick DeFilippis	35.00	$700	$24,500.00
Tanjila Sultana	25.50	$550	$14,025.00
Investigators			
Amy Bitkower	81.75	$650	$53,137.50
Robin Barnier	663.00	$450	$298,350.00
Laura Marvelli	163.50	$500	$81,750.00
Jacob Foster	50.25	$400	$20,100.00

NAME	HOURS	HOURLY RATE	LODESTAR
Case Managers & Paralegals			
Cindy Bomzer-Stein	31.25	$450	$14,062.50
Khristine De Leon	47.50	$450	$21,375.00
Jeffrie Hausman	119.00	$400	$47,600.00
Matthew Mahady	52.00	$450	$23,400.00
Toby Saviano	122.00	$450	$54,900.00
Nathan Vickers	49.50	$325	$16,087.50
Gary Weston	13.25	$475	$6,293.75
Managing Clerk's Office			
Mahiri Buffong	36.00	$500	$18,000.00
Jessica Lacon	22.25	$450	$10,012.50
Janielle Lattimore	17.25	$475	$8,193.75
TOTALS:	**4,178.75**		**$3,733,837.50**

EXHIBIT 2

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP

EXPENSE REPORT

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
Court Fees	$717.00
Investigation	$170.00
Online Factual Research	$16,644.23
Online Legal Research	$38,744.01
Telephone	$191.78
Local Transportation	$892.50
Working Meals	$587.55
Court Reporting & Transcripts	$1,031.00
Experts & Consultants	$41,665.85
Independent Witness Counsel & Witness Expenses	$8,540.00
Mediation Fees	$25,638.13
TOTAL:	**$134,822.05**

EXHIBIT 3

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP

FIRM BIOGRAPHY

BLB&G Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP

Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP
Attorneys at Law

Firm Resume

Table of Contents

Firm Overview 3
More Top Securities Recoveries Than Any Other Firm 3
Giving Shareholders a Voice and Changing Business Practices for the Better 4
Practice Areas 5
Securities Fraud Litigation 5
Corporate Governance and Shareholder Rights 5
Distressed Debt and Bankruptcy 6
Commercial Litigation 6
Alternative Dispute Resolution 6
Feedback from the Courts 7
Significant Recoveries 8
Securities Fraud Litigation 8
Corporate Governance and Shareholders' Rights 17
Clients and Fees 21
In the Public Interest 22
Our Attorneys 23
Partners 23
Senior Counsel 29
Associates 30

Since our founding in 1983, Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP has obtained more than $40 billion in recoveries on behalf of investors. The firm has obtained some of the largest settlements ever agreed to by public companies related to securities fraud, including six of the 15 largest in history. Working with our clients, we have also used the litigation process to achieve precedent-setting reforms that have increased market transparency, held wrongdoers accountable, and improved corporate business practices in groundbreaking ways.

Firm Overview

Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP (BLB&G), a national law firm with offices located in New York, California, Delaware, Louisiana, and Illinois, prosecutes class and private actions on behalf of individual and institutional clients. The firm's litigation practice areas include securities class and direct actions in federal and state courts; corporate governance and shareholder rights litigation, including claims for breach of fiduciary duty and proxy violations; mergers and acquisitions and transactional litigation; alternative dispute resolution; and distressed debt and bankruptcy. We also handle, on behalf of major institutional clients and lenders, more general complex commercial litigation involving allegations of breach of contract, accountants' liability, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and negligence.

We are the nation's leading firm representing institutional investors in securities fraud class action litigation. The firm's institutional client base includes U.S. public pension funds the New York State Common Retirement Fund; the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS); the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association; the Chicago Municipal, Police and Labor Retirement Systems; the Teacher Retirement System of Texas; the Arkansas Teacher Retirement System; the Florida State Board of Administration; the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi; the New York State Teachers' Retirement System; the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System; the State Teachers Retirement System of Ohio; the Oregon Public Employees Retirement System; the Virginia Retirement System; the Louisiana School, State, Teachers and Municipal Police Retirement Systems; the Public School Teachers' Pension and Retirement Fund of Chicago; the New Jersey Division of Investment of the Department of the Treasury; TIAA-CREF and other private institutions; as well as numerous other public and Taft-Hartley pension entities. Our European client base includes APG; Aegon AM; ATP; Blue Sky Group; Hermes IM; Robeco; SEB; Handelsbanken; Nykredit; PGB; and PGGM, among others.

More Top Securities Recoveries Than Any Other Firm

Since its founding in 1983, BLB&G has prosecuted some of the most complex cases in history and obtained more than $40 billion on behalf of investors. The firm has negotiated and obtained many of the largest securities recoveries in history, including:

- *In re WorldCom, Inc. Securities Litigation – $6.19 billion recovery*
- *In re Cendant Corporation Securities Litigation – $3.3 billion recovery*
- *In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation – $2.43 billion recovery*

- *In re Allianz Global Investors U.S. Litigation – More than $2 billion recovered in a series of direct actions*
- *In re Nortel Networks Corporation Securities Litigation (Nortel II) – $1.07 billion recovery*
- *In re Merck & Co., Inc. Securities Litigation – $1.06 billion recovery*
- *In re McKesson HBOC, Inc. Securities Litigation – $1.05 billion recovery*
- *In re Wells Fargo & Company Securities Litigation – $1.00 billion recovery*

Based on our record of success, BLB&G has been at the top of the rankings by ISS Securities Class Action Services (ISS-SCAS), a leading industry research publication that provides independent and objective third-party analysis and statistics on securities-litigation law firms, since its inception. In its most recent report, *Top 100 U.S. Class Action Settlements of All-Time*, ISS-SCAS once again ranked BLB&G as the top firm in the field for the 14th year in a row. BLB&G has served as lead or co-lead counsel in 38 of the ISS-SCAS's top 100 U.S. securities-fraud settlements—significantly more than any other firm—and recovered over $27 billion for investors in those cases, nearly $9 billion more than any other plaintiffs' securities firm.

Giving Shareholders a Voice and Changing Business Practices for the Better

BLB&G was among the first law firms ever to obtain meaningful corporate governance reforms through litigation. In courts throughout the country, we prosecute shareholder class and derivative actions, asserting claims for breach of fiduciary duty and proxy violations wherever the conduct of corporate officers and/or directors, or M&A transactions, seeks to deprive shareholders of fair value, undermine shareholder voting rights, or allow management to profit at the expense of shareholders.

We have prosecuted seminal cases establishing precedent that has increased market transparency, held wrongdoers accountable, addressed issues in the boardroom and executive suite, challenged unfair deals, and improved corporate business practices in groundbreaking ways. We have confronted a variety of questionable, unethical, and proliferating corporate practices, setting new standards of director independence, restructuring board practices in the wake of persistent illegal conduct, challenging the improper use of defensive measures and deal protections for management's benefit, and confronting stock options backdating abuses and other self-dealing by executives.

Practice Areas

Securities Fraud Litigation

Securities fraud litigation is the cornerstone of the firm's litigation practice. Since its founding, the firm has had the distinction of having tried and prosecuted many of the most high-profile securities fraud class actions in history, recovering billions of dollars and obtaining unprecedented corporate governance reforms on behalf of our clients. BLB&G continues to play a leading role in major securities litigation pending in federal and state courts, and the firm remains one of the nation's leaders in representing institutional investors in securities fraud class litigation.

The firm also pursues direct actions in securities fraud cases, when appropriate. By selectively opting out of certain securities class actions, we seek to resolve our clients' claims efficiently and for substantial multiples of what they might otherwise recover from related class action settlements.

Our attorneys have extensive experience in the laws that regulate the securities markets and in the disclosure requirements of corporations that issue publicly traded securities. Many also have accounting backgrounds. The group has access to state-of-the-art, online financial wire services and databases, which enable it to instantaneously investigate any potential securities fraud action involving a public company's debt and equity securities. Biographies for our attorneys can be accessed on the firm's website by clicking here.

Corporate Governance and Shareholder Rights

Our Corporate Governance and Shareholder Rights attorneys prosecute derivative actions, claims for breach of fiduciary duty, and proxy violations on behalf of individual and institutional investors in state and federal courts throughout the country. We have prosecuted actions challenging numerous highly publicized corporate transactions that violated fair process, fair price, and the applicability of the business judgment rule, and have also addressed issues of corporate waste, shareholder voting rights claims, and executive compensation.

Our attorneys have prosecuted numerous cases regarding the improper "backdating" of executive stock options that resulted in windfall undisclosed compensation to executives at the direct expense of shareholders—and returned hundreds of millions of dollars to company coffers. We also represent institutional clients in lawsuits seeking to enforce fiduciary obligations in connection with mergers and acquisitions and going-private transactions that deprive shareholders of fair value when participants buy companies from their public shareholders "on the cheap." Although enough shareholders accept the consideration offered for the transaction to close, many sophisticated investors correctly recognize and ultimately enjoy the increased returns to be obtained by pursuing appraisal rights and demanding that courts assign a "true value" to the shares taken private in these transactions.

Our attorneys are well versed in changing SEC rules and regulations on corporate governance issues and have a comprehensive understanding of a wide variety of corporate law transactions and both substantive and courtroom expertise in the specific legal areas involved. As a result of the firm's high-profile and widely recognized capabilities, our attorneys are increasingly in demand with institutional investors who are exercising a more assertive voice with corporate boards regarding corporate governance issues and the boards' accountability to shareholders.

Distressed Debt and Bankruptcy

BLB&G has obtained billions of dollars through litigation on behalf of bondholders and creditors of distressed and bankrupt companies, as well as through third-party litigation brought by bankruptcy trustees and creditors' committees against auditors, appraisers, lawyers, officers and directors, and other defendants who may have contributed to client losses. As counsel, we advise institutions and individuals nationwide in developing strategies and tactics to recover assets presumed lost as a result of bankruptcy. Our record in this practice area is characterized by extensive trial experience in addition to successful settlements.

Commercial Litigation

BLB&G provides contingency fee representation in complex business litigation and has obtained substantial recoveries on behalf of investors, corporations, bankruptcy trustees, creditor committees, and other business entities. We have faced down the most powerful and well-funded law firms and defendants in the country—and consistently prevailed. For example, on behalf of the bankruptcy trustee, the firm prosecuted *BFA Liquidation Trust v. Arthur Andersen*, arising from the largest nonprofit bankruptcy in U.S. history. After two years of litigation and a week-long trial, the firm obtained a $217 million recovery from Andersen for the Trust. Combined with other recoveries, the total amounted to more than 70 percent of the Trust's losses.

Having obtained huge recoveries with nominal out-of-pocket expenses and fees of less than 20 percent, we have repeatedly demonstrated that valuable claims are best prosecuted by a first-rate litigation firm on a contingent basis at negotiated percentages. Legal representation need not compound the risk and high cost inherent in today's complex and competitive business environment. We are paid only if we (and our clients) win. The result: the highest quality legal representation at a fair price.

Alternative Dispute Resolution

BLB&G offers clients an accomplished team and a creative venue in which to resolve conflicts outside of the litigation process. We have experience in U.S. and international disputes, and our attorneys have led complex business-to-business arbitrations and mediations domestically and abroad, representing clients before all the major arbitration tribunals, including the American Arbitration Association, FINRA, JAMS, International Chamber of Commerce, and the London Court of International Arbitration.

Our lawyers have successfully arbitrated cases that range from complex business-to-business disputes to individuals' grievances with employers. It is our experience that in some cases, a well-executed arbitration process can resolve disputes faster, with limited appeals and a higher level of confidentiality than public litigation.

In the wake of the credit crisis, for example, we successfully represented numerous former executives of a major financial institution in arbitrations relating to claims for compensation. We have also assisted clients with disputes involving failure to honor compensation commitments, disputes over the purchase of securities, businesses seeking compensation for uncompleted contracts, and unfulfilled financing commitments.

Feedback from the Courts

Throughout the firm's history, many courts have recognized the professional excellence and diligence of the firm and its members. A few examples are set forth below.

In re WorldCom, Inc. Securities Litigation

- The Honorable Denise Cote of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

"I have the utmost confidence in plaintiffs' counsel…they have been doing a superb job…The Class is extraordinarily well represented in this litigation."

"The magnitude of this settlement is attributable in significant part to Lead Counsel's advocacy and energy…The quality of the representation given by Lead Counsel…has been superb…and is unsurpassed in this Court's experience with plaintiffs' counsel in securities litigation."

"Lead Counsel has been energetic and creative…Its negotiations with the Citigroup Defendants have resulted in a settlement of historic proportions."

* * *

In re Clarent Corporation Securities Litigation

- The Honorable Charles R. Breyer of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California

"It was the best tried case I've witnessed in my years on the bench…."

"[A]n extraordinarily civilized way of presenting the issues to you [the jury]…We've all been treated to great civility and the highest professional ethics in the presentation of the case…"

"These trial lawyers are some of the best I've ever seen."

* * *

Landry's Restaurants, Inc. Shareholder Litigation

- Vice Chancellor J. Travis Laster of the Delaware Court of Chancery

"I do want to make a comment again about the excellent efforts…put into this case…This case, I think, shows precisely the type of benefits that you can achieve for stockholders and how representative litigation can be a very important part of our corporate governance system…you hold up this case as an example of what to do."

* * *

McCall V. Scott (Columbia/HCA Derivative Litigation)

- The Honorable Thomas A. Higgins of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee

"Counsel's excellent qualifications and reputations are well documented in the record, and they have litigated this complex case adeptly and tenaciously throughout the six years it has been pending. They assumed an enormous risk and have shown great patience by taking this case on a contingent basis, and despite an early setback they have persevered and brought about not only a large cash settlement but sweeping corporate reforms that may be invaluable to the beneficiaries."

Significant Recoveries

BLB&G has successfully identified, investigated, and prosecuted many of the most significant securities and shareholder actions in history, recovering billions of dollars on behalf of defrauded investors and obtaining groundbreaking corporate-governance reforms. These resolutions include eight recoveries of over $1 billion, more than any other firm in our field. Examples of cases with our most significant recoveries include:

Securities Fraud Litigation

Case: *In re WorldCom, Inc. Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $6.19 billion securities fraud class action recovery—the second largest in history; unprecedented recoveries from Director Defendants.

Case Summary: Investors suffered massive losses in the wake of the financial fraud and subsequent bankruptcy of former telecom giant WorldCom. This litigation alleged that WorldCom and others disseminated false and misleading statements to the investing public regarding its earnings and financial condition in violation of the federal securities and other laws. It further alleged a nefarious relationship between Citigroup subsidiary Salomon Smith Barney and WorldCom, carried out primarily by Salomon employees involved in providing investment banking services to WorldCom, and by WorldCom's former CEO and CFO. As Court-appointed Co-Lead Counsel representing Lead Plaintiff the New York State Common Retirement Fund, we obtained unprecedented settlements totaling more than $6 billion from the Investment Bank Defendants who underwrote WorldCom bonds, including a $2.575 billion cash settlement to settle all claims against the Citigroup Defendants. On the eve of trial, the 13 remaining "Underwriter Defendants," including J.P. Morgan Chase, Deutsche Bank, and Bank of America, agreed to pay settlements totaling nearly $3.5 billion to resolve all claims against them. Additionally, the day before trial was scheduled to begin, the former WorldCom Director Defendants agreed to pay over $60 million to settle the claims against them. An unprecedented first for outside directors, $24.75 million of that amount came out of the pockets of the individuals—20% of their collective net worth. *The Wall Street Journal*, in its coverage, profiled the settlement as having "shaken Wall Street, the audit profession and corporate boardrooms." After four weeks of trial, Arthur Andersen, WorldCom's former auditor, settled for $65 million. Subsequent settlements were reached with the former executives of WorldCom, and then with Andersen, bringing the total obtained for the Class to over $6.19 billion.

Case: *In re Cendant Corporation Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

Highlights: $3.3 billion securities fraud class action recovery—the third largest in history; significant corporate governance reforms obtained.

Summary: The firm was Co-Lead Counsel in this class action against Cendant Corporation, its officers and directors and Ernst & Young (E&Y), its auditors, for their role in disseminating materially false and misleading financial statements concerning the company's revenues, earnings and expenses for its 1997 fiscal year. As a result of companywide accounting irregularities, Cendant restated its financial results for its 1995, 1996, and 1997 fiscal years and all fiscal quarters therein. Cendant agreed to settle the action for $2.8 billion and to adopt some of the most extensive corporate governance changes in history. E&Y settled for $335 million. These settlements remain the largest sums ever recovered from a public company and a public accounting firm through securities class action litigation. BLB&G represented Lead Plaintiffs CalPERS, the New York State Common Retirement Fund, and the New York City Pension Funds, the three largest public pension funds in America, in this action.

Case: *In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $2.425 billion in cash; significant corporate governance reforms to resolve all claims. This recovery is by far the largest shareholder recovery related to the subprime meltdown and credit crisis; the single largest securities class action settlement ever resolving a Section 14(a) claim—the federal securities provision designed to protect investors against misstatements in connection with a proxy solicitation; the largest ever funded by a single corporate defendant for violations of the federal securities laws; the single largest settlement of a securities class action in which there was neither a financial restatement involved nor a criminal conviction related to the alleged misconduct; and one of the 10 largest securities class action recoveries in history.

Summary: The firm represented Co-Lead Plaintiffs the State Teachers Retirement System of Ohio, the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System, and the Teacher Retirement System of Texas in this securities class action filed on behalf of shareholders of Bank of America Corporation (BAC) arising from BAC's 2009 acquisition of Merrill Lynch & Co. The action alleges that BAC, Merrill Lynch, and certain of the companies' current and former officers and directors violated the federal securities laws by making a series of materially false statements and omissions in connection with the acquisition. These violations included the alleged failure to disclose information regarding billions of dollars of losses Merrill had suffered before the BAC shareholder vote on the proposed acquisition, as well as an undisclosed agreement allowing Merrill to pay billions in bonuses before the acquisition closed despite these losses. Not privy to these material facts, BAC shareholders voted to approve the acquisition.

Case: *In re Allianz Global Investors U.S. Litigation*

Court: Cases primarily filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: Over $2 billion dollars recovered for investors in a series of more than 20 direct actions.

Summary: BLB&G prosecuted claims on behalf of institutional investors that suffered losses in connection with investments in the Allianz Structured Alpha Funds—a suite of investment products developed and overseen by Allianz Global Investors U.S.—due to Allianz's breaches of fiduciary and contractual duties. BLB&G negotiated settlements that returned over $2 billion to investors. Our firm filed a series of direct actions, including the first complaint in this matter on behalf of Arkansas Teacher Retirement System, and subsequently served as liaison counsel in more than 20 related actions.

Allianz's representations concerning the Alpha Funds were also investigated by the SEC and the U.S. Department of Justice. Allianz ultimately set aside over $6 billion to deal with government investigations and lawsuits resulting from the collapse of the Structured Alpha Funds.

Case: *In re Nortel Networks Corporation Securities Litigation (Nortel II)*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: Over $1.07 billion in cash and common stock recovered for the class.

Summary: This securities fraud class action charged Nortel Networks Corporation and certain of its officers and directors with violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, alleging that the Defendants knowingly or recklessly made false and misleading statements with respect to Nortel's financial results during the relevant period. BLB&G clients the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan Board and the Treasury of the State of New Jersey and its Division of Investment were appointed as Co-Lead Plaintiffs for the Class in one of two related actions (Nortel II), and BLB&G was appointed Lead Counsel for the Class. In a historic settlement, Nortel agreed to pay $2.4 billion in cash and Nortel common stock to resolve both matters. Nortel later announced that its insurers had agreed to pay $228.5 million toward the settlement, bringing the total amount of the global settlement to approximately $2.7 billion, and the total amount of the Nortel II settlement to over $1.07 billion.

Case: *In re Merck & Co., Inc. Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court, District of New Jersey

Highlights: $1.06 billion recovery for the class.

Summary: This case arises out of misrepresentations and omissions concerning life-threatening risks posed by the "blockbuster" COX-2 painkiller Vioxx, which Merck withdrew from the market in 2004. In January 2016, BLB&G achieved a $1.062 billion settlement on the eve of trial after more than 12 years of hard-fought litigation that included a successful decision at the United States Supreme Court. This settlement is the second-largest recovery ever obtained in the Third Circuit and one of the top securities recoveries of all time. BLB&G represented Lead Plaintiff the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi.

Case: *In re McKesson HBOC, Inc. Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Northern District of California

Highlights: $1.05 billion recovery for the class.

Summary: This securities fraud litigation was filed on behalf of purchasers of HBOC, McKesson, and McKesson HBOC securities, alleging that Defendants misled the investing public concerning HBOC's and McKesson HBOC's financial results. On behalf of Lead Plaintiff the New York State Common Retirement Fund, BLB&G obtained a $960 million settlement from the company, $72.5 million in cash from Arthur Andersen, and, on the eve of trial, a $10 million settlement from Bear Stearns & Co., with total recoveries reaching more than $1 billion.

Case: *In re Wells Fargo & Company Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $1 billion recovery for the class, the top U.S. securities class action settlement of 2023, among the top six in the past decade, and among the top 17 of all time.

Summary: In 2018, Wells Fargo's regulators imposed unprecedented consent orders on Wells Fargo designed to halt the bank's decades-long, fraudulent banking practices and rectify the severely deficient corporate oversight that allowed those fraudulent practices to develop and endure (the "2018 Consent Orders"). In this action, lead plaintiffs, represented by BLB&G as co-lead counsel, alleged that Wells Fargo and certain of its senior executives issued false and misleading statements to investors regarding the status of Wells Fargo's compliance with the 2018 Consent Orders, claiming that the bank had regulator-approved "plans" and that it was "in compliance" with the Orders. In reality, Wells Fargo had yet to submit to regulators an acceptable plan or schedule for overhauling the bank's compliance and oversight practices and was nowhere near meeting the regulators' requirements that were a predicate to lifting the severe measures imposed on the bank. Wells Fargo investors were harmed after a series of disclosures, including damning congressional hearings and reports, revealed the truth to the market that the bank had blatantly disregarded the basic requirements set forth in the 2018 Consent Orders. The $1 billion settlement was reached after three years of hard-fought litigation and was achieved with the assistance of a respected mediator, former U.S. District Judge Layn R. Phillips.

Case: *HealthSouth Corporation Bondholder Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama

Highlights: $804.5 million in total recoveries.

Summary: In this litigation, BLB&G was the appointed Co-Lead Counsel for the bond holder class, representing Lead Plaintiff the Retirement Systems of Alabama. This action arose from allegations that Birmingham-based HealthSouth Corporation overstated its earnings at the direction of its founder and former CEO Richard Scrushy. Subsequent revelations disclosed that the overstatement exceeded

over $2.4 billion, virtually wiping out all of HealthSouth's reported profits for the prior five years. A total recovery of $804.5 million was obtained in this litigation through a series of settlements, including an approximately $445 million settlement for shareholders and bondholders, a $100 million in cash settlement from UBS AG, UBS Warburg LLC, and individual UBS Defendants, and $33.5 million in cash from the company's auditor. The total settlement for injured HealthSouth bond purchasers exceeded $230 million, recouping over a third of bond purchaser damages.

Case: *In re Washington Public Power Supply System Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the District of Arizona

Highlights: Over $750 million—the largest securities fraud settlement ever achieved at the time.

Summary: BLB&G was appointed Chair of the Executive Committee responsible for litigating on behalf of the class in this action. The case was litigated for over seven years and involved an estimated 200 million pages of documents produced in discovery; the depositions of 285 fact witnesses and 34 expert witnesses; more than 25,000 introduced exhibits; six published district court opinions; seven appeals or attempted appeals to the Ninth Circuit; and a three-month jury trial, which resulted in a settlement of over $750 million—then the largest securities fraud settlement ever achieved.

Case: *In re Lehman Brothers Equity/Debt Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $735 million in total recoveries.

Summary: Representing the Government of Guam Retirement Fund, BLB&G successfully prosecuted this securities class action arising from Lehman Brothers Holdings' issuance of billions of dollars in offerings of debt and equity securities that were sold using offering materials that contained untrue statements and missing material information.

After four years of intense litigation, Lead Plaintiffs achieved a total of $735 million in recoveries consisting of a $426 million settlement with underwriters of Lehman securities offerings, a $90 million settlement with former Lehman directors and officers, a $99 million settlement that resolves claims against Ernst & Young, Lehman's former auditor (considered one of the top 10 auditor settlements ever achieved), and a $120 million settlement that resolves claims against UBS Financial Services. This recovery is remarkable not only because of the difficulty in recovering assets when the issuer defendant is bankrupt, but also because no financial results were restated, and the auditors never disavowed the statements.

Case: *In re Citigroup, Inc. Bond Action Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $730 million cash recovery, the second largest recovery in a litigation arising from the financial crisis.

Summary: In the years prior to the collapse of the subprime mortgage market, Citigroup issued 48 offerings of preferred stock and bonds. This securities fraud class action was filed on behalf of purchasers of Citigroup bonds and preferred stock alleging that these offerings contained material misrepresentations and omissions regarding Citigroup's exposure to billions of dollars in mortgage-related assets, the loss reserves for its portfolio of high-risk residential mortgage loans, and the credit quality of the risky assets it held in off-balance sheet entities known as "structured investment vehicles." After protracted litigation lasting four years, we obtained a $730 million cash recovery—the second largest securities class action recovery in a litigation arising from the financial crisis, and the second largest recovery ever in a securities class action brought on behalf of purchasers of debt securities. As Lead Bond Counsel for the Class, BLB&G represented Lead Bond Plaintiffs Minneapolis Firefighters' Relief Association, Louisiana Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System, and Louisiana Sheriffs' Pension and Relief Fund.

Case: *In re Schering-Plough Corporation/Enhance Securities Litigation; In re Merck & Co., Inc. Vytorin/Zetia Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

Highlights: $688 million in combined settlements (Schering-Plough settled for $473 million; Merck settled for $215 million) in this coordinated securities fraud litigations filed on behalf of investors in Merck and Schering-Plough.

Summary: After nearly five years of intense litigation, just days before trial, BLB&G resolved the two actions against Merck and Schering-Plough, which stemmed from claims that Merck and Schering artificially inflated their market value by concealing material information and making false and misleading statements regarding their blockbuster anti-cholesterol drugs Zetia and Vytorin. Specifically, we alleged that the companies knew that their "ENHANCE" clinical trial of Vytorin (a combination of Zetia and a generic) demonstrated that Vytorin was no more effective than the cheaper generic at reducing artery thickness. The companies nonetheless championed the "benefits" of their drugs, attracting billions of dollars of capital. When public pressure to release the results of the ENHANCE trial became too great, the companies reluctantly announced these negative results, which we alleged led to sharp declines in the value of the companies' securities, resulting in significant losses to investors. The combined $688 million in settlements (Schering-Plough settled for $473 million; Merck settled for $215 million) is the second largest securities recovery ever in the Third Circuit, among the top 25 settlements of all time, and among the 10 largest recoveries ever in a case where there was no financial restatement. BLB&G represented Lead Plaintiffs Arkansas Teacher Retirement System, the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, and the Louisiana Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System.

Case: *In re Lucent Technologies, Inc. Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

Highlights: $667 million in total recoveries; the appointment of BLB&G as Co-Lead Counsel is especially noteworthy as it marked the first time since the 1995 passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act that a court reopened the lead plaintiff or lead counsel selection process to account for changed circumstances, new issues, and possible conflicts between new and old allegations.

***Summary*:** BLB&G served as Co-Lead Counsel in this securities class action, representing Lead Plaintiffs the Parnassus Fund, Teamsters Locals 175 & 505 D&P Pension Trust, Anchorage Police and Fire Retirement System, and the Louisiana School Employees' Retirement System. The complaint accused Lucent of making false and misleading statements to the investing public concerning its publicly reported financial results and failing to disclose the serious problems in its optical networking business. When the truth was disclosed, Lucent admitted that it had improperly recognized revenue of nearly $679 million in fiscal 2000. The settlement obtained in this case is valued at approximately $667 million, and is composed of cash, stock, and warrants.

Case: *In re Wachovia Preferred Securities and Bond/Notes Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $627 million recovery—among the largest securities class action recoveries in history; third-largest recovery obtained in an action arising from the subprime mortgage crisis.

***Summary*:** This securities class action was filed on behalf of investors in certain Wachovia bonds and preferred securities against Wachovia Corp., certain former officers and directors, various underwriters, and its auditor, KPMG. The case alleged that Wachovia provided offering materials that misrepresented and omitted material facts concerning the nature and quality of Wachovia's multibillion-dollar option-ARM (adjustable rate mortgage) "Pick-A-Pay" mortgage loan portfolio, and that Wachovia's loan loss reserves were materially inadequate. According to the Complaint, these undisclosed problems threatened the viability of the financial institution, requiring it to be "bailed out" during the financial crisis before it was acquired by Wells Fargo. The combined $627 million recovery obtained in the action is among the 20 largest securities class action recoveries in history, the largest settlement ever in a class action case asserting only claims under the Securities Act of 1933, and one of a handful of securities class action recoveries obtained where there were no parallel civil or criminal actions brought by government authorities. The firm represented Co-Lead Plaintiffs Orange County Employees Retirement System and Louisiana Sheriffs' Pension and Relief Fund in this action.

Case: *In re Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement Class Action Litigations*

Court: United States District Court for the District of Columbia

Highlights: $612.4 million jury award for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac investors in a unanimous trial verdict.

***Summary*:** BLB&G secured a $612.4 million jury award for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac investors in a unanimous trial verdict against the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA). The action challenged FHFA's decision to sweep the entire net worth of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to the U.S. Treasury, depriving

shareholders of significant value. The award came after two trials and 10 years of intense litigation and negotiations. The court also recently approved our request for prejudgment interest, adding approximately $198 million to the recovery for investors (pending entry of judgment).

Case: *Bear Stearns Mortgage Pass-Through Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: $500 million recovery—the largest recovery ever on behalf of purchasers of residential mortgage-backed securities.

***Summary*:** BLB&G served as Co-Lead Counsel in this securities action, representing Lead Plaintiffs the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi. The case alleged that Bear Stearns & Company sold mortgage pass-through certificates using false and misleading offering documents. The offering documents contained false and misleading statements related to, among other things, the underwriting guidelines used to originate the mortgage loans underlying the certificates and the accuracy of the appraisals for the properties underlying the certificates. After six years of hard-fought litigation and extensive arm's-length negotiations, the $500 million recovery is the largest settlement in a U.S. class action against a bank that packaged and sold mortgage securities at the center of the 2008 financial crisis.

Case: *Gary Hefler et al. v. Wells Fargo & Company et al.*

Court: United States District Court for the Northern District of California

Highlights $480 million recovery—the fourth largest securities settlement ever achieved in the Ninth Circuit.

***Summary*:** BLB&G served as Lead Counsel for the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiff Union Asset Management Holding, AG in this action, which alleged that Wells Fargo and certain current and former officers and directors of Wells Fargo made a series of materially false statements and omissions in connection with Wells Fargo's secret creation of fake or unauthorized client accounts in order to hit performance-based compensation goals. After years of presenting a business driven by legitimate growth prospects, U.S. regulators revealed in September 2016 that Wells Fargo employees were secretly opening millions of potentially unauthorized accounts for existing Wells Fargo customers. The Complaint alleged that these accounts were opened in order to hit performance targets and inflate the "cross-sell" metrics that investors used to measure Wells Fargo's financial health and anticipated growth. When the market learned the truth about Wells Fargo's violation of its customers' trust and failure to disclose reliable information to its investors, the price of Wells Fargo's stock dropped, causing substantial investor losses.

Case: *In re Kraft Heinz Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Highlights: $450 million in total recoveries.

***Summary*:** BLB&G litigated claims against Kraft Heinz arising from the defendants' misstatements regarding the company's financial position, including the carrying value of Kraft's assets, the sustainability of Kraft's margins, and the success of recent cost-cutting strategies by the company. After overcoming defendants' motions to dismiss and conducting discovery involving the production of over 14.7 million pages of documents, the parties engaged in mediation and reached a settlement that represented a recovery of $450 million for impacted investors.

Case: *Ohio Public Employees Retirement System v. Freddie Mac*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio

Highlights: $410 million settlement.

***Summary*:** This securities fraud class action was filed on behalf of the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System and the State Teachers Retirement System of Ohio alleging that Freddie Mac and certain of its current and former officers issued false and misleading statements in connection with the company's previously reported financial results. Specifically, the Complaint alleged that the Defendants misrepresented the company's operations and financial results by engaging in numerous improper transactions and accounting machinations that violated fundamental GAAP precepts in order to artificially smooth the company's earnings and hide earnings volatility. In connection with these improprieties, Freddie Mac restated more than $5 billion in earnings. A settlement of $410 million was reached in the case just as deposition discovery had begun and document review was complete.

Case: *In re Refco, Inc. Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: Over $407 million in total recoveries.

***Summary*:** The lawsuit arises from the revelation that Refco, a once-prominent brokerage, had for years secreted hundreds of millions of dollars of uncollectible receivables with a related entity controlled by Phillip Bennett, the company's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. This revelation caused the stunning collapse of the company a mere two months after its initial public offering of common stock. As a result, Refco filed one of the largest bankruptcies in U.S. history. Settlements have been obtained from multiple company and individual defendants, resulting in a total recovery for the class of over $407 million. BLB&G represented Co-Lead Plaintiff RH Capital Associates LLC.

Case: *In re Allergan, Inc. Proxy Violation Securities Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Central District of California

Highlights: Recovered over $250 million for investors while challenging an unprecedented insider trading scheme by billionaire hedge fund manager Bill Ackman.

***Summary*:** As alleged in groundbreaking litigation, billionaire hedge fund manager Bill Ackman and his Pershing Square Capital Management fund secretly acquired a near 10% stake in pharmaceutical concern Allergan as part of an unprecedented insider trading scheme by Ackman and Valeant Pharmaceuticals International. What Ackman knew—but investors did not—was that in the ensuing weeks, Valeant would be launching a hostile bid to acquire Allergan shares at a far higher price. Ackman enjoyed a massive instantaneous profit upon public news of the proposed acquisition, and the scheme worked for both parties as he kicked back hundreds of millions of his insider-trading proceeds to Valeant after Allergan agreed to be bought by a rival bidder. After a ferocious three-year legal battle over this attempt to circumvent the spirit of the U.S. securities laws, BLB&G obtained a $250 million settlement for Allergan investors, and created precedent to prevent similar such schemes in the future. The Plaintiffs in this action were the State Teachers Retirement System of Ohio, the Iowa Public Employees Retirement System, and Patrick T. Johnson.

Corporate Governance and Shareholders' Rights

Case: *Tornetta v. Musk*

Court: Delaware Court of Chancery

Highlights: Achieved a historic ruling rescinding Elon Musk's $55 billion compensation package at Tesla—the largest such package in history.

Summary: BLB&G led a headline-grabbing shareholder derivative action against Elon Musk and certain Tesla board members challenging the $55 billion compensation plan granted to Musk—the largest such compensation plan in history. BLB&G served as lead trial counsel in this case on behalf of a Tesla stockholder. The firm litigated for more than four years, examined eight of the most critical witnesses—including Elon Musk himself—and presented a strong factual record to the Court. On January 30, 2024, in a historic decision, the court nullified Musk's entire $55 billion compensation package, finding that Tesla's board of directors had breached their fiduciary duty in structuring Musk's multi-tranched compensation.

Case: *City of Monroe Employees' Retirement System, Derivatively on Behalf of Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc. v. Rupert Murdoch, et al.*

Court: Delaware Court of Chancery

Highlights: Landmark derivative litigation established unprecedented, independent Board-level council to ensure employees are protected from workplace harassment while recouping $90 million for the company's coffers.

Summary: Before the birth of the #metoo movement, BLB&G led the prosecution of an unprecedented shareholder derivative litigation against Fox News parent 21st Century Fox arising from the systemic sexual and workplace harassment at the embattled network. After nearly 18 months of litigation,

discovery and negotiation related to the shocking misconduct and the Board's extensive alleged governance failures, the parties unveil a landmark settlement with two key components: 1) the first ever Board-level watchdog of its kind—the "Fox News Workplace Professionalism and Inclusion Council" of experts (WPIC)—majority independent of the Murdochs, the Company and Board; and 2) one of the largest financial recoveries—$90 million—ever obtained in a pure corporate board oversight dispute. The WPIC serves as a model for public companies in all industries. The firm represented 21st Century Fox shareholder the City of Monroe (Michigan) Employees' Retirement System.

Case: *In re McKesson Corporation Derivative Litigation*

Court: United States District Court, Northern District of California, Oakland Division and Delaware Chancery Court

***Highlights*:** Litigation recovered $175 million and achieved substantial corporate governance reforms.

***Summary*:** BLB&G represented the Police & Fire Retirement System City of Detroit and Amalgamated Bank in this derivative class action arising from the company's role in permitting and exacerbating America's ongoing opioid crisis. The complaint, initially filed in Delaware Chancery Court, alleged that defendants breached their fiduciary duties by failing to adequately oversee McKesson's compliance with provisions of the Controlled Substances Act and a series of settlements with the Drug Enforcement Administration intended to regulate the distribution and misuse of controlled substances such as opioids. Even after paying fines and settlements in the hundreds of millions of dollars, McKesson was sued in the National Opioid Multidistrict Litigation. In May 2018, our clients joined a substantially similar action being litigated in California federal court. Acting as co-lead counsel, BLB&G played a major role in litigating the case, opposing a motion to stay the action by a special litigation committee, and engaging in extensive pretrial discovery. Ultimately, $175 million was recovered for the benefit of McKesson's shareholders in a settlement that also created substantial corporate-governance reforms to prevent a recurrence of McKesson's inadequate legal compliance efforts.

Case: *UnitedHealth Group, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the District of Minnesota

Highlights: Recovered over $920 million in ill-gotten compensation directly from former officers for their roles in illegally backdating stock options, while the company agreed to far-reaching reforms aimed at curbing future executive compensation abuses.

Summary: This shareholder derivative action filed against certain current and former executive officers and members of the Board of Directors of UnitedHealth Group alleged that the Defendants obtained, approved and/or acquiesced in the issuance of stock options to senior executives that were unlawfully backdated to provide the recipients with windfall compensation at the direct expense of UnitedHealth and its shareholders. The firm recovered over $920 million in ill-gotten compensation

directly from the former officer Defendants—the largest derivative recovery in history. As feature coverage in *The New York Times* indicated, "investors everywhere should applaud [the UnitedHealth settlement]….[T]he recovery sets a standard of behavior for other companies and boards when performance pay is later shown to have been based on ephemeral earnings." The Plaintiffs in this action were the St. Paul Teachers' Retirement Fund Association, the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, the Jacksonville Police & Fire Pension Fund, the Louisiana Sheriffs' Pension & Relief Fund, the Louisiana Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System and Fire & Police Pension Association of Colorado.

Case: *Caremark Merger Litigation*

Court: Delaware Court of Chancery – New Castle County

Highlights: Landmark Court ruling ordered Caremark's board to disclose previously withheld information, enjoined a shareholder vote on the CVS merger offer, and granted statutory appraisal rights to Caremark shareholders. The litigation ultimately forced CVS to raise its offer by $7.50 per share, equal to more than $3.3 billion in additional consideration to Caremark shareholders.

Summary: Commenced on behalf of the Louisiana Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System and other shareholders of Caremark RX, this shareholder class action accused the company's directors of violating their fiduciary duties by approving and endorsing a proposed merger with CVS Corporation, while refusing to fairly consider an alternative transaction proposed by another bidder. In a landmark decision, the Court ordered the Defendants to disclose material information that had previously been withheld, enjoined the shareholder vote on the CVS transaction until the additional disclosures occurred, and granted statutory appraisal rights to Caremark's shareholders—forcing CVS to increase the consideration offered to shareholders by $7.50 per share in cash (over $3 billion in total).

Case: *In re Pfizer Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*

Court: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Highlights: Landmark settlement in which Defendants agreed to create a new Regulatory and Compliance Committee of the Pfizer Board to be supported by a dedicated $75 million fund.

Summary: In the wake of Pfizer's agreement to pay $2.3 billion as part of a settlement with the U.S. Department of Justice to resolve civil and criminal charges relating to the illegal marketing of at least 13 of the company's most important drugs (the largest such fine ever imposed), this shareholder derivative action was filed against Pfizer's senior management and Board alleging they breached their fiduciary duties to Pfizer by, among other things, allowing unlawful promotion of drugs to continue after receiving numerous "red flags" that Pfizer's improper drug marketing was systemic and widespread. The suit was brought by Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs Louisiana Sheriffs' Pension and Relief Fund and Skandia Life Insurance Company, Ltd. In an unprecedented settlement reached by the parties, the Defendants agreed to create a new Regulatory and Compliance Committee of the Pfizer Board of Directors (the "Regulatory Committee") to oversee and monitor Pfizer's compliance and drug

marketing practices and to review the compensation policies for Pfizer's drug sales related employees.

Case: *Miller et al. v. IAC/InterActiveCorp et al.*

Court: Delaware Court of Chancery

Highlights: This litigation shut down efforts by controlling shareholders to obtain "dynastic control" of the company through improper stock class issuances, setting valuable precedent and sending a strong message to boards and management in all sectors that such moves will not go unchallenged.

Summary: BLB&G obtained this landmark victory for shareholder rights against IAC/InterActiveCorp and its controlling shareholder and chairman, Barry Diller. For decades, activist corporate founders and controllers sought ways to entrench their position atop the corporate hierarchy by granting themselves and other insiders "supervoting rights." Diller laid out a proposal to introduce a new class of non-voting stock to entrench "dynastic control" of IAC within the Diller family. BLB&G litigation on behalf of IAC shareholders ended in capitulation with the Defendants effectively conceding the case by abandoning the proposal. This became a critical corporate governance precedent, given the trend of public companies to introduce "low" and "no-vote" share classes, which diminish shareholder rights, insulate management from accountability, and can distort managerial incentives by providing controllers voting power out of line with their actual economic interests in public companies.

Case: *In re News Corp. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*

Court: Delaware Court of Chancery – Kent County

Highlights: An unprecedented settlement in which News Corp. recouped $139 million and enacted significant corporate governance reforms that combat self-dealing in the boardroom.

Summary: Following News Corp.'s 2011 acquisition of a company owned by News Corp. Chairman and CEO Rupert Murdoch's daughter, and the phone-hacking scandal within its British newspaper division, BLB&G filed a derivative litigation on behalf of the company because of institutional shareholder concern with the conduct of News Corp.'s management. BLB&G ultimately obtained an unprecedented settlement in which News Corp. recouped $139 million for the company coffers and agreed to enact corporate governance enhancements to strengthen its compliance structure, the independence and functioning of its board, and the compensation and clawback policies for management.

Clients and Fees

We are firm believers in the contingency fee as a socially useful, productive and satisfying basis of compensation for legal services, particularly in litigation. Wherever appropriate, even with our corporate clients, we encourage retentions in which our fee is contingent on the outcome of the litigation. This way, it is not the number of hours worked that will determine our fee, but rather the result achieved for our client. The firm generally negotiates with our clients a contingent fee schedule specific to each litigation, and all fee proposals are approved by the client prior to commencing litigation, and ultimately by the Court.

Our clients include many large and well-known financial and lending institutions and pension funds, as well as privately held companies that are attracted to our firm because of our reputation, expertise, and fee structure. Most of the firm's clients are referred by other clients, law firms and lawyers, bankers, investors, and accountants. A considerable number of clients have been referred to the firm by former adversaries. We have always maintained a high level of independence and discretion in the cases we decide to prosecute. As a result, the level of personal satisfaction and commitment to our work is high.

In the Public Interest

Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP is guided by two principles: excellence in legal work and a belief that the law should serve a socially useful and dynamic purpose. Attorneys at the firm are active in academic, community, and pro bono activities and regularly participate as speakers and contributors to professional organizations. In addition, the firm endows a public interest law fellowship and sponsors an academic scholarship at Columbia Law School. Highlights of our community contributions include:

Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann Public Interest Law Fellows

BLB&G is committed to fighting discrimination and effecting positive social change. In support of this commitment, the firm donates funds to Columbia Law School to create the Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann Public Interest Law Fellowship. This fund at Columbia Law School provides Fellows with 100% of the funding needed to make payments on their law school tuition loans so long as such graduates remain in the public interest law field. BLB&G Fellows can begin their careers free of any school debt if they make a long-term commitment to public interest law.

Firm Sponsorship of Her Justice

BLB&G is a sponsor of Her Justice, a not-for-profit organization in New York City dedicated to providing pro bono legal representation to indigent women, principally vulnerable women, in connection with the myriad legal problems they face. The organization trains and supports the efforts of New York lawyers who provide pro bono counsel to these women. Several members and associates of the firm volunteer their time to help women who need divorces from abusive spouses or representation on issues such as child support, custody, and visitation. To read more about Her Justice, visit the organization's website at http://www.herjustice.org/.

Firm Sponsorship of City Year New York

BLB&G is an active supporter of City Year New York, a division of AmeriCorps. The program was founded in 1988 as a means of encouraging young people to devote time to public service and unites a diverse group of volunteers for a demanding year of full-time community service, leadership development, and civic engagement. Through their service, corps members experience a rite of passage that can inspire a lifetime of citizenship and build a stronger democracy.

Max W. Berger Pre-Law Program

The Max W. Berger Pre-Law Program was established at Baruch College to encourage outstanding minority undergraduates to pursue a meaningful career in the legal profession. Providing workshops, seminars, counseling, and mentoring to Baruch students, the program facilitates and guides them through the law school research and application process, and places them in appropriate internships and other pre-law working environments.

Our Attorneys

BLB&G employs a dedicated team of attorneys, including partners, counsel, associates, and senior staff attorneys. Biographies for each of our attorneys can be found on our website here. On a case-by-case basis, we also make use of a pool of staff attorneys to supplement our litigation teams. The BLB&G team also includes investigators, financial analysts, paralegals, e-discovery specialists, information technology professionals, and administrative staff. Biographies for our investigative team are available on our website here, and biographies for the leaders of our administrative departments are viewable here.

Partners

Max Berger, Founding Partner, has grown BLB&G from a partnership of four lawyers in 1983 into what the *Financial Times* described as "one of the most powerful securities class action law firms in the United States" by prosecuting seminal cases which have increased market transparency, held wrongdoers accountable, and improved corporate business practices in groundbreaking ways.

Described by sources quoted in leading industry publication *Chambers USA* as "the smartest, most strategic plaintiffs' lawyer [they have] ever encountered," Max has litigated many of the firm's most high-profile and significant cases and secured some of the largest recoveries ever achieved in securities fraud lawsuits, negotiating seven of the largest securities fraud settlements in history, each in excess of a billion dollars: *Cendant* ($3.3 billion), *Citigroup-WorldCom* ($2.575 billion), *Bank of America/Merrill Lynch* ($2.4 billion), *JPMorgan Chase-WorldCom* ($2 billion), *Nortel* ($1.07 billion), *Merck* ($1.06 billion), and *McKesson* ($1.05 billion). Max's prosecution of the *WorldCom* litigation, which resulted in unprecedented monetary contributions from WorldCom's outside directors (nearly $25 million out of their own pockets on top of their insurance coverage) "shook Wall Street, the audit profession and corporate boardrooms." (*The Wall Street Journal*)

Max's cases have resulted in sweeping corporate governance overhauls, including the creation of an independent task force to oversee and monitor diversity practices (*Texaco* discrimination litigation), establishing an industry-accepted definition of director independence, increasing a board's power and responsibility to oversee internal controls and financial reporting (*Columbia/HCA*), and creating a Healthcare Law Regulatory Committee with dedicated funding to improve the standard for regulatory compliance oversight by a public company board of directors (*Pfizer*). His cases have yielded results which have served as models for public companies going forward.

Most recently, before the #metoo movement came alive, on behalf of an institutional investor client, Max handled the prosecution of an unprecedented shareholder derivative litigation against Fox News parent 21st Century Fox, Inc. arising from the systemic sexual and workplace harassment at the embattled network. After nearly 18 months of litigation, discovery, and negotiation related to the shocking misconduct and the Board's extensive alleged governance failures, the parties unveiled a landmark settlement with two key components: 1) the first ever Board-level watchdog of its kind—the "Fox News Workplace Professionalism and Inclusion Council" of experts (WPIC)—majority independent of the Murdochs, the Company and Board; and 2) one of the largest financial recoveries—$90 million—ever obtained in a pure corporate board oversight dispute. The WPIC is expected to serve as a model for public companies in all industries.

Max's work has garnered him extensive media attention, and he has been the subject of feature articles in a variety of major media publications. *The New York Times* highlighted his remarkable track record in an October 2012 profile entitled "Investors' Billion-Dollar Fraud Fighter," which also discussed his role in the *Bank of America/Merrill Lynch Merger* litigation. In 2011, Max was twice profiled by *The American Lawyer* for his role in negotiating a $627 million recovery on behalf of investors in the *In re Wachovia Corp. Securities Litigation,* and a $516 million recovery in *In re Lehman Brothers Equity/Debt Securities Litigation.* For his outstanding efforts on behalf of WorldCom investors, he was featured in articles in *BusinessWeek* and *The American Lawyer*, and *The National Law Journal* profiled Max (one of only eleven attorneys selected nationwide) in its annual 2005 "Winning Attorneys" section. He was subsequently featured in a 2006 *New York Times* article, "A Class-Action Shuffle," which assessed the evolving landscape of the securities litigation arena.

One of the "100 Most Influential Lawyers in America"

Widely recognized as the "Dean" of the U.S. plaintiff securities bar for his remarkable career and his professional excellence, Max has a distinguished and unparalleled list of honors to his name.

- He was selected as one of the "100 Most Influential Lawyers in America" by *The National Law Journal* for being "front and center" in holding Wall Street banks accountable and obtaining over $5 billion in cases arising from the subprime meltdown, and for his work as a "master negotiator" in obtaining numerous multi-billion dollar recoveries for investors.

- Described as a "standard-bearer" for the profession in a career spanning nearly 50 years, he is the recipient of *Chambers USA's* award for Outstanding Contribution to the Legal Profession. In presenting this prestigious honor, *Chambers* recognized Max's "numerous headline-grabbing successes," as well as his unique stature among colleagues—"warmly lauded by his peers, who are nevertheless loath to find him on the other side of the table." Max has been recognized as a litigation "star" and leading lawyer in his field by *Chambers* since its inception.

- *Benchmark Litigation* recently inducted him into its exclusive "Hall of Fame" and named him a 2021 "Litigation Star" in recognition of his career achievements and impact on the field of securities litigation.

- Upon its tenth anniversary, *Lawdragon* named Max a "Lawdragon Legend" for his accomplishments. He was recently inducted into *Lawdragon's* "Hall of Fame." He is regularly included in the publication's "500 Leading Lawyers in America" and "100 Securities Litigators You Need to Know" lists.

- *Law360* published a special feature discussing his life and career as a "Titan of the Plaintiffs Bar," named him one of only six litigators selected nationally as a "Legal MVP," and selected him as one of "10 Legal Superstars" nationally for his work in securities litigation.

- Max has been regularly named a "leading lawyer" in the *Legal 500 US Guide* where he was also named to their "Hall of Fame" list, as well as *The Best Lawyers in America®* guide.

- Max was honored for his outstanding contribution to the public interest by Trial Lawyers for Public Justice, which named him a "Trial Lawyer of the Year" Finalist in 1997 for his work in *Roberts, et al. v. Texaco*, the celebrated race discrimination case, on behalf of Texaco's African-American employees.

Max has lectured extensively for many professional organizations and is the author and co-author of numerous articles on developments in the securities laws and their implications for public policy. He was chosen, along with several of his BLB&G partners, to author the first chapter—"Plaintiffs' Perspective"—of Lexis/Nexis's seminal industry guide *Litigating Securities Class Actions*. An esteemed voice on all sides of the legal and financial markets, in 2008 the SEC and Treasury called on Max to provide guidance on regulatory changes being considered as the accounting profession was experiencing tectonic shifts shortly before the financial crisis.

Max also serves the academic community in numerous capacities. A long-time member of the Board of Trustees of Baruch College, he served as the President of the Baruch College Fund from 2015-2019 and now serves as its Chairman. In May 2006, he was presented with the Distinguished Alumnus Award for his contributions to Baruch College, and in 2019, was awarded an honorary Doctor of Laws degree at Baruch's commencement, the highest honor Baruch College confers upon an individual for non-academic achievement. The award recognized his decades-long dedication to the mission and vision of the College, and in bestowing it, Baruch's President described Max as "one of the most influential individuals in the history of Baruch College." Max established the Max Berger Pre-Law Program at Baruch College in 2007.

A member of the Dean's Council to Columbia Law School as well as the Columbia Law School Public Interest/Public Service Council, Max has taught Profession of Law, an ethics course at Columbia Law School, and serves on the Advisory Board of Columbia Law School's Center on Corporate Governance. In February 2011, Max received Columbia Law School's most prestigious and highest honor, "The Medal for Excellence." This award is presented annually to Columbia Law School alumni who exemplify the qualities of character, intellect, and social and professional responsibility that the Law School seeks to instill in its students. As a recipient of this award, Max was profiled in the Fall 2011 issue of *Columbia Law School Magazine.* Max is a member of the American Law Institute and an Advisor to its Restatement Third: Economic Torts project. Max recently endowed the Max Berger '71 Public Interest/Public Service Fellows Program at Columbia Law School. The program provides support for law students interested in pursuing careers in public service. Max and his wife, Dale, previously endowed the Dale and Max Berger Public Interest Law Fellowship at Columbia Law School and, under Max's leadership, BLB&G also created the Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann Public Interest Law Fellowship at Columbia.

Among numerous charitable and volunteer works, Max is a significant and long-time contributor to Her Justice, a non-profit organization in New York City dedicated to providing *pro bono* legal representation to indigent women, principally survivors of intimate partner violence, in connection with the many legal problems they face. In recognition of their personal support of the organization, Max and his wife, Dale Berger, were awarded the "Above and Beyond Commitment to Justice Award" by Her Justice in 2021 for being steadfast advocates for women living in poverty in New York City. In addition to his personal support of Her Justice, Max has ensured BLB&G's long-time involvement with the organization. Max is also an active supporter of City Year New York, a division of AmeriCorps, dedicated to encouraging young people to devote time to public service. In July 2005, he was named City Year New York's "Idealist of the Year," for his commitment to, service for, and work in the community. A celebrated

photographer, Max has held two successful photography shows that raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for City Year and Her Justice.

Education: Columbia Law School, 1971, J.D., Editor of the *Columbia Survey of Human Rights Law*; Baruch College-City University of New York, 1968, B.B.A., Accounting

Bar Admissions: New York; United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York; United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; United States

Scott Foglietta prosecutes securities fraud, corporate governance, and shareholder rights litigation on behalf of the firm's institutional investor clients. As a member of the firm's case development and client advisory group, Scott advises Taft-Hartley pension funds, public pension funds, and other institutional investors on potential legal claims.

Scott was an integral member of the teams that advised the firm's clients in their prosecution of numerous significant matters, including securities class actions against *Wells Fargo* ($480 million recovery), *Kraft Heinz* ($450 million recovery), *Salix Pharmaceuticals* ($210 million recovery), *Luckin Coffee* ($175 million recovery), and *Equifax* ($149 million recovery). Scott was also key member of the teams that evaluated and developed novel case theories or claims in several matters, including a securities class action against Willis Towers Watson, which arose from misrepresentations made in a proxy statement in connection with the merger between Willis Group and Towers Watson and was resolved for $75 million, and an ongoing securities class action against *Perrigo* arising from misrepresentations made in connection with a tender offer for shares trading in both the United States and Israel. Scott was also a member of the teams that secured our clients' appointments as lead plaintiffs in the ongoing securities class actions against *Boeing, Meta Platforms, Seagate, Silvergate, TD Bank* and *First Horizon*, and *SVB Financial*, among others.

Scott was also a member of the team that advised one of the firm's institutional investor clients in a shareholder derivative action against the board of directors of *FirstEnergy Corp*. arising from the company's role in an egregious public corruption scandal, in which $180 million was recovered and substantial governance reforms were obtained. Scott is routinely recognized for his outstanding legal work, including being named a "Rising Star" by *The National Law Journal* and *Law360*, and to *Benchmark Litigation's* "40 & Under" Hot List. Scott has also been named to numerous Lawdragon lists, including "500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers," "500 Leading Lawyers in America," and "*Lawdragon 500 X* – The Next Generation."

Before joining the firm, Scott represented institutional and individual clients in a wide variety of complex litigation matters, including securities class actions, commercial litigation, and ERISA litigation. Prior to law school, Scott earned an M.B.A. in finance from Clark University and worked as a capital markets analyst for a boutique investment banking firm.

Education: Brooklyn Law School, 2010, J.D. Clark University, Graduate School of Management, 2007, M.B.A., Finance; Clark University, 2006, B.A., *cum laude*, Management

Bar Admissions: New York; New Jersey; United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York; United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

Jim Harrod, a BLB&G partner, focuses his practice on representing the firm's institutional investor clients in securities fraud-related matters. He leads the firm's Global Securities and Litigation Monitoring Team, which monitors securities actions around the world and advises BLB&G' s institutional clients on potential avenues for recovery in those actions. Jim has more than 25 years of experience prosecuting complex litigation in federal courts and has obtained over $3 billion on behalf of investor classes. He practices out of BLB&G' s New York office.

Jim has litigated many of BLB&G' s most significant securities fraud actions, obtaining record recoveries for the firm's clients. Most recently, he was a leader of the BLB&G litigation team that recovered over $2 billion for 35 institutions that invested in the Allianz Structured Alpha Funds. Jim's other high-profile cases include:

- *New York State Teachers' Retirement System v. General Motors Company*: Jim prosecuted the securities litigation against General Motors arising from the company's recall of vehicles with defective ignition switches, recovering $300 million for investors—the second largest securities class action recovery in the Sixth Circuit.
- *In re Motorola Securities Litigation*: Jim was a key member of a litigation team that represented the State of New Jersey's Division of Investment in the securities fraud case against Motorola, obtaining a $190 million recovery three days before trial.

Jim has significant knowledge and experience prosecuting claims against foreign issuers and actions brought under foreign law. His recent work in this area includes:

- *Roofers' Pension Fund v. Joseph C. Papa, et al.:* Jim led the securities case against Perrigo, which asserted claims on behalf of investors under U.S. and Israeli law. Perrigo was recently resolved for $97 million.
- *In re Equifax Inc. Securities Litigation:* Jim served as lead counsel for German asset manager Union Asset Management AG in litigation against Equifax related to the company's massive 2017 data breach, obtaining a $149 million recovery for defrauded investors. This remains the largest recovery in a securities class action based on a data breach.
- *In re Volkswagen AG Securities Litigation*: Jim served as lead counsel in this litigation relating to Volkswagen's misrepresentations concerning its "clean diesel" cars. The case involved significant international discovery, foreign jurisdictional issues, and overlapping litigation in Europe. The settlement obtained a recovery of 100% of investors damages

Jim's experience includes representing institutional investors in cases concerning the issuance of residential mortgage-backed securities prior to the 2008 financial crisis. For example, he led the team that recovered $500 million for investors in *In re Bear Stearns Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates Litigation*, which brought claims related to the issuance of mortgage pass-through certificates during 2006 and 2007. Jim served as co-lead counsel in a similar action, *Plumbers' & Pipefitters' Local #562 Supplemental Plan & Trust v. J.P. Morgan Acceptance Corp*. I, which recovered $280 million on behalf of a class of investors.

Jim is a frequent speaker to public pension fund organizations and trustees concerning fiduciary duties, emerging issues in securities litigation, and the financial markets. He is also a regular author on topics related to the securities laws. Most recently, he co-authored a *Bloomberg Law* article examining a common insider trading defense.

In recognition of his outstanding work, Jim was named a "Securities MVP" by Law360 in 2022 and a "Plaintiffs' Lawyers Trailblazer" by *The National Law Journal* in 2021. He is regularly recognized as a "Litigation Star" by

Benchmark Litigation, among the leading U.S. legal practitioners by Lawdragon, and among the most talented lawyers in New York by Thomson Reuters' *Super Lawyers*.

Prior to joining BLB&G, Jim practiced at Wolf Popper LLP for 14 years. He received his J.D. from George Washington University Law School and his B.A. from Skidmore College.

Education: George Washington University Law School, J.D. Skidmore College, B.A.

Bar Admissions: New York; United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York; United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan; United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Avi Josefson is a senior partner and co-head of BLB&G' s Complex Litigation Practice, representing clients in healthcare, digital privacy, and complex fraud litigation. He also serves as a senior member of the firm's Case Development and Client Advisory Group, which analyzes and advises clients regarding potential claims. Avi counsels the firm's clients in the U.S., Europe, and Israel, and practices in the firm's Chicago and New York offices.

As co-head of the firm's Complex Litigation Practice, Avi is prosecuting several high-profile matters, including "cash sweep" cases against major financial institutions such as Wells Fargo, Morgan Stanley, UBS, and others, alleging that these banks systematically and unlawfully enriched themselves at the expense of their retail clients by paying de minimis interest rates on cash balances, in breach of their fiduciary and contractual obligations.

He is also pursuing significant cases against Meta Platforms, Inc. ("Meta"), including a lawsuit alleging the social media giant knowingly facilitates and profits from billions of scam advertisements on its popular Facebook and Instagram platforms that defraud seniors and other users most vulnerable to harm. Additionally, Avi is leading the BLB&G case team in a nationwide class action brought on behalf of advertisers who were overcharged billions of dollars purchasing online ads on Meta's Facebook platform.

Avi is also leading the firm's prosecution of cases within the healthcare sector against Express Scripts and CVS—two of the country's largest pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs). These class actions, which were filed on behalf of union health and welfare funds, arise from a wide-ranging fraudulent conspiracy through which defendants diverted billions of dollars in drug rebates from their PBM customers to offshore entities to enrich themselves.

In the digital privacy space, Avi is leading the firm's prosecution and investigation of matters involving unauthorized data collection and sharing, unlawful tracking and monitoring, biometric identifiers, and data security failures. The team is litigating cases against Adidas and Lowe's for invasively tracking the activity of visitors to their websites—what visitors were browsing before coming to the website, what they did on the website, and where they went after—and then sharing that information with third parties like Microsoft and TikTok. He is also advising government and private clients on cases involving environmental harm, human trafficking, and copyright violations.

Through his prosecution of complex cases, Avi has helped recover billions of dollars on behalf of the firm's clients. He led the BLB&G team that recovered over $2 billion for 35 institutions that invested in the Allianz Structured Alpha Funds—the largest known recovery arising out of a complex options trading scandal. He also developed and prosecuted claims on behalf of U.S. and European institutions in actions against Deutsche Bank and Morgan Stanley

arising from their sale of mortgage-backed securities. Avi has presented arguments in several federal and state courts, including the Delaware Supreme Court.

In recognition of his deep knowledge and successful representation of the firm's institutional investors, Avi has been recognized by *Lawdragon* as both a "Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyer" and one of the "500 Leading Lawyers in America," and by *The National Law* Journal as a "Plaintiffs' Lawyers Trailblazer."

Education: Northwestern University School of Law, 2000, J.D., Dean's List, Awarded the Justice Stevens Public Interest Fellowship (1999); Public Interest Law Initiative Fellowship (2000); Brandeis University, 1997, B.A., *cum laude*

Bar Admissions: Illinois; New York; Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department; United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois; United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin; United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin; United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Senior Counsel

Alec Coquin practices out of the firm's New York office, where he primarily prosecutes securities fraud and shareholder rights litigation on behalf of the firm's institutional clients. Alec is currently a member of the teams prosecuting Camelot Event Driven Fund v. Morgan Stanley and City of Miami Fire Fighters' and Police Officers' Retirement Trust v. Cerence Inc.

Alec comes to BLB&G with nearly a decade of experience representing shareholders in complex litigation, most recently practicing at one of the nation's leading securities litigation firms. Alec has supported teams that helped investors recover hundreds of millions of dollars in securities class actions during his career.

Alec received his J.D. from St. John's University School of Law, *cum laude*, where he served as the Associate Managing Editor of the St. John's Law Review, and his B.A. from Wesleyan University.

Education: St. John's University School of Law, 2014, J.D. Wesleyan University, 2008, B.A.

Bar Admissions: New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Second Department; U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York; U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York; U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan; U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

David Duncan's practice concentrates on the settlement of class actions and other complex litigation and the administration of class action settlements.

Prior to joining BLB&G, David worked as a litigation associate at Debevoise & Plimpton, where he represented clients in a wide variety of commercial litigation, including contract disputes, antitrust and products liability litigation, and in international arbitration. In addition, he has represented criminal defendants on appeal in New York State courts and has successfully litigated on behalf of victims of torture and political persecution from Sudan, Côte d'Ivoire and Serbia in seeking asylum in the United States.

While in law school, David served as an editor of the *Harvard Law Review*. After law school, he clerked for Judge Amalya L. Kearse of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Education: Harvard Law School, 1997, J.D; *magna cum laude;* Harvard College, 1993, A.B., *magna cum laude*, Social Studies

Bar Admissions: New York; Connecticut; United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

Associates

Jimmy Brunetto is a BLB&G associate prosecuting securities fraud, corporate governance, and shareholder rights litigation on behalf of the firm's institutional investor clients. He practices out of the firm's New York office.

As a member of the firm's case development and client advisory group, Jimmy works as part of a team of attorneys, financial analysts, and investigators to counsel public pension funds and other institutional investors on potential legal claims.

Jimmy contributes to ongoing legal discourse on topics related to his practice areas. Most recently, he co-authored "The SEC's New Cybersecurity Disclosure Rules Decoded: What They Mean for Investors," published in *Reuters*.

Prior to joining the firm, Jimmy investigated and prosecuted securities fraud at the New York State Office of the Attorney General's Investor Protection Bureau, where he worked on several high-profile matters. In recognition for his contributions as part of a federal and state working group that investigated and prosecuted securities fraud in connection with the issuance and sale of residential mortgage-backed securities, Jimmy was awarded the Louis J. Lefkowitz Award for outstanding performance.

Jimmy received his J.D. from New York Law School, where he was honored as a John Marshall Harlan Scholar and served as a Staff Editor of the *New York Law School Law Review*. He holds both a B.S. in Finance and a B.A. in Political Science from the University of Florida.

Education: New York Law School, 2011, J.D., *cum laude*, John Marshall Harlan Scholar; Staff Editor, New York Law School Law Review; University of Florida, 2007, B.A., *cum laude*, Political Science; University of Florida, 2007, B.S.B.A, Finance

Bar Admissions: New York; U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York; U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Mathews de Carvalho is a BLB&G associate prosecuting securities fraud, corporate governance, and shareholder rights litigation on behalf of the firm's institutional investor clients. He is based in the firm's New York office.

Mat has played a key role in achieving significant recoveries for the firm's clients, including in securities class actions against Ryder System ($45 million recovery) and Cerence ($30 million recovery). Currently, he is serving as a key member of BLB&G litigation teams prosecuting several high-impact cases, including securities class actions involving The Boeing Company, Silicon Valley Bank, Meta Platforms, and Lamb Weston Holdings.

A thought leader in the field, Mat regularly contributes to legal discourse. Most recently, he co-authored an article titled "Save Your Messages: SEC's Focus on Document Retention Continues into 2024," published by Reuters. Mat is also an active member of the Federal Bar Council's First Decade Committee and has helped coordinate or moderated several panels in connection with the Federal Bar Council.

Prior to joining the firm, Mat was a member of the securities litigation group at Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, where he focused on securities class actions and corporate governance matters. He was also involved in several pro bono projects, including a criminal defense appeal and work with the Innocence Project. Mat previously served as a law clerk for the Honorable Matthew W. Brann of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Mat earned his J.D. from the New York University School of Law, where he served as Competitions Executive Editor of the Moot Court Board and was a member of the Order of Barristers. He holds a B.A. in Political Science and Sociology from Fordham University.

Education: New York University School of Law, 2019, J.D.; Fordham University, 2013, B.A., Political Science; Sociology

Bar Admissions: New York; U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York; United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Andrea Dorado [Former Associate] practiced out of the New York office prosecuting securities fraud, corporate governance, and shareholder rights litigation on behalf of the firm's institutional investor clients.

She was a member of the firm's case development and client advisory group, in which she, as part of a team of attorneys, financial analysts, and investigators, counseled public pension funds and other institutional investors on potential legal claims.

Prior to joining BLB&G, Andrea was an Antitrust and Consumer Products Associate at Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC. There, she represented plaintiffs in multidistrict class action litigation concerning a variety of antitrust and consumer protection matters, including, products liability, monopolization, restraint of trade, tying, and allegations of unfair competition.

Andrea received her J.D. from Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, where she served as the Associate Editor of the *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*, assisted asylum seekers at Sanctuary for Families, co-founded Cardozo's own Women in Tech Law chapter, interned at the New York State Department of Financial Services, and clerked for KBL Roche representing video game developers. Andrea graduated from Boston College with a B.A. in Linguistics and a minor in International Affairs and French.

Education: Boston College, 2014, B.A., Linguistics; Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, 2021, J.D.

Bar Admissions: New York

Julissa Ramirez practices out of the firm's New York office, prosecuting securities fraud, corporate governance, and shareholder rights litigation on behalf of the firm's institutional investor clients.

Prior to joining BLB&G, Julissa was selected to participate in BLB&G's 2024 Summer Associate Program. She previously managed the paralegal team for the humanitarian unit at The Law Offices of Janell Freeman, PC, where she conducted

legal research and prepared documentation for family-based, humanitarian, and special immigrant juvenile visas. Her experience also includes serving as a Judicial Extern to the Honorable Justice Joshua Groban of the Supreme Court of California and Judge Charles R. Breyer of the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of California.

Julissa received her J.D. from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law, where she contributed to Berkeley Law's Ninth Circuit Practicum, briefing and arguing a pro bono case before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. She completed her undergraduate studies at the University of California, Davis, receiving her B.A. with dual majors in Psychology and Chicana/o Studies and a minor in Political Science. *Not yet admitted to practice in New York.

Education: University of California, Berkeley School of Law, 2025, J.D.; University of California College of Law, San Francisco, 2023, Completed First-Year J.D. Curriculum; University of California, Davis, 2020, B.A., Psychology and Chicana/o Studies

Exhibit 5B

Exhibit 5B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE KORNIT DIGITAL LTD. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. CECCHI IN SUPPORT OF LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES, ON BEHALF OF CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.

I, James E. Cecchi, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a partner in the law firm Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Brody & Agnello, P.C. ("Carella Byrne").[1] I submit this declaration in support of Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees in connection with services rendered in the Action, as well as for payment of expenses incurred by my firm in connection with the Action. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and, if called upon, could and would testify to these facts.

2. My firm acted as Liaison Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs Genesee County Employees' Retirement System, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD, Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD,

[1] Capitalized terms that are not defined in this declaration have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-1) (the "Stipulation").

and Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. and the Settlement Class in this Action. In that capacity, Carella Byrne worked closely with lead counsel in all substantive aspects of the litigation, including drafting papers, attending Court appearances, and participating in settlement conferences.

3. The schedule attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a detailed summary indicating the amount of time spent by each Carella Byrne attorney and professional support staff employee from its inception through and including July 2, 2026 and the lodestar calculation for those individuals based on their current hourly rates. For personnel who are no longer employed by my firm, the lodestar calculation is based upon the hourly rates for such personnel in their final year of employment with my firm. The schedule was prepared from contemporaneous daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Carella Byrne. All time expended in preparing the request for attorneys' fees and expenses has been excluded.

4. As the partner responsible for supervising my firm's work on this case, I reviewed these time and expense records to prepare this declaration. The purpose of this review was to confirm both the accuracy of the time entries and expenses and the necessity for, and reasonableness of, the time and expenses committed to the litigation.

5. I believe that the time reflected in the firm's lodestar calculation and the expenses for which payment is sought as stated in this declaration are reasonable

in amount and were necessary for the effective and efficient prosecution and resolution of the litigation. In addition, based on my experience in similar litigation, the expenses are all of a type that would normally be billed to a fee-paying client in the private legal marketplace.

6. The hourly rates for the Carella Byrne attorneys and professional support staff employees included in Exhibit 1 are their standard rates and are the same as, or comparable to, the rates submitted by my firm and accepted by courts for lodestar cross-checks in other class action fee applications. My firm's rates are set based on periodic analysis of rates used by firms performing comparable work and that have been approved by courts. Different timekeepers within the same employment category (*e.g.*, partners, associates, paralegals, etc.) may have different rates based on a variety of factors, including years of practice, years at the firm, year in the current position (*e.g.*, years as a partner), relevant experience, relative expertise, and the rates of similarly experienced peers at our firm or other firms.

7. The total number of hours expended on this Action by my firm from the inception of the case through and including July 2, 2026, is 57.90 hours. The total lodestar for my firm for that period is $48,227.50. My firm's lodestar figures are based upon the firm's hourly rates described above, which do not include expense items. Expense items are recorded separately, and these amounts are not duplicated in my firm's hourly rates.

8. As detailed in Exhibit 2, my firm is seeking payment for a total of $1,873.17 in expenses incurred in connection with this Action.

9. The expenses reflected in Exhibit 2 are the expenses actually incurred by my firm.

10. The expenses incurred in this Action are reflected in the records of my firm, which are regularly prepared and maintained in the ordinary course of business. These records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials, and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

11. With respect to the standing of my firm, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a brief biography of my firm and the attorneys involved in this matter.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing facts are true and correct. Executed on October 14, 2026.

/s/James E. Cecchi
James E. Cecchi

EXHIBIT 1

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.

TIME REPORT

Inception through and including July 2, 2026

NAME	HOURS	HOURLY RATE	LODESTAR
Partners			
Cecchi, James	9.00	$1,400.00	$12,600.00
Cooper, Kevin	32.40	$950.00	$30,780.00
Associates			
O'Toole, Brian	0.50	$600.00	$300.00
Manory, William	2.20	$550.00	$1,210.00
Paralegals			
Houser, Nancy	4.00	$225.00	$900.00
Falduto, Jeff	3.10	$300.00	$930.00
Law Clerks			
Adimando, Matthew	5.70	$225.00	$1,282.50
Dehghan, Aryana	1.00	$225.00	$225.00
TOTALS:	**57.90**		**$48,227.50**

EXHIBIT 2

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.

EXPENSE REPORT

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
Court Fees	$1,723.40
Postage & Express Mail	$86.32
Court Reporting & Transcripts	$63.45
TOTAL:	**$1,873.17**

EXHIBIT 3

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.

FIRM BIOGRAPHY

CARELLA BYRNE CECCHI BRODY AGNELLO, P.C.

CLASS ACTION RESUME

Formed in 1976, Carella Byrne is one of the leading law firms in the New Jersey – New York metropolitan area, serving a diverse clientele ranging from small businesses to Fortune 500 corporations. Carella Byrne's class action practice - founded and led by James E. Cecchi - is the preeminent consumer class action firm in the State of New Jersey and across the United States. Mr. Cecchi has held leadership positions in many of the nation's most complex and important consumer class actions effecting consumer rights in the last ten years. The most recent examples, to name a few are: (1) *In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation*; (2) *In re Takata Airbag Product Defect Litigation*; (3) *In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation;* (4); *In re American Medical Collection Agency, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*; (5) *In re Mercedes-Benz Emissions Litigation*; (6) *In re Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litigation;* (7) *In re Volkswagen Timing Chain Product Liability Litigation;* (8) *In re Insulin Pricing Litigation*.

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

- *In re: Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2672 (N.D. Cal.) (Hon. Charles R. Breyer) (James Cecchi appointed to Steering Committee and as Settlement Class Counsel; settlement in excess of $15,000,000,000 for consumer fraud and warranty claims arising from the use of a defeat device to evade U.S. emissions regulations.)

- *In re: Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.) (Hon. Frederico A. Moreno) (James Cecchi appointed to Steering Committee and as Settlement Class Counsel; settlement in excess of $1,500,000,000 for consumer fraud and warranty claims arising from use of defective and dangerous airbags; the case is ongoing as it pertains to second-wave defendants, including Mercedes Benz USA.)

- *In re: American Medical Collection Agency, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 2904 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Madeline Cox Arleo) (James Cecchi appointed sole Lead Counsel in national Multi-District data breach litigation.)

- *In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation*, MDL No. 2804 (N.D. Ohio) (Hon. Dan A. Polster) (James Cecchi appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee relating to marketing of opioid drugs. Recent settlements include a proposed $26 billion settlement with the nation's largest drug distributors and Johnson & Johnson. Recent trial team victories include Track 3 bellwether of $650.6 million.)

- *In re: Mercedes-Benz Emissions Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-cv-881 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Kevin McNulty) (James Cecchi appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class in a case arising out of the alleged use of a defeat device to evade U.S. emissions regulations; settlement with value in excess of $700,000,000 granted final approval.)

- *In Re: Vytorin/Zetia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1938 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Dennis M. Cavanaugh); *In re Schering-Plough/Enhance Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No.: 08-cv-397 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Dennis M. Cavanaugh); *In re Merck & Co., Inc. Vytorin/Zetia Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No.: 08-cv-2177 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Dennis M. Cavanaugh) (consumer and securities fraud claims arising from marketing and sale of anti-cholesterol drugs Vytorin and Zetia) (Co-Lead Counsel in Consumer Cases which settled for $41,500,000 and Liaison Counsel in Securities Cases which collectively settled for $688,000,000.)

- *In re: Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litigation,* MDL No. 2687 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Jose L. Linares) (James Cecchi appointed as Lead Counsel and secured a settlement of greater than $100,000,000.)

- *In Re Effexor XR Antitrust Litigation,* Civil Action No. 11-cv-5661 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Joel A. Pisano) (claims on behalf of indirect purchasers of brand-name drug alleging that manufacturer obtained patent by fraud and enforced patent by sham litigation to maintain illegal monopoly of brand-name drug. James Cecchi appointed as Chair of Plaintiffs' Indirect Purchaser Executive Committee.)

- *Davis Landscape v. Hertz Equipment Rental*, Civil Action No. 06-cv-3830 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Dennis M. Cavanaugh) (Co-Lead Counsel in settlement valued at over $50,000,000 on behalf of contested nationwide class asserting claims that HERTZ' loss/damage waiver charges violated the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act because it provides no benefit to customers.)

- *In Re: Merck & Co., Inc., Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation*, MDL No. 1658 (D.N.J.) (Hon. Stanley R. Chesler) (securities fraud claims arising from Merck's failure to disclose problems with commercial viability of anti-pain drug Vioxx which settled for more than $1,000,000,000.)

- *In re: Mercedes-Benz Tele-Aid Contract Litigation*, MDL No. 1914 (Hon. Dickson R. Debevoise) (Co-Lead Counsel in $40,000,000 settlement of consumer fraud claims arising from Mercedes' failure to notify Tele-Aid customers of mandated change from analog to digital system, and charging customers to replace system Mercedes knew would be obsolete.)

Exhibit 6

EXHIBIT 6

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

BREAKDOWN OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL'S EXPENSES BY CATEGORY

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
Court Fees	$2,440.40
Investigation	$170.00
Online Factual Research	$16,644.23
Online Legal Research	$38,744.01
Telephone	$191.78
Postage & Express Mail	$86.32
Local Transportation	$892.50
Working Meals	$587.55
Court Reporting & Transcripts	$1094.45
Experts & Consultants	$41,665.85
Independent Witness Counsel & Witness Expenses	$8,540.00
Mediation Fees	$25,638.13
TOTAL:	**$136,695.22**

Exhibit 7

EXHIBIT 7

In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation,
Master File No. 2:23-cv-00888-MCA-AME

COMPENDIUM OF UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS AND AUTHORITY CITED IN THE FEE AND EXPENSE MOTION

Exhibit	
7A	Fee Order, *Odeh v. Immunomedics, Inc.*, No. 2:18-cv-17645-ESK (D.N.J. June 15, 2023), Dkt. No. 286
7B	Fee Order, *In re Advanced Auto Parts, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 1:18-cv-0212-RTD-SRF (D. Del. June 13, 2022), Dkt. No. 367
7C	Twentieth and Final Application of Davis Polk, *In re Purdue Pharma L.P.*, No. 19-23649 (SHL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. June 15, 2026), Dkt. No. 9375 (excerpts)
7D	Second Interim and Final Fee Application of Davis Polk, *In re Azul S.A.*, No. 25-1176 (SHL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2026), Dkt. No. 1396 (excerpts)
7E	Fee Order, *In re Cognizant Tech. Sols. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 16-609 (ES)(CLW) (D.N.J. Dec. 20, 2021), Dkt. No. 184, and Lead Plaintiff Declarations, No. 2:16-cv-09449 (CLW) (D.N.J. Nov. 22, 2021), Dkt. Nos. 172-1, 172-2, 172-3.
7F	Fee Order, *In re Allergan Generic Drug Pricing Sec. Litig.*, No. 2:16-cv-09449 (CLW) (D.N.J. Nov. 22, 2021), Dkt. No. 237, and Lead Plaintiff Declarations, No. 2:16-cv-09449 (CLW) (D.N.J. Oct. 13, 2021), Dkt. Nos. 231-2, 231-3
7G	Lead Plaintiff Declaration, *Vitiello v. Bed Bath & Beyond Inc.*, No. 2:20-cv-04240-MCA-MAH (D.N.J. Apr. 28, 2022), Dkt. No. 79-4

Exhibit 7A

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN,
BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
JAMES E. CECCHI
LINDSEY H. TAYLOR
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: 973/994-1700
973/994-1744 (fax)
jcecchi@carellabyrne.com
ltaylor@carellabyrne.com

Co-Liaison Counsel

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

AHMAD ODEH, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiff, vs. IMMUNOMEDICS, INC., et al., Defendants.	No. 2:18-cv-17645-ESK **(Consolidated)** CLASS ACTION

ORDER AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES AND AWARDS TO LEAD PLAINTIFFS PURSUANT TO 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4)

This matter having come before the Court on June 15, 2023, on Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses (the "Fee Motion") in the above-captioned action (the "Action"), and the Court, having considered all papers filed and proceedings conducted herein, having found the Settlement of this Action to be fair, reasonable and adequate, and otherwise being fully informed in the premises and good cause appearing therefore;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation of Settlement dated January 20, 2023 (the "Stipulation") (ECF 269-3), and all capitalized terms used in this Order, but not defined herein, shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Order, the Fee Motion, and all matters relating thereto, including Class Members.

3. Notice of Lead Counsel's Fee Motion was given to all Class Members who could be located with reasonable effort. The form and method of notifying the Class of the Fee Motion met the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(7), the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process clause), and all other applicable law and rules, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and

constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

4. The Court hereby awards Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel attorneys' fees of 29.5% of the Settlement Amount (or $11.8 million), plus expenses in the amount of $591,035.89, together with interest earned on both amounts for the same time period and at the same rate as that earned on the Settlement Fund until paid. The Court finds that the amount of fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of fees awarded is fair and reasonable under the "percentage-of-recovery" method.

5. The awarded attorneys' fees and expenses and interest earned thereon shall be paid to Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel subject to the terms, conditions, and obligations of the Stipulation, and in particular ¶6.2 thereof, which terms, conditions, and obligations are incorporated herein.

6. In making this award of fees and expenses to Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel, the Court has considered and found that:

(a) the Settlement has created a fund of $40,000,000 in cash that is already on deposit, and numerous Class Members who submit, or have submitted, valid Proof of Claim and Release Forms will benefit from the Settlement created by Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel;

(b) over 43,200 copies of the Notice were disseminated to potential Class Members indicating that Lead Counsel would move for attorneys' fees in an

amount not to exceed 29.5% of the Settlement Amount, and for expenses in an amount not to exceed $650,000, plus interest earned on both amounts, and no objections to the fees or expenses were filed by Class Members.

(c) Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel have pursued the Action and achieved the Settlement with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(d) Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel have expended substantial time and effort pursuing the Action on behalf of the Class;

(e) Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel pursued the Action on a contingent basis, having received no compensation during the Action, and any fee amount has been contingent on the result achieved;

(f) the Action involves complex factual and legal issues and, in the absence of settlement, would involve lengthy proceedings whose resolution would be uncertain;

(g) had Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel not achieved the Settlement, there would remain a significant risk that the Class may have recovered less or nothing from Defendants;

(h) Lead Plaintiffs' Counsel have devoted a total of 23,965 hours, with a lodestar value of $14,475,899.00, to achieve the Settlement;

(i) public policy concerns favor the award of reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses in securities class action litigation; and

(j) the attorneys' fees and expenses awarded are fair and reasonable and consistent with awards in similar cases within the Third Circuit.

7. Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Court's approval regarding the Fee Motion shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment entered with respect to the Settlement.

8. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4), Lead Plaintiff Boris Saljanin is awarded $12,500 and Lead Plaintiff Construction Industry and Laborers Joint Pension Trust is awarded $12,437.50 for their representation of the Class during the Action.

9. In the event that the Settlement is terminated or the Judgment approving the Settlement does not become Final or the Effective Date does not occur in accordance with the terms of the Stipulation, this Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided in the Stipulation and shall be vacated in accordance with the Stipulation.

10. There is no just reason for delay in the entry of this Order, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: **June 15, 2023**

/s/ Edward S. Kiel
THE HONORABLE EDWARD S. KIEL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Exhibit 7B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE ADVANCE AUTO PARTS, INC. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Case No. 1:18-cv-00212-RTD-SRF

ORDER AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES
AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

This matter is before the Court on Class Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. The Court having considered all matters submitted to it; and it appearing that notice substantially in the form approved by the Court, which advised of Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, was mailed to all Class Members who or which could be identified with reasonable effort, and that a summary notice substantially in the form approved by the Court was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and was transmitted over *PR Newswire* pursuant to the specifications of the Court; and the Court having considered and determined the fairness and reasonableness of the attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses requested;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement, dated December 23, 2021 (D.I. 355-1) (the "Stipulation") and all capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation.

2. The Court has jurisdiction to enter this Order and over the subject matter of the Action and all parties to the Action, including all Class Members.

3. Notice of Class Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses was given to all Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort. The form and method of notifying the Class of the motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4, as amended, and all other applicable law and rules; constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

4. Plaintiff's Counsel are hereby awarded attorneys' fees in the amount of 25% of the Settlement Fund, which sum the Court finds to be fair and reasonable. Plaintiff's Counsel are also hereby awarded $2,373,807.51 in payment of litigation expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund, which sum the Court finds to be fair and reasonable. Class Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded amongst Plaintiff's Counsel in a manner which it, in good faith, believes reflects the contributions of such counsel to the institution, prosecution, and settlement of the Action.

5. In making this award of attorneys' fees and payment of litigation expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund, the Court has considered and found that:

(a) The Settlement has created a fund of $49,250,000 in cash that has been funded into escrow pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation, and that numerous Class Members who submit acceptable Claim Forms will benefit from the Settlement that occurred because of the efforts of Plaintiff's Counsel;

(b) The fee sought has been reviewed and approved as reasonable by Class Representative, a sophisticated institutional investor that actively supervised the Action;

(c) A total of 94,462 Postcard Notices and 329 Notices were mailed to potential Class Members and nominees stating that Class Counsel would apply for an award of attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 25% of the Settlement Fund and for payment of Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $2,400,000, and not one objection to the requested fee and expense application has been received;

(d) Class Counsel conducted the litigation and achieved the Settlement with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(e) The Action raised a number of complex issues;

(f) Had Class Counsel not achieved the Settlement there would remain a significant risk that Class Representative and the other members of the Class may have recovered less or nothing from Defendants;

(g) Plaintiff's Counsel devoted over 36,416 hours to the Action, with a lodestar value of $16,982,276.00, to achieve the Settlement; and

(h) The amount of attorneys' fees awarded and expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund are fair and reasonable and consistent with awards in similar cases.

6. Class Representative the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi is hereby awarded $13,737.50 from the Settlement Fund as reimbursement for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Class.

7. Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Court's approval regarding any attorneys' fees and expense application shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment.

8. In the event that the Settlement is terminated or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by the Stipulation.

9. There is no just reason for delay in the entry of this Order, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

SO ORDERED this 13th day of June 2022.

The Honorable Robert T. Dawson
United States District Judge

Exhibit 7C

Hearing Date and Time: 11:00 a.m.[1] on July 21, 2026
Objection Deadline: 4:00 p.m. on July 14, 2026

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 450-4000
Facsimile: (212) 701-5800
Marshall S. Huebner
Benjamin S. Kaminetzky
Eli J. Vonnegut
Christopher S. Robertson
Abraham Bane

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	**Chapter 11**
PURDUE PHARMA L.P., *et al.*,	**Case No. 19-23649 (SHL)**
Debtors.[2]	**(Jointly Administered)**

COVER SHEET TO THE TWENTIETH AND FINAL APPLICATION OF DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP FOR COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE DEBTORS AND DEBTORS IN POSSESSION FOR THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 15, 2019, THROUGH MAY 1, 2026

In accordance with the Local Guidelines,[3] Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP ("**Davis Polk**"), counsel for the above-captioned debtors, submits this Summary of fees and expenses sought as

[1] All times herein are expressed in prevailing Eastern Time.

[2] The Debtors in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's registration number in the applicable jurisdiction, are as follows: Purdue Pharma L.P. (7484), Purdue Pharma Inc. (7486), Purdue Transdermal Technologies L.P. (1868), Purdue Pharma Manufacturing L.P. (3821), Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. (0034), Imbrium Therapeutics L.P. (8810), Adlon Therapeutics L.P. (6745), Greenfield BioVentures L.P. (6150), Seven Seas Hill Corp. (4591), Ophir Green Corp. (4594), Purdue Pharma of Puerto Rico (3925), Purdue Products L.P. (4140), Purdue Pharmaceutical Products L.P. (3902), Purdue Neuroscience Company (4712), Nayatt Cove Lifescience Inc. (7805), Button Land L.P. (7502), Rhodes Associates L.P. (N/A), Paul Land Inc. (7425), Quidnick Land L.P. (7584), Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. (6166), Rhodes Technologies (7143), UDF LP (0495), SVC Pharma LP (5717) and SVC Pharma Inc. (4014). The Debtors' corporate headquarters is located at One Stamford Forum, 201 Tresser Boulevard, Stamford, CT 06901.

[3] Capitalized terms used but not defined in this summary (this "**Summary**") shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the application to which this Summary is attached (the "**Application**").

actual and necessary in the Application for the period of September 15, 2019, through May 1, 2026 (the "**Fee Period**"), including the period of January 1, 2026, through May 1, 2026 (the "**20th Fee Period**").

General Information	
Name of Applicant:	Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP Counsel to Debtors and Debtors in Possession
Authorized to Provide Services to:	Purdue Pharma L.P., *et al.*,
Petition Date:	September 15, 2019
Retention Date:	November 25, 2019, *nunc pro tunc* to September 15, 2019 [ECF No. 542]
Date of Order Approving Retention:	November 25, 2019 [ECF No. 542]
Summary of Fees and Expenses Requested for the 20th Fee Period	
Time Period Covered by This Application:	January 1, 2026, through May 1, 2026
Total Compensation Requested:	$11,530,019.50
Total Expenses Requested:	$60,658.96
Total Compensation and Expenses Requested:	$11,590,678.46[4]
Summary of Past Requests for Compensation for the 20th Fee Period and Prior Payments[5]	
Compensation Sought in This Application Already Paid Pursuant to a Compensation Order but Not yet Allowed:	$9,224,015.60
Expenses Sought in This Application Already Paid Pursuant to a Compensation Order but Not yet Allowed:	$60,658.96
Total Compensation and Expenses Sought in This Application Already Paid Pursuant to a Compensation Order but Not yet Allowed:	$2,306,003.90

[4] This figure reflects reductions in the aggregate amount of at least $209,989.72 on account of voluntary write-offs and/or compliance with applicable Fee Guidelines.

[5] Pursuant to the Interim Compensation Order, the objection deadline with respect to the *Seventy-Ninth Monthly Fee Statement of Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP for Compensation for Services and Reimbursement of Expenses Incurred as Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession for the Period from March 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026* [ECF No. 9157] has passed, and objections to the *Eightieth Monthly Fee Statement of Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP for Compensation for Services and Reimbursement of Expenses Incurred as Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession for the Period from April 1, 2026, through May 1, 2026* [ECF No. 9284] are to be filed no later than June 16, 2026. As of the time of this filing, Davis Polk has received no objections or other responsive pleadings to such fee statements, and therefore anticipates that, prior to the hearing with respect to this Application, it will receive compensation in the amount of $5,407,512.96, as set forth therein.

Summary of Rates and Other Related Information for the 20th Fee Period	
Blended Rate in This Application for All Professionals:	$1,845.39
Number of Professionals Included in This Application:	66
Difference Between Fees Budgeted and Compensation Sought for This Period:	N/A[6]
Number of Professionals Billing Fewer than 15 Hours During This Period:	17
Increase in Rates Since Date of Retention:	The 20th Fee Period includes a customary annual rate increase for all timekeepers as disclosed in a supplemental declaration filed at ECF No. 8466.

This is a(n): ___ monthly __ interim _x_ final application

Summary of Davis Polk's Monthly Fee Statements for the 20th Fee Period						
Period Covered and ECF No.	**Total Fees Requested**	**Total Expenses Requested**	**Total Fees and Expenses Requested**	**Fees Paid**	**Expenses Paid**	**Total Balance Remaining to be Paid**
1/1/2026 – 1/31/2026 ECF No. 8872	$2,748,815.00	$14,960.87	$2,763,775.87	$2,199,052.00	$14,960.87	$549,763.00
2/1/2026 – 2/28/2026 ECF No. 9007	$2,064,462.00	$11,579.13	$2,076,041.13	$1,651,569.60	$11,579.13	$412,892.40
3/1/2026 – 3/31/2026 ECF No. 9157	$3,036,100.00	$15,697.67	$3,051,797.67	$2,428,880.00	$15,697.67	$607,220.00
4/1/2026 – 5/1/2026 ECF No. 9284	$3,680,642.50	$18,421.29	$3,699,063.79	$2,944,514.00	$18,421.29	$736,128.50

***

[6] As there has been no budget update for this period since June 2025, there is no current Davis Polk budget applicable to this period.

Hearing Date and Time: 11:00 a.m. on July 21, 2026
Objection Deadline: 4:00 p.m. on July 14, 2026

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 450-4000
Facsimile: (212) 701-5800
Marshall S. Huebner
Benjamin S. Kaminetzky
Eli J. Vonnegut
Christopher S. Robertson
Abraham Bane

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	**Chapter 11**
PURDUE PHARMA L.P., *et al.*,	**Case No. 19-23649 (SHL)**
Debtors.[1]	**(Jointly Administered)**

TWENTIETH AND FINAL APPLICATION OF DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP FOR COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE DEBTORS AND DEBTORS IN POSSESSION FOR THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 15, 2019, THROUGH MAY 1, 2026

Pursuant to sections 327 and 330 of title 11 of the United States Code (the "**Bankruptcy Code**"), Rule 2016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "**Bankruptcy Rules**"), Rule 2016-1 of the Local Bankruptcy Rules for the Southern District of New York, incorporating the *Amended Guidelines for Fees and Disbursements for Professionals in the Southern District of New*

[1] The Debtors in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's registration number in the applicable jurisdiction, are as follows: Purdue Pharma L.P. (7484), Purdue Pharma Inc. (7486), Purdue Transdermal Technologies L.P. (1868), Purdue Pharma Manufacturing L.P. (3821), Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. (0034), Imbrium Therapeutics L.P. (8810), Adlon Therapeutics L.P. (6745), Greenfield BioVentures L.P. (6150), Seven Seas Hill Corp. (4591), Ophir Green Corp. (4594), Purdue Pharma of Puerto Rico (3925), Purdue Products L.P. (4140), Purdue Pharmaceutical Products L.P. (3902), Purdue Neuroscience Company (4712), Nayatt Cove Lifescience Inc. (7805), Button Land L.P. (7502), Rhodes Associates L.P. (N/A), Paul Land Inc. (7425), Quidnick Land L.P. (7584), Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. (6166), Rhodes Technologies (7143), UDF LP (0495), SVC Pharma LP (5717) and SVC Pharma Inc. (4014). The Debtors' corporate headquarters is located at One Stamford Forum, 201 Tresser Boulevard, Stamford, CT 06901.

York Bankruptcy Cases [General Order M-447], among other guidelines (together, the "**Local Guidelines**"), the *Guidelines for Reviewing Applications for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses Filed Under 11 U.S.C. § 330 for Attorneys in Larger Chapter 11 Cases*, effective as of November 1, 2013 (the "**U.S. Trustee Guidelines**," and together with the Local Guidelines, the "**Fee Guidelines**"), the *Order Establishing Procedures for Interim Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses for Retained Professionals* [ECF No. 529] (the "**Interim Compensation Order**"), the Retention Order,[2] and Article 2.1(b) of the Plan, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP ("**Davis Polk**"), counsel for the above-captioned debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the "**Debtors**"), submits this *Twentieth and Final Application of Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP for Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Expenses Incurred as Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession for the Period from September 15, 2019, through May 1, 2026* (together with the exhibits hereto, this "**Application**") seeking (a) final allowance of compensation in the total amount of $314,198,771.74[3] ($311,286,126.86 for reasonable and necessary professional services rendered and reimbursement of $2,912,644.88 for actual and necessary costs and expenses incurred) for the period of September 15, 2019, through May 1, 2026 (the "**Fee Period**")—including $11,530,019.50 for reasonable and necessary professional services rendered during the period of January 1, 2026, through May 1, 2026 (the "**20th Fee Period**") and reimbursement of $60,658.96 for actual and necessary costs and expenses that Davis Polk incurred in connection with such services—and (b) payment of the foregoing amounts (to the extent not already paid).

[2] Capitalized terms used but not immediately or otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them elsewhere herein or in the *Eighteenth Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Purdue Pharma L.P. and its Affiliated Debtors* [ECF No. 8263, Ex. A] (the "**Plan**"), as applicable.

[3] As further set forth below, this figure reflects reductions in the aggregate amount of at least $5,380,436.23.

Exhibit A

Professional and Paraprofessional Fees for the 20th Fee Period

Name of Professional	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year Of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Partner					
Azzopardi, Frank J.	Partner; joined partnership in 2008; admitted: New York 2004	Intellectual Property	$2,935.00	1.1	$3,228.50
Bauer, David R.	Partner; joined partnership in 2018; admitted: New York 2008	Intellectual Property	$2,935.00	47.7	$139,999.50
Conway, Jennifer S.	Partner; joined partnership in 2021; admitted: New York 2002	Employment	$2,935.00	21.5	$63,102.50
Huebner, Marshall S.	Partner; joined partnership in 1999; admitted: New York 1994	Restructuring	$2,935.00	182.0	$534,170.00
Kaminetzky, Benjamin S.	Partner; joined partnership in 2003; admitted: New York 1996	Civil Litigation	$2,935.00	96.8	$284,108.00
Libby, Angela M.	Partner; joined partnership in 2019; admitted: New York 2012	Restructuring	$2,935.00	39.6	$116,226.00
McClammy, James I.	Partner; joined partnership in 2015; admitted: New York 1999	Civil Litigation	$2,935.00	11.1	$32,578.50
Vonnegut, Eli J.	Partner; joined partnership in 2015; admitted: New York 2008	Restructuring	$2,935.00	266.4	$781,884.00
Williams, Marc O.	Partner; joined partnership in 1998; admitted: New York 1999	Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$2,935.00	2.2	$6,457.00
Partner Total:				**668.4**	**$1,961,754.00**
Counsel					
Altus, Leslie J.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 1985; admitted: New York 1984	Tax	$2,235.00	118.4	$264,624.00
Brown, Joseph W.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2017	Restructuring	$1,970.00	194.0	$382,180.00
Kasprisin, Justin Alexander	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2017; admitted: New York 2012	Employment	$1,970.00	30.7	$60,479.00
Lele, Ajay B.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2008; admitted: New York 2001	Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$2,235.00	86.0	$192,210.00
Matlock, Tracy L.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2011; admitted: New York 2013	Tax	$2,235.00	106.0	$236,910.00
Piraino, Stephen D.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2014; admitted: New York 2014	Restructuring	$2,235.00	40.8	$91,188.00
Robertson, Christopher	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2011; admitted: New York 2013	Restructuring	$2,235.00	32.1	$71,743.50
Shi, Charles	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2016; admitted: New York 2009	Employment	$2,235.00	10.3	$23,020.50
Sieben, Brian G.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2015; admitted: New York 2016	Private Wealth	$2,235.00	27.6	$61,686.00
Tobak, Marc J.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2009; admitted: Ohio 2012	Civil Litigation	$2,235.00	189.3	$423,085.50
Counsel Total:				**835.2**	**$1,807,126.50**
Associates, Law Clerks, and Legal Assistants					
Azie, Erin	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,410.00	9.7	$13,677.00
Bamidele, David	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,065.00	17.6	$18,744.00
Bane, Abraham	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2019; admitted: New York 2020	Restructuring	$1,780.00	5.6	$9,968.00
			$1,885.00	305.8	$576,433.00
Blum, Garry A.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: New York 2026	Litigation - General	$1,175.00	5.4	$6,345.00

Britvan, Bari	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Intellectual Property	$1,410.00	6.1	$8,601.00
Brown, Tasha	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,410.00	17.3	$24,393.00
Chandrakumar, Priyanka	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$1,410.00	6.0	$8,460.00
Chiakpo, Colin	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$1,410.00	201.0	$283,410.00
Cordonnier, Bailey	Lawyer - Not Admitted Locally; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: Missouri 2025	Litigation - General	$1,845.00	72.1	$133,024.50
Dekhtyar, Mariya	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted: New York 2021	Information Systems	$1,885.00	48.9	$92,176.50
Dobrovolskiy, Dmitry	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2021; admitted: New York 2022	Tax	$1,885.00	59.4	$111,969.00
Dyas, Molly	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$1,885.00	58.0	$109,330.00
Halper, Jordan F.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Litigation - General	$1,410.00	92.0	$129,720.00
Kazaz, Itay	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2023	Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$1,845.00	240.6	$443,907.00
Kim, Eric M.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2017; admitted: New York 2017	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	5.6	$10,556.00
Kramer, Isaiah B.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2024	Tax	$1,845.00	6.4	$11,808.00
Kreider, Kyle	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted: New York 2023	Restructuring	$1,885.00	5.7	$10,744.50
Martino, Daniella	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Intellectual Property	$1,410.00	20.3	$28,623.00
Marx, Elaina	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted: New York 2023	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	144.7	$272,759.50
Melcer, Moshe	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted: New York 2021	Restructuring	$1,885.00	31.0	$58,435.00
Moelis, Ryann E.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted: New York 2023	White Collar Defense & Investigations	$1,885.00	110.6	$208,481.00
Pollock, Brian	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted: District of Columbia 2021	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	134.1	$252,778.50
Russo, Anthony	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2025	Litigation - General	$1,410.00	272.5	$384,225.00
Sette, Kevin E.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2022	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	143.1	$269,743.50
Sherman, Bradford	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2019; admitted: New York 2019	Tax	$1,885.00	12.0	$22,620.00
Shi, Long	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2023	Employment	$1,845.00	9.7	$17,896.50
Shinbrot, Joshua N.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2019; admitted: New York 2020	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	584.5	$1,101,782.50
Somers, Kate	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted: New York 2021	Restructuring	$1,885.00	0.6	$1,131.00
Talas, Ted	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2024	Intellectual Property	$1,885.00	2.7	$5,089.50
Tirú Vega, Carolina	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: New York 2024	Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$1,410.00	137.6	$194,016.00
Townes, Esther C.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2018; admitted: New York 2018	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	54.6	$102,921.00
Trost, Brette L.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2019; admitted: New York 2020	Intellectual Property	$1,885.00	101.6	$191,516.00
Tublin, Daniel	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: New York 2025	Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$1,175.00	56.3	$66,152.50
Ungan, Nazli	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2018	Intellectual Property	$1,410.00	13.6	$19,176.00
Verrier, Hugh Hansard	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted: New York 2023	Civil Litigation	$1,885.00	42.6	$80,301.00
Whalen, Mckenzie K.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2024	Restructuring	$1,255.00	3.6	$4,518.00
			$1,845.00	67.4	$124,353.00

Willems, Emma	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted: New York 2023	Intellectual Property	$1,885.00	11.8	$22,243.00
Williams Wells, Zakiya Desiree	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: New York 2025	Litigation - General	$1,410.00	152.8	$215,448.00
Winiarski, Kevin L.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted: New York 2024	Restructuring	$1,845.00	278.7	$514,201.50
Yang, Yueyu	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted: New York 2021	Tax	$1,885.00	52.7	$99,339.50
Bernard, Trevor	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: New York 2026	Securities Distribution	$1,175.00	75.4	$88,595.00
Blum, Garry A.	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted: New York 2026	Litigation - General	$1,175.00	138.4	$162,620.00
Gbaye, Chanty	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Finance	$1,175.00	136.6	$160,505.00
Junda, Nikki	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Litigation - General	$1,175.00	233.0	$273,775.00
Nelson, Haili S.	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Employment	$1,175.00	33.3	$39,127.50
Schwartz, David	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$1,175.00	142.5	$167,437.50
Vance, Eden	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Tax	$1,175.00	105.1	$123,492.50
Wong, Emmanuella (Vicky)	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$1,175.00	41.9	$49,232.50
Ben-Abdallah, Sheima	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2026	L/A - Litigation	$560.00	2.9	$1,624.00
Brandl, Jillian	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2026	L/A - Litigation	$560.00	9.3	$5,208.00
Bruney, Theresa	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2001	L/A - Litigation	$790.00	2.2	$1,738.00
Coyle, Daniel	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2025	L/A - Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$790.00	75.0	$59,250.00
Fabsik, Paul	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2025	L/A - Insolvency and Restructuring	$790.00	111.6	$88,164.00
Graves, Will	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2024	L/A - Mergers and Acquisitions - General	$790.00	7.1	$5,609.00
Hasbun-Rivera, Jacob	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2026	L/A - Litigation	$560.00	43.2	$24,192.00
Mcadams, Matias	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2024	L/A - Litigation	$790.00	105.7	$83,503.00
Menkes, Madeleine	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2025	L/A - Insolvency and Restructuring	$790.00	149.9	$118,421.00
O'Brien, Emily	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2025	L/A - Litigation	$790.00	21.3	$16,827.00
Vanora, Maria F.	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 1985	L/A - Tax	$790.00	2.6	$2,054.00
Wang, Zidao	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2024	L/A - Litigation	$790.00	3.2	$2,528.00
Chen, Johnny W.	eDiscovery Project Manager; joined Davis Polk in 2008	eDiscovery Project Management	$835.00	31.4	$26,219.00
Associates, Law Clerks, and Legal Assistants Total:				**5,073.9**	**$7,761,139.00**
Grand Total				**6,577.5**	**$11,530,019.50**

Exhibit D

Customary and Comparable Compensation Disclosures for the 20th Fee Period

TIMEKEEPER CATEGORY	BLENDED HOURLY RATE	
	Professionals at Davis Polk's New York Office for a 12-Month Period Ending on April 30, 2026, Excluding Bankruptcy Matters[1]	**Purdue Application**
Partner	**$2,341.45**	**$2,935**
Counsel	**$1,898.08**	**$2,163.71**
Other Attorneys[2]	**$1,236.04**	**$1,624.89**
Paraprofessionals	**$568.76**	**$766.14**
All Timekeepers Aggregated	**$1,444.78**	**$1,753.48**

[1] This blended hourly rate is adjusted to exclude hours and compensation billed to certain clients with special billing arrangements.

[2] This category includes Law Clerks and Discovery Attorneys.

Exhibit 7D

Hearing Date: May 6, 2026 at 11:00 a.m.[1]
Objection Deadline: April 21, 2026 at 4:00 p.m.

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 450-4000
Timothy Graulich
Joshua Y. Sturm
Stephen D. Piraino
Jarret Erickson
Richard J. Steinberg

Counsel to the Reorganized Debtors

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	**Chapter 11**
AZUL S.A., *et al.*,	**Case No. 25-11176 (SHL)**
Reorganized Debtors.[2]	**(Jointly Administered)**

COVER SHEET TO THE SECOND INTERIM AND FINAL FEE APPLICATION OF DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP FOR COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE REORGANIZED DEBTORS FOR THE (I) INTERIM FEE PERIOD OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2025 THROUGH FEBRUARY 20, 2026 AND (II) FINAL FEE PERIOD OF MAY 28, 2025 THROUGH FEBRUARY 20, 2026

In accordance with Rule 2016-1 of the Local Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, incorporating the *Amended Guidelines for Fees and Disbursements for Professionals in the Southern District of New York Bankruptcy Cases* [General Order M-447], among other guidelines (the "**Local**

[1] All times herein are expressed in prevailing Eastern Time.

[2] The reorganized debtors, along with the last four digits of their respective tax or employer identification numbers (as applicable), are as follows: Azul S.A. (CNPJ: 5.994); Azul Linhas Aéreas Brasileiras S.A. (CNPJ: 6.295); and Azul Secured Finance LLP (EIN: 9978). The Debtors' corporate headquarters is located at Avenida Marcos Penteado de Ulhôa Rodrigues, nº 939, 8º floor, Edifício Jatobá, Condomínio Castelo Branco Office Park, Tamboré, 06460-040, Barueri, São Paulo, Brazil.

Guidelines"), and the *Order Establishing Procedures for Interim Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Retained Professionals*, dated July 18, 2025 [ECF No. 261] (the "**Interim Compensation Order**"), Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP ("**Davis Polk**"), counsel for the above-captioned reorganized debtors (collectively, the "**Debtors**"), submits this summary (this "**Summary**") of fees and expenses sought as actual and necessary in the fee application to which this Summary is attached (the "**Application**") for (i) the interim fee period of September 1, 2025 through February 20, 2026 (the "**Second Interim Fee Period**") and (ii) the aggregate fee period of May 28, 2025 through February 20, 2026 (the "**Final Fee Period**").

General Information	
Name of Applicant:	Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP Counsel to the Reorganized Debtors
Authorized to Provide Services to:	Azul S.A., *et al*.
Petition Date:	May 28, 2025
Retention Date:	July 16, 2025 *nunc pro tunc* to May 28, 2025
Date of Order Approving Retention:	July 16, 2025 [ECF No. 220]
Summary of Fees and Expenses Requested in This Application for the Second Interim Fee Period	
Time Period Covered by the Second Interim Fee Period:	September 1, 2025 through February 20, 2026
Total Compensation Requested in the Second Interim Fee Period:	$20,095,627.50
Total Expenses Requested in the Second Interim Fee Period:	$60,990.76

Total Compensation and Expenses Requested in the Second Interim Fee Period:	$20,156,618.26[3]
Summary of Past Requests for Compensation and Prior Payments[4]	
Compensation Sought in This Application for the Second Interim Fee Period Already Paid Pursuant to a Compensation Order but Not Yet Allowed:	$16,076,502.00
Expenses Sought in This Application for the Second Interim Fee Period Already Paid Pursuant to a Compensation Order but Not Yet Allowed:	$60,990.76
Total Compensation and Expenses Sought in This Application for the Second Interim Fee Period Already Paid Pursuant to a Compensation Order but Not Yet Allowed:	$16,137,492.76
Summary of Rates and Other Related Information for the Second Interim Fee Period	
Blended Rate in Second Interim Fee Period for All Partners, of Counsel, and Associates:	$1,761.32
Blended Rate in Second Interim Fee Period for All Timekeepers:	$1,735.78

[3] The "Total Compensation and Expenses Requested in the Second Interim Fee Period" accounts for voluntary write-offs in an aggregate amount of $305,182.00 reflected in the monthly fee statements filed during the Second Interim Fee Period and incorporated in the total compensation and expenses reflected in this Application.

[4] Pursuant to the Interim Compensation Order, objections to the *Ninth Monthly Fee Statement of Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP for Compensation for Services and Reimbursement of Expenses Incurred as Counsel to the Reorganized Debtors for the Period from February 1, 2026 through February 20, 2026* [ECF No. 1380] (the "**February Monthly Fee Statement**") are to be filed no later than April 9, 2026. Absent any such objection or other responsive pleading to the February Monthly Fee Statement being filed, Davis Polk anticipates that, prior to the hearing with respect to this Application, it will receive compensation in the amount of $2,734,727.20, which is equal to 80% of the total amount of reasonable compensation for actual, necessary legal services that Davis Polk incurred in connection with such services during the period from February 1, 2026 through and including February 20, 2026 (the "**February Fee Period**"), and payment of $12,246.68 for the actual, necessary expenses of Davis Polk incurred in connection with such services during the February Fee Period.

Number of Professionals Included in the Second Interim Fee Period:	78
Difference Between Fees Budgeted and Compensation Sought for the Second Interim Fee Period:	N/A
Number of Professionals Billing Fewer Than 15 Hours During the Second Interim Fee Period:	26
Increase in Rates Since Date of Retention:	This Application includes a customary annual rate increase for all timekeepers since Davis Polk's retention in the Chapter 11 Cases, which was disclosed on the Court docket in the *Supplemental Declaration of Timothy Graulich Pursuant to the Order Approving Application of the Debtors for Authority to Employ and Retain Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP as Attorneys for the Debtors* Nunc Pro Tunc *to the Petition Date* [ECF No. 1163].
Summary of Fees and Expenses Requested in This Application for the Final Fee Period	
Time Period Covered by the Final Fee Period:	May 28, 2025 through February 20, 2026
Total Compensation Requested in the Final Fee Period:	$30,441,372.50
Total Expenses Requested in the Final Fee Period:	$142,513.90
Total Compensation and Expenses Requested in the Final Fee Period:	$30,583,886.40[5]
Summary of Rates and Other Related Information for the Final Fee Period	
Blended Rate in the Final Fee Period for All Partners, of Counsel, and Associates:	$1,725.26

[5] The "Total Compensation and Expenses Requested in the Final Fee Period" accounts for (i) voluntary write-offs in an aggregate amount of $462,118.00 reflected in the monthly fee statements filed during the Final Fee Period and (ii) additional voluntary write-offs of fees and expenses reflected in the Court's *Order Granting First Interim Applications for Allowance of Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Expenses Incurred from May 28, 2025 Through and Including August 31, 2025* [ECF No. 991] in the aggregate amount of $12,705.14, for a total voluntary reduction of $474,823.14 in these Chapter 11 Cases.

Blended Rate in the Final Fee Period for All Timekeepers:	$1,695.61
Number of Professionals Included in the Final Fee Period:	90
Difference Between Fees Budgeted and Compensation Sought for the Final Fee Period:	N/A
Number of Professionals Billing Fewer Than 15 Hours During the Final Fee Period:	26
Increase in Rates Since Date of Retention:	This Application includes a customary annual rate increase for all timekeepers since Davis Polk's retention in the Chapter 11 Cases, which was disclosed on the Court docket in the *Supplemental Declaration of Timothy Graulich Pursuant to the Order Approving Application of the Debtors for Authority to Employ and Retain Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP as Attorneys for the Debtors* Nunc Pro Tunc *to the Petition Date* [ECF No. 1163].

This is a(n): ___ monthly _x_ interim _x_ final application

Hearing Date: May 6, 2026 at 11:00 a.m.[1]
Objection Deadline: April 21, 2026 at 4:00 p.m.

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 450-4000
Timothy Graulich
Joshua Y. Sturm
Stephen D. Piraino
Jarret Erickson
Richard J. Steinberg

Counsel to the Reorganized Debtors

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	**Chapter 11**
AZUL S.A., *et al.*,	**Case No. 25-1176 (SHL)**
Reorganized Debtors.[2]	**(Jointly Administered)**

SECOND INTERIM AND FINAL FEE APPLICATION OF DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP FOR COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE REORGANIZED DEBTORS FOR THE (I) INTERIM FEE PERIOD OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2025 THROUGH FEBRUARY 20, 2026 AND (II) FINAL FEE PERIOD OF MAY 28, 2025 THROUGH FEBRUARY 20, 2026

Pursuant to sections 327, 330, and 331 of chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code (the "**Bankruptcy Code**"), Rule 2016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "**Bankruptcy Rules**"), Rule 2016-1 of the Local Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, incorporating

[1] All times herein are expressed in prevailing Eastern Time.

[2] The reorganized debtors, along with the last four digits of their respective tax or employer identification numbers (as applicable), are as follows: Azul S.A. (CNPJ: 5.994); Azul Linhas Aéreas Brasileiras S.A. (CNPJ: 6.295); and Azul Secured Finance LLP (EIN: 9978). The Debtors' corporate headquarters is located at Avenida Marcos Penteado de Ulhôa Rodrigues, nº 939, 8º floor, Edifício Jatobá, Condomínio Castelo Branco Office Park, Tamboré, 06460-040, Barueri, São Paulo, Brazil.

Exhibit C

Professional and Paraprofessional Fees for Second Interim Fee Period

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Partners					
Azzopardi, Frank J.	Partner; joined partnership in 2008; admitted New York 2004	Intellectual Property	$2,645	16.7	$44,171.50
			$2,935	2.6	$7,631.00
Blanco, Maurice	Partner; joined partnership in 2008; admitted New York 2002	Corporate	$2,935	3.5	$10,272.50
Buchwald, Lara Samet	Partner; joined partnership in 2017; admitted New York 2009	Litigation	$2,645	22.7	$60,041.50
Florack, James A.	Partner; joined partnership in 1986; admitted New York 1988	Sponsor Finance	$2,645	12.3	$32,533.50
Garciadiaz, Manuel	Partner; joined partnership in 1998; admitted New York 1998	Corporate	$2,645	42.0	$111,090.00
			$2,935	170.7	$501,004.50
Goodman, Corey M.	Partner; joined partnership in 2021; admitted New York 2008	Tax	$2,645	4.6	$12,167.00
			$2,935	10.7	$31,404.50
Graulich, Timothy	Partner; joined partnership in 2009; admitted New York 1995	Restructuring	$2,645	615.2	$1,627,204.00
			$2,935	154.3	$452,870.50
Kaminetzky, Benjamin S.	Partner; joined partnership in 1995; admitted New York 1996	Litigation	$2,645	5.6	$14,812.00
Kaminsky, Adam	Partner; joined partnership in 2019; admitted New York 2006	Employment	$2,645	8.7	$23,011.50
			$2,935	1.4	$4,109.00

[1] The Second Interim Fee Period includes customary annual rate increases for all timekeepers, which occurred on January 1, 2026 and was disclosed in the *Supplemental Declaration of Timothy Graulich Pursuant to the Order Approving Application of the Debtors for Authority to Employ and Retain Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP as Attorneys for the Debtors* Nunc Pro Tunc *to the Petition Date* [ECF No. 1163]. This exhibit includes the hourly billing rates for the calendar years 2025 and 2026, as well as the hours and amounts billed under each rate, as applicable.

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Marquardt, Paul D.	Partner; joined partnership in 2021; admitted Michigan 1996; admitted District of Columbia 1998	Financial Institutions	$2,645	1.2	$3,174.00
Merns, Jillian E.	Partner; joined partnership in 2025; admitted New York 2009	Private Wealth	$2,610	2.1	$5,481.00
Solomon, Jesse	Partner; joined partnership in 2016; admitted District of Columbia 2011	Antitrust & Competition	$2,645	30.7	$81,201.50
Zhang, Yan	Partner; joined partnership in 2016; admitted New York 2005	Derivatives	$2,645	49.7	$131,456.50
			$2,935	63.3	$185,785.50
	Partner Total:			**1,218.0**	**$3,339,421.50**
	Counsel				
Erickson, Jarret	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2018; admitted New York 2018	Restructuring	$1,790	610.2	$1,092,258.00
			$2,235	339.2	$758,112.00
Kleinman, Jacob S.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2001	M&A	$2,040	40.1	$81,804.00
			$2,235	20.8	$46,488.00
Lopes-Sabino, Lourenço	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2015; admitted England and Wales 2014; admitted São Paulo 2015	Corporate	$2,235	7.6	$16,986.00
Matlock, Tracy L.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2011; admitted New York 2013	Tax	$2,040	81.7	$166,668.00
			$2,235	17.3	$38,665.50
McCoy, Meytal	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted District of Columbia 2007	Antitrust & Competition	$2,040	4.5	$9,180.00
Molchanov, Dmitriy	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2017; admitted New York 2018	M&A	$1,790	5.0	$8,950.00
Papadopoulos, Konstantinos	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2015; admitted São Paulo 2010	Corporate	$2,040	105.3	$214,812.00
			$2,235	100.2	$223,947.00

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Piraino, Stephen D.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2014; admitted New York 2014	Restructuring	$2,040	196.1	$400,044.00
			$2,235	28.9	$64,591.50
Schisa, Will	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2017; admitted District of Columbia 2002	Financial Institutions	$2,040	1.2	$2,448.00
Sieben, Brian G.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2015; admitted New York 2016	Private Wealth	$1,790	11.8	$21,122.00
Silver, Matthew R.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2017; admitted New York 2015	Investment Management	$2,040	1.1	$2,244.00
Sin, Yuko	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2017; admitted New York 2018	Sponsor Finance	$1,790	149.1	$266,889.00
			$2,235	141.6	$316,476.00
Steinberg, Richard J.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2019; admitted New York 2019	Restructuring	$1,790	716.5	$1,282,535.00
			$1,970	311.5	$613,655.00
Sturm, Josh	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted New York 2007	Restructuring	$2,040	314.2	$640,968.00
			$2,235	60.2	$134,547.00
Tobak, Marc J.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2009; admitted New York 2009	Litigation	$2,040	101.0	$206,040.00
Woller, Christopher C.	Counsel; joined Davis Polk in 2016; admitted New York 2017	Intellectual Property	$2,040	56.8	$115,872.00
			$2,235	16.7	$37,324.50
Counsel Total:				**3,438.6**	**$6,762,626.50**
Associates, Law Clerks, and Legal Assistants					
Dethmers, Frances	Special Adviser - EU Antitrust; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted Netherlands 2012; admitted Brussels 2023	Antitrust & Competition	$2,040	23.2	$47,328.00
			$2,235	3.5	$7,822.50
Bamidele, David	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,065	18.8	$20,022.00

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Battaglia, Jenna	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New York 2023	Tax	$1,885	13.5	$25,447.50
Beer, David J.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New York 2024	Tax	$1,255	100.8	$126,504.00
			$1,845	45.8	$84,501.00
Chisholm, Louis W.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2021	Litigation	$1,780	17.7	$31,506.00
Dekhtyar, Mariya	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted New York 2021	Restructuring	$1,780	64.7	$115,166.00
Diniz, Alexandre	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2022	Corporate	$1,760	235.1	$413,776.00
			$1,885	248.7	$468,799.50
Floyd, Thomas	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Litigation	$1,065	2.2	$2,343.00
Forrester, Lachlan J.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2023	Intellectual Property	$1,780	42.3	$75,294.00
			$1,885	23.3	$43,920.50
Frisoli, Andrew	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2022	Restructuring	$1,780	656.0	$1,167,680.00
			$1,885	129.9	$244,861.50
Goldberger, Jacob	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New York 2023	Restructuring	$1,255	74.4	$93,372.00
			$1,845	65.8	$121,401.00
Hood, Cameron K.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2023	M&A	$1,670	6.6	$11,022.00
			$1,885	4.5	$8,482.50
Isaacs, Ben	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New Zealand 2016; admitted England and Wales 2021	Antitrust & Competition	$1,780	48.2	$85,796.00
			$1,885	1.0	$1,885.00
Jang, Seokwon (Eric)	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Tax	$1,065	2.6	$2,769.00
Jorde, Wolfgang	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,065	59.9	$63,793.50

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Kreider, Kyle	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2023	Restructuring	$1,670	5.6	$9,352.00
Kuang, Tony	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New York 2024	Sponsor Finance	$1,255	12.9	$16,189.50
Liang, William	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted New York 2022	Tax	$1,780	18.0	$32,040.00
			$1,885	13.3	$25,070.50
Looney, Chris	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2020	Financial Institutions	$1,780	1.7	$3,026.00
Luo, Lara	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2020	Restructuring	$1,780	18.5	$32,930.00
Ma, Sophy	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted New York 2021	Restructuring	$1,780	42.4	$75,472.00
			$1,885	83.0	$156,455.00
Makorie, Zanudeen (Zane)	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted New York 2021	Sponsor Finance	$1,885	60.2	$113,477.00
Masella, Francesca	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2021; admitted New York 2022	Intellectual Property	$1,760	27.2	$47,872.00
			$1,885	3.4	$6,409.00
Moran, Lily	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2023	Litigation	$1,670	79.6	$132,932.00
			$1,885	1.9	$3,581.50
Murchie, Hugh	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,065	26.6	$28,329.00
			$1,410	109.5	$154,395.00
Nelson, Charlie	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Sponsor Finance	$1,065	48.0	$51,120.00
			$1,410	86.9	$122,529.00
Nirappel, James	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2023	Restructuring	$1,670	150.2	$250,834.00
			$1,885	14.5	$27,332.50
Otero, Katie Kelleher	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,065	568.6	$605,559.00
			$1,410	327.3	$461,493.00

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Philhower, Naomi R.	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2024; admitted New York 2025	Restructuring	$1,065	715.5	$762,007.50
			$1,410	206.2	$290,742.00
Rivkin, Motty	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2021; admitted New York 2022	Restructuring	$1,760	422.8	$744,128.00
			$1,885	11.5	$21,677.50
Sousa, Luis Felipe	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2020; admitted New York 2022	Corporate	$1,780	6.1	$10,858.00
			$1,885	6.8	$12,818.00
Sun, Tony	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New York 2024	Restructuring	$1,255	14.2	$17,821.00
Wang, Eva	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2023; admitted New York 2024	Restructuring	$1,255	49.4	$61,997.00
Wang, Lisa	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2025; admitted New York 2024	Litigation	$1,255	68.0	$85,340.00
Weissler, Ben	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2023	Restructuring	$1,670	688.8	$1,150,296.00
			$1,885	158.2	$298,207.00
Wells, Zach	Associate; joined Davis Polk in 2022; admitted New York 2023	Sponsor Finance	$1,670	13.8	$23,046.00
			$1,885	81.2	$153,062.00
Ahmad, Shahmeer	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Employment	$730	8.3	$6,059.00
Biesinger, Hannah	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Sponsor Finance	$1,175	53.5	$62,862.50
Blum, Garry A.	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Litigation	$730	34.3	$25,039.00
Kaczmarek, Sean T.	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$730	109.6	$80,008.00
			$1,175	38.2	$44,885.00
Nelson, Haili S.	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$730	55.3	$40,369.00
			$1,175	23.4	$27,495.00
Pomerantz, Esther	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$730	38.2	$27,886.00
			$1,175	37.4	$43,945.00
Schwartz, David	Law Clerk; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$730	134.9	$98,477.00
			$1,175	83.5	$98,112.50

Name of Professional Individual	Position, Year Assumed Position, Prior Relevant Experience, Year of Obtaining Relevant License to Practice	Department	Hourly Billing Rate[1]	Total Hours Billed	Total Compensation
Boggs, Emilia	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2024	Finance	$790	5.0	$3,950.00
Fabsik, Paul	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$715	149.2	$106,678.00
			$790	17.5	$13,825.00
McIntosh, Andrew	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2019	Corporate	$505	23.4	$11,817.00
			$790	10.0	$7,900.00
Menkes, Madeleine	Legal Assistant; joined Davis Polk in 2025	Restructuring	$505	40.1	$20,250.50
			$790	11.5	$9,085.00
Andresini, Emily	Research Services; joined Davis Polk in 2022	Research Services	$655	8.9	$5,829.50
Zaleck, Mark	Research Services; joined Davis Polk in 1995	Research Services	$880	8.2	$7,216.00
	Associates, Law Clerks, and Legal Assistants Total:			**6,920.7**	**$9,993,579.50**
	GRAND TOTAL			**11,577.3**	**$20,095,627.50[2]**

[2] This amount reflects a reduction in fees in the amount of $305,182.00 on account of voluntary write-offs, as reflected in the monthly fee statements filed during the Second Interim Fee Period.

Exhibit I

Customary and Comparable Compensation Disclosures for the Final Fee Period

CATEGORY OF TIMEKEEPER	BLENDED HOURLY RATE	
	Professionals at the New York Office of Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP for a 12-Month Period Ending on February 28, 2026, Excluding Bankruptcy Matters[1]	**Azul Application**
Partner	**$2,463.22**	**$2,708.41**
Counsel	**$1,945.03**	**$1,938.05**
Other Attorneys[2]	**$1,336.62**	**$1,443.54**
Paraprofessionals	**$579.42**	**$618.52**
All Timekeepers Aggregated	**$1,539.69**	**$1,695.61**

[1] This blended hourly rate is adjusted to exclude hours and compensation billed to certain clients with special billing arrangements.

[2] This category includes Law Clerks and Special Advisers.

Exhibit 7E

Case 2:16-cv-06509-ES-CLW Document 184 Filed 12/20/21 Page 4 of 29 PageID: 4292
PageID: 3786

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE COGNIZANT TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS CORPORATION SECURITIES LITIGATION	Civil Action No. 16-6509 (ES) (CLW)

~~[REVISED PROPOSED]~~ ORDER AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

This matter came on for hearing on December 20, 2021 (the "Settlement Hearing") on Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. The Court having considered all matters submitted to it at the Settlement Hearing and otherwise; and it appearing that notice of the Settlement Hearing substantially in the form approved by the Court was mailed to all Settlement Class Members who or which could be identified with reasonable effort, and that a summary notice of the hearing substantially in the form approved by the Court was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and released over the *PR Newswire* pursuant to the specifications of the Court; and the Court having considered and determined the fairness and reasonableness of the award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses requested,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated September 2, 2021 (ECF No. 165-3) (the "Stipulation") and all terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation.

2. The Court has jurisdiction to enter this Order and over the subject matter of the Action and all Parties to the Action, including all Settlement Class Members.

3. Plaintiff's Counsel are hereby awarded attorneys' fees in the amount of 20% of the Settlement Fund, net of Litigation Expenses, or $18,931,957.36 (plus interest on that amount at

Case 2:16-cv-06509-ES-CLW Document 184 Filed 12/20/21 Page 2 of 4 PageID: 4293
PageID: 3787

the same rate as earned by the Settlement Fund), as well as $271,858.21 in payment of Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses (which fees and expenses shall be paid from the Settlement Fund), which sums the Court finds to be fair and reasonable. Lead Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded amongst Plaintiffs' Counsel in a manner which it, in good faith, believes reflects the contributions of such counsel to the institution, prosecution, and settlement of the Action.

4. In making this award of attorneys' fees and payment of expenses from the Settlement Fund, the Court has considered and found that:

(a) The Settlement has created a fund of $95,000,000 in cash that has been funded into escrow pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation, and that numerous Settlement Class Members who submit acceptable Claim Forms will benefit from the Settlement that occurred because of the efforts of Plaintiffs' Counsel;

(b) The requested fee has been reviewed and approved as reasonable by Lead Plaintiffs, which are sophisticated institutional investors that actively supervised the Action;

(c) Copies of the Notice were mailed to over 325,000 potential Settlement Class Members and nominees stating that Lead Counsel would apply for attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 20% of the Settlement Fund and for Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $475,000, and no objections to the requested attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses were received;

(d) Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted the litigation and achieved the Settlement with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(e) The Action raised a number of complex issues;

Case 2:16-cv-06509-ES-CLW Document 174 Filed 12/06/21 Page 4 of 5 PageID: 4255

(f) Had Plaintiffs' Counsel not achieved the Settlement there would remain a significant risk that Lead Plaintiff and the other members of the Settlement Class may have recovered less or nothing from Defendants;

(g) Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted over 14,400 hours, with a lodestar value of over $8,491,000, to achieve the Settlement; and

(h) The amount of attorneys' fees awarded and expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund are fair and reasonable and consistent with awards in similar cases.

5. Lead Plaintiff Union Asset Management Holding AG is hereby awarded $40,375.00 from the Settlement Fund as reimbursement for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

6. Lead Plaintiff Amalgamated Bank, as Trustee for the LongView Collective Investment Funds is hereby awarded $11,250.00 from the Settlement Fund as reimbursement for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

7. Lead Plaintiff Fire and Police Pension Association of Colorado is hereby awarded $16,730.00 from the Settlement Fund as reimbursement for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

8. Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Court's approval regarding any attorneys' fees and expense application shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment.

9. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby retained over the Parties and the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to this Action, including the administration, interpretation, effectuation or enforcement of the Stipulation and this Order.

Case 2:16-cv-06509-ES-CLW Document 184 Filed 12/21/21 Page 4 of 5 PageID: 4295
PageID: 3739

10. In the event that the Settlement is terminated or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by the Stipulation.

11. There is no just reason for delay in the entry of this Order, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

SO ORDERED this 20th day of December 2021.

The Honorable Esther Salas
United States District Judge

#3065059

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE COGNIZANT TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS CORPORATION SECURITIES LITIGATION	Civil Action No. 16-6509 (ES) (CLW)

DECLARATION OF JOCHEN RIECHWALD, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL OF UNION ASSET MANAGEMENT HOLDING AG, IN SUPPORT OF (A) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (B) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

JOCHEN RIECHWALD, declares as follows:

1. I am the Assistant General Counsel of Union Asset Management Holding AG ("Union AG"), one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action (the "Action").[1] I submit this declaration in support of: (a) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed settlement of the Action for $95 million in cash (the "Settlement") and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; (b) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel; and (c) Union AG's request to recover its reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the prosecution of this litigation. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.

[1] Capitalized terms that are not defined in this declaration have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated September 2, 2021 (ECF No. 165-3) (the "Stipulation").

I. Background

A. Union AG

2. Union AG is the parent holding company of the Union Investment Group. The Union Investment Group, based in Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, was founded in 1956, and is one of Germany's leading asset managers for retail and institutional clients with €386 billion assets under management as of December 30, 2020.

3. On February 3, 2017, the Court issued an Order appointing Union AG; Amalgamated Bank, as Trustee for the LongView Collective Investment Funds ("Amalgamated"); and the Fire and Police Pension Association of Colorado ("Colorado FPPA") as Lead Plaintiffs in the Action pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA"), and approving Lead Plaintiffs' selection of Motley Rice LLC ("Motley Rice") and Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP ("Bernstein Litowitz") as co-Lead Counsel in the Action. Union AG had selected Motley Rice to represent it in this matter, and Amalgamated and Colorado FPPA had selected Bernstein Litowitz. On May 15, 2017, Union AG filed a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order with the Court stating that Union AG had terminated its relationship with Motley Rice and retained Bernstein Litowitz to represent it this matter, so that thereafter Bernstein Litowitz would serve as sole Lead Counsel in the Action, subject to the approval of the Court. On May 19, 2017, the Court approved Union AG's substitution of Bernstein Litowitz for Motley Rice as counsel for Union AG and approved the selection of Bernstein Litowitz as sole Lead Counsel in the Action.

4. Union AG has monitored the prosecution and settlement of this Action through the active and continuous involvement of myself, as well as Dr. Carsten Fischer, Union AG's General Counsel. We have had regular communications with Bernstein Litowitz concerning the prosecution and settlement of this case. We have communicated with Bernstein Litowitz

throughout the litigation, including in connection with each material event in the case and when important decisions needed to be made. When necessary, we briefed other representatives of Union AG on the status of the Action.

5. Based on its active participation in the prosecution of this Action, Union AG has been able to capably oversee the prosecution of this case as well as the ultimate settlement of the Action. Union AG was able to directly observe the substantial efforts undertaken by Lead Counsel to obtain an excellent proposed recovery for the Settlement Class, notwithstanding the meaningful and multiple risks Lead Plaintiffs faced in this litigation.

6. Union AG, consistent with its strong interest in the outcome of this litigation and the exercise of its fiduciary duties to the Settlement Class, worked diligently to ensure that the recovery in this Action was maximized to the greatest extent possible in light of the risks and circumstances of the case.

B. Union AG's Extensive Participation in the Prosecution and Settlement of this Action

7. Leading up to and following the substitution of Bernstein Litowitz for Motley Rice on May 19, 2017, Union AG engaged in frequent discussions with Bernstein Litowitz concerning case developments and strategy, and received frequent status reports from Bernstein Litowitz. Among other things, in its role as a Lead Plaintiff, Union AG has:

a. Analyzed the merits of the potential case prior to seeking appointment as Lead Plaintiff in this Action, including evaluating: (i) the potential alleged wrongdoing of and securities claims against Cognizant and the other Defendants; and (ii) the critical legal and procedural issues involved in prosecuting the Action;

b. Reviewed and commented on pleadings filed in the Action, including the Amended Class Action Complaint ("Amended Complaint") and the Second Amended Class Action Complaint ("SAC" or "Complaint");

c. Reviewed and commented on briefs filed in the Action, including the documents filed in support of and in opposition to the Original Defendants' motions to dismiss the Amended Complaint, Defendants' motions to dismiss the SAC, and Cognizant's motions for an interlocutory appeal;

d. Consulted with Bernstein Litowitz regarding counsel's review and assessment of the document discovery obtained;

e. Participated in the mediation process and consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and

f. Evaluated and approved the mediator's recommendation issued by former United States District Judge Layn R. Phillips ("Judge Phillips") that the Action be settled for $95 million in cash.

8. Union AG has reviewed the briefs and other documents related to the Settlement, including those that are presently being submitted in support of (a) final approval of the Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (b) approval of Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses.

II. Union AG Strongly Endorses Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation

9. Based on Union AG's oversight of the prosecution and negotiations for the proposed settlement of this Action, Union AG strongly endorses the Settlement and believes it provides an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class, especially when measured against the

substantial risks of establishing liability and damages. Union AG also strongly endorses the proposed Plan of Allocation, and believes that it represents a fair and reasonable method for valuing claims submitted by Settlement Class Members, and for distributing the Net Settlement Fund to Settlement Class Members who submit valid and timely proof of claim forms.

III. Union AG Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

10. Union AG also supports Lead Counsel's requested fee (for all Plaintiffs' Counsel) of 20% of the Settlement Fund, net of Litigation Expenses. Union AG takes seriously its role as a Lead Plaintiff to ensure that the attorneys' fees are fair in light of the result achieved for the Settlement Class and reasonably compensate Plaintiffs' Counsel for the work involved and the substantial risks they undertook in litigating the Action. Union AG negotiated and approved that fee, subject to Court approval, when it determined to substitute Bernstein Litowitz for Motley Rice as Lead Counsel in this Action. Union AG negotiated and approved the fee with Bernstein Litowitz pursuant to a retention agreement providing for different levels of percentage fees based on the state of litigation at which settlement was reached. Following the agreement to settle the Action, Union AG has again reviewed the proposed fee and believes it is fair and reasonable in light of the outstanding result obtained for the Settlement Class, the excellent work performed by Plaintiffs' Counsel, and the risks undertaken by counsel in this Action.

11. Union AG further believes Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses are reasonable and represent costs and expenses necessary for the prosecution and resolution of this securities class action. As a result, Union AG has approved the request for payment of expenses submitted by Plaintiffs' Counsel.

12. Based on the foregoing, and consistent with its obligation to the Settlement Class to obtain the best result at the most efficient cost, Union AG supports Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses.

IV. Union AG's Request for Reimbursement of Costs and Expenses

13. Union AG understands that reimbursement of a lead plaintiff's reasonable costs and expenses is authorized under the PSLRA. For this reason, in connection with Lead Counsel's request for payment of Litigation Expenses, Union AG seeks reimbursement for the time that it dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class in the Action.

14. One of my responsibilities as Assistant General Counsel of Union AG is to monitor outside litigation matters, including Union AG's activities in securities class actions where (as here) it has been appointed lead plaintiff. In addition to me, the following lawyers at Union AG also participated in the prosecution and settlement of this Action: Dr. Carsten Fischer (General Counsel) and Julia Luther (Senior Legal Counsel).

15. The time that I and other Union AG employees devoted to the representation of the Settlement Class in this Action was time that we otherwise would have expected to spend on other work for Union AG and, thus, represented a cost to Union AG. Union AG seeks reimbursement in the amount of $40,375.00 for the time of the following personnel:

Personnel	Hours[2]	Hourly Rate[3]	Total
Dr. Carsten Fischer	20	$500	$10,000
Jochen Riechwald	60	$425	$25,500
Julia Luther	15	$325	$4,875
TOTAL			**$40,375**

V. Conclusion

16. In conclusion, Union AG was closely involved with the prosecution and settlement of this Action, strongly endorses the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes that it represents an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class in light of the risks of continued litigation. We have reviewed and endorse the proposed Plan of Allocation as fair and reasonable for the Settlement Class. Union AG further respectfully requests that the Court approve Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses for Plaintiffs' Counsel. And finally, Union AG requests reimbursement for its costs and expenses under the PSLRA as set forth above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United State of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, this 3rd day of November, 2021.

JOCHEN RIECHWALD

[2] While Union AG devoted a significant amount of time to this Action, its request for reimbursement of costs is based on a very conservative estimate of the number of hours we spent on this litigation.

[3] The hourly rates used for purposes of this request are based on comparable rates for lawyers of similar experience working in the Frankfurt, Germany market. For example, prior to joining Union, Dr. Fischer was a lawyer at Dechert, where his hourly rate was €590. Similarly, I was a lawyer at Willkie Farr & Gallagher prior to joining Union, where my last hourly rate was €420; and, prior to joining Union, Ms. Luther was a lawyer at Bird & Bird, where her hourly rate was €300.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE COGNIZANT TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS CORPORATION SECURITIES LITIGATION	Civil Action No. 16-6509 (ES) (CLW)

DECLARATION OF DEBORAH SILODOR, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL OF AMALGAMATED BANK, IN SUPPORT OF (A) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (B) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

DEBORAH SILODOR, declares as follows:

1. I am an Executive Vice President and the General Counsel of Amalgamated Bank. Amalgamated Bank, as Trustee for the LongView Collective Investment Funds ("Amalgamated") is one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action (the "Action").[1] I submit this declaration in support of: (a) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed settlement of the Action for $95 million in cash (the "Settlement") and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; (b) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel; and (c) Amalgamated's request to recover its reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the prosecution of this litigation. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.

[1] Capitalized terms that are not defined in this declaration have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated September 2, 2021 (ECF No. 165-3) (the "Stipulation").

I. Background

A. Amalgamated

2. Amalgamated is a New York State chartered, FDIC insured, commercial bank that was established in 1923 by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. Amalgamated, through its Trustee Committee, serves as trustee to the LongView Collective Investments Funds ("LongView"). Amalgamated purchased Cognizant common stock for the benefit of LongView during the Class Period and was damaged by Defendants' conduct as alleged in the Complaint.

3. On February 3, 2017, the Court issued an Order appointing Amalgamated, Union Asset Management AG ("Union AG"); and the Fire and Police Pension Association of Colorado ("Colorado") as Lead Plaintiffs in the Action pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA"), and approving Lead Plaintiffs' selection of Motley Rice LLC ("Motley Rice") and Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP ("Bernstein Litowitz") as co-Lead Counsel in the Action. Union AG had selected Motley Rice to represent it in this matter, and Amalgamated and Colorado had selected Bernstein Litowitz. On May 19, 2017, the Court approved Union AG's substitution of Bernstein Litowitz for Motley Rice as counsel for Union and approved the selection of Bernstein Litowitz as sole Lead Counsel in the Action.

4. Amalgamated has monitored the prosecution and settlement of this Action through the active and continuous involvement of myself, as well as other Amalgamated employees. We have had regular communications with Bernstein Litowitz concerning the prosecution and settlement of this case. We have communicated with Bernstein Litowitz throughout the litigation, including in connection with each material event in the case and when important decisions needed to be made. When necessary, we briefed other representatives of Amalgamated on the status of the Action.

5. Based on its active participation in the prosecution of this Action, Amalgamated has been able to capably oversee the prosecution of this case as well as the ultimate settlement of the Action. Amalgamated was able to directly observe the substantial efforts undertaken by Lead Counsel to obtain an excellent proposed recovery for the Settlement Class, notwithstanding the meaningful and multiple risks Lead Plaintiffs faced in this litigation.

6. Amalgamated, consistent with its strong interest in the outcome of this litigation and the exercise of its fiduciary duties to the Settlement Class, worked diligently to ensure that the recovery in this Action was maximized to the greatest extent possible in light of the risks and circumstances of the case.

B. Amalgamated's Extensive Participation in the Prosecution and Settlement of this Action

7. In connection with seeking appointment as a Lead Plaintiff and thereafter, Amalgamated engaged in frequent discussions with Bernstein Litowitz concerning case developments and strategy, and received frequent status reports from Bernstein Litowitz. Among other things, in its role as a Lead Plaintiff, Amalgamated has:

a. Analyzed the merits of the potential case prior to seeking appointment as Lead Plaintiff in this Action, including evaluating: (i) the potential alleged wrongdoing and securities violations against Cognizant and the other Defendants; and (ii) the critical legal and procedural issues involved in prosecuting the Action;

b. Reviewed and commented on pleadings filed in the Action, including the Amended Class Action Complaint ("Amended Complaint") and the Second Amended Class Action Complaint ("SAC" or "Complaint");

c. Reviewed and commented on briefs filed in the Action, including the documents filed in support of and in opposition to the Original Defendants' motions to

dismiss the Amended Complaint, Defendants' motions to dismiss the SAC, and Cognizant's motion for an interlocutory appeal;

d. Consulted with Bernstein Litowitz regarding counsel's review and assessment of the document discovery obtained;

e. Participated in the mediation process and consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and

f. Evaluated and approved the mediator's recommendation issued by former United States District Judge Layn R. Phillips ("Judge Phillips") that the Action be settled for $95 million in cash.

8. Amalgamated has reviewed the briefs and other documents related to the Settlement, including those that are presently being submitted in support of (a) final approval of the Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (b) approval of Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses.

II. Amalgamated Strongly Endorses Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation

9. Based on Amalgamated's oversight of the prosecution and negotiations for the proposed settlement of this Action, Amalgamated strongly endorses the Settlement and believes it provides an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class, especially when measured against the substantial risks of establishing liability and damages. Amalgamated also strongly endorses the proposed Plan of Allocation, and believes that it represents a fair and reasonable method for valuing claims submitted by Settlement Class Members, and for distributing the Net Settlement Fund to Settlement Class Members who submit valid and timely proof of claim forms.

III. Amalgamated Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

10. Amalgamated also supports Lead Counsel's requested fee (for all Plaintiffs' Counsel) of 20% of the Settlement Fund, net of Litigation Expenses. Amalgamated takes seriously its role as a Lead Plaintiff to ensure that the attorneys' fees are fair in light of the result achieved for the Settlement Class and reasonably compensate Plaintiffs' Counsel for the work involved and the substantial risks they undertook in litigating the Action. The fee requested is consistent with a retainer agreement entered into between Amalgamated and Bernstein Litowitz at the outset of the litigation. Following the agreement to settle the Action, Amalgamated has again reviewed the proposed fee and believe it is fair and reasonable in light of the outstanding result obtained for the Settlement Class, the excellent work performed by Plaintiffs' Counsel, and the risks undertaken by counsel in this Action.

11. Amalgamated further believes Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses are reasonable and represent costs and expenses necessary for the prosecution and resolution of this securities class action. As a result, Amalgamated has approved the request for payment of expenses submitted by Plaintiffs' Counsel.

12. Based on the foregoing, and consistent with its obligation to the Settlement Class to obtain the best result at the most efficient cost, Amalgamated supports Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses.

IV. Amalgamated's Request for Reimbursement of Costs and Expenses

13. Amalgamated understands that reimbursement of a lead plaintiff's reasonable costs and expenses is authorized under the PSLRA. For this reason, in connection with Lead Counsel's request for payment of Litigation Expenses, Amalgamated seeks reimbursement for the time that it dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class in the Action.

14. One of my responsibilities as General Counsel of Amalgamated is to monitor outside litigation matters, including Amalgamated's activities in securities class actions where (as here) it has been appointed lead plaintiff. In addition to me, the following additional personnel at Amalgamated also participated in the prosecution and settlement of this Action: Anthony Lauriello, a Senior Vice President and Deputy General Counsel of Amalgamated; and Marcelo Choi, a former Assistant General Counsel of Amalgamated.

15. The time that I and other Amalgamated employees devoted to the representation of the Settlement Class in this Action was time that we otherwise would have expected to spend on other work for Amalgamated and, thus, represented a cost to Amalgamated. Amalgamated seeks reimbursement in the amount of $11,250 for the time of the following personnel:

Personnel	Hours[2]	Hourly Rate[3]	Total
Deborah Silodor	30	$250	$7,500
Anthony Lauriello	25	$125	$3,125
Marcelo Choi	5	$125	$625
TOTAL	**60**		**$11,250**

V. Conclusion

16. In conclusion, Amalgamated was closely involved with the prosecution and settlement of this Action, strongly endorses the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes that it represents an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class in light of the risks of continued litigation. We have reviewed and endorse the proposed Plan of Allocation

[2] While Amalgamated devoted a significant amount of time to this Action, its request for reimbursement of costs is based on a conservative estimate of the number of hours we spent on this litigation.

[3] The hourly rates used for purposes of this request are based on our annual salaries and backgrounds.

as fair and reasonable for the Settlement Class. Amalgamated further respectfully requests that the Court approve Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses for Plaintiffs' Counsel. And finally, Amalgamated requests reimbursement for its costs and expenses under the PSLRA as set forth above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United State of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, this 5th day of November, 2021.

deborah silodor

Digitally signed by deborah silodor
Date: 2021.11.05 08:27:29 -04'00'

DEBORAH SILODOR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE COGNIZANT TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS CORPORATION SECURITIES LITIGATION	Civil Action No. 16-6509 (ES) (CLW)

DECLARATION OF KEVIN LINDAHL, GENERAL COUNSEL AND DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE FIRE AND POLICE PENSION ASSOCIATION OF COLORADO, IN SUPPORT OF (A) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (B) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

KEVIN LINDAHL, declares as follows:

1. I am the General Counsel and Deputy Executive Director of the Fire and Police Pension Association of Colorado ("Colorado FPPA"), one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action (the "Action").[1] I submit this declaration in support of: (a) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed settlement of the Action for $95 million in cash (the "Settlement") and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; (b) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel; and (c) Colorado FPPA's request to recover its reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the prosecution of this litigation. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.

[1] Capitalized terms that are not defined in this declaration have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated September 2, 2021 (ECF No. 165-3) (the "Stipulation").

I. Background

A. Colorado FPPA

2. Colorado FPPA is a public pension fund established in 1980 for the purpose of providing retirement benefits for police officers and firefighters throughout the State of Colorado. As of September 30, 2021, Colorado FPPA held over $7.4 billion in net assets.

3. On February 3, 2017, the Court issued an Order appointing Colorado FPPA; Union Asset Management AG ("Union AG"); and Amalgamated Bank, as Trustee for the LongView Collective Investment Funds ("Amalgamated") as Lead Plaintiffs in the Action pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA"), and approving Lead Plaintiffs' selection of Motley Rice LLC ("Motley Rice") and Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP ("Bernstein Litowitz") as co-Lead Counsel in the Action. Union AG had selected Motley Rice to represent it in this matter, and Amalgamated and Colorado FPPA had selected Bernstein Litowitz. On May 19, 2017, the Court approved Union AG's substitution of Bernstein Litowitz for Motley Rice as counsel for Union and approved the selection of Bernstein Litowitz as sole Lead Counsel in the Action.

4. Colorado FPPA has monitored the prosecution and settlement of this Action through the active and continuous involvement of myself, as well as other Colorado FPPA employees. We have had regular communications with Bernstein Litowitz concerning the prosecution and settlement of this case. We have communicated with Bernstein Litowitz throughout the litigation, including in connection with each material event in the case and when important decisions needed to be made. When necessary, we briefed other representatives of Colorado FPPA on the status of the Action.

5. Based on its active participation in the prosecution of this Action, Colorado FPPA has been able to capably oversee the prosecution of this case as well as the ultimate settlement of the Action. Colorado FPPA was able to directly observe the substantial efforts undertaken by Lead Counsel to obtain an excellent proposed recovery for the Settlement Class, notwithstanding the meaningful and multiple risks Lead Plaintiffs faced in this litigation.

6. Colorado FPPA, consistent with its strong interest in the outcome of this litigation and the exercise of its fiduciary duties to the Settlement Class, worked diligently to ensure that the recovery in this Action was maximized to the greatest extent possible in light of the risks and circumstances of the case.

B. Colorado FPPA's Extensive Participation in the Prosecution and Settlement of this Action

7. In connection with seeking appointment as a Lead Plaintiff and thereafter, Colorado FPPA engaged in frequent discussions with Bernstein Litowitz concerning case developments and strategy, and received frequent status reports from Bernstein Litowitz. Among other things, in its role as a Lead Plaintiff, Colorado FPPA has:

a. Analyzed the merits of the potential case prior to seeking appointment as Lead Plaintiff in this Action, including evaluating: (i) the potential alleged wrongdoing of and securities claims against Cognizant and the other Defendants; and (ii) the critical legal and procedural issues involved in prosecuting the Action;

b. Reviewed and commented on pleadings filed in the Action, including the Amended Class Action Complaint ("Amended Complaint") and the Second Amended Class Action Complaint ("SAC" or "Complaint");

c. Reviewed and commented on briefs filed in the Action, including the documents filed in support of and in opposition to the Original Defendants' motions to

dismiss the Amended Complaint, Defendants' motions to dismiss the SAC, and Cognizant's motions for an interlocutory appeal;

d. Consulted with Bernstein Litowitz regarding counsel's review and assessment of the document discovery obtained;

e. Participated in the mediation process, which included my attendance at an all-day mediation session in California in February 2020, and consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and

f. Evaluated and approved the mediator's recommendation issued by former United States District Judge Layn R. Phillips ("Judge Phillips") that the Action be settled for $95 million in cash.

8. Colorado FPPA has reviewed the briefs and other documents related to the Settlement, including those that are presently being submitted in support of (a) final approval of the Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (b) approval of Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses.

II. Colorado FPPA Strongly Endorses Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation

9. Based on Colorado FPPA's oversight of the prosecution and negotiations for the proposed settlement of this Action, Colorado FPPA strongly endorses the Settlement and believes it provides an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class, especially when measured against the substantial risks of establishing liability and damages. Colorado FPPA also strongly endorses the proposed Plan of Allocation, and believes that it represents a fair and reasonable method for valuing claims submitted by Settlement Class Members, and for distributing the Net Settlement Fund to Settlement Class Members who submit valid and timely proof of claim forms.

III. Colorado FPPA Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

10. Colorado FPPA also supports Lead Counsel's requested fee (for all Plaintiffs' Counsel) of 20% of the Settlement Fund, net of Litigation Expenses. Colorado FPPA takes seriously its role as a Lead Plaintiff to ensure that the attorneys' fees are fair in light of the result achieved for the Settlement Class and reasonably compensate Plaintiffs' Counsel for the work involved and the substantial risks they undertook in litigating the Action. Colorado FPPA negotiated and approved the fee with Bernstein Litowitz pursuant to a retention agreement providing for different levels of percentage fees based on the state of litigation at which settlement was reached. Following the agreement to settle the Action, Colorado FPPA has again reviewed the proposed fee and believe it is fair and reasonable in light of the outstanding result obtained for the Settlement Class, the excellent work performed by Plaintiffs' Counsel, and the risks undertaken by counsel in this Action.

11. Colorado FPPA further believes Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses are reasonable and represent costs and expenses necessary for the prosecution and resolution of this securities class action. As a result, Colorado FPPA has approved the request for payment of expenses submitted by Plaintiffs' Counsel.

12. Based on the foregoing, and consistent with its obligation to the Settlement Class to obtain the best result at the most efficient cost, Colorado FPPA supports Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses.

IV. Colorado FPPA's Request for Reimbursement of Costs and Expenses

13. Colorado FPPA understands that reimbursement of a lead plaintiff's reasonable costs and expenses is authorized under the PSLRA. For this reason, in connection with Lead

Counsel's request for payment of Litigation Expenses, Colorado FPPA seeks reimbursement for the time that it dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class in the Action.

14. One of my responsibilities as General Counsel of Colorado FPPA is to monitor outside litigation matters, including Colorado FPPA's activities in securities class actions where (as here) it has been appointed lead plaintiff. In addition to me, the following additional personnel at Colorado FPPA also participated in the prosecution and settlement of this Action: Steven Miller, Investment Counsel.

15. The time that I and other Colorado FPPA employees devoted to the representation of the Settlement Class in this Action was time that we otherwise would have expected to spend on other work for Colorado FPPA and, thus, represented a cost to Colorado FPPA. Colorado FPPA seeks reimbursement in the amount of $16,730 for the time of the following personnel:

Personnel	Hours[2]	Hourly Rate[3]	Total
Kevin Lindahl	65	$217	$14,105
Steven Miller	21	$125	$2,625
TOTAL	**86**		**$16,730**

V. Conclusion

16. In conclusion, Colorado FPPA was closely involved with the prosecution and settlement of this Action, strongly endorses the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes that it represents an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class in light of

[2] While Colorado FPPA devoted a significant amount of time to this Action, its request for reimbursement of costs is based on a conservative estimate of the number of hours we spent on this litigation.

[3] The hourly rates used for purposes of this request are based on our annual salaries and backgrounds.

the risks of continued litigation. We have reviewed and endorse the proposed Plan of Allocation as fair and reasonable for the Settlement Class. Colorado FPPA further respectfully requests that the Court approve Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses for Plaintiffs' Counsel. And finally, Colorado FPPA requests reimbursement for its costs and expenses under the PSLRA as set forth above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United State of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, this 8th day of November, 2021.

KEVIN B. LINDAHL

Exhibit 7F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE ALLERGAN GENERIC DRUG PRICING SECURITIES LITIGATION	Case No. 2:16-cv-09449 (CLW)

ORDER AWARDING
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

This matter came on for hearing on November 17, 2021 (the "Settlement Hearing") on Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. The Court having considered all matters submitted to it at the Settlement Hearing and otherwise; and it appearing that notice of the Settlement Hearing substantially in the form approved by the Court was mailed to all Settlement Class Members who or which could be identified with reasonable effort, and that a summary notice of the Settlement Hearing substantially in the form approved by the Court was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and was transmitted over the *PR Newswire* pursuant to the specifications of the Court; and the Court having considered and determined the fairness and reasonableness of the attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses requested;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 8, 2021 (ECF No. 223-1) (the "Stipulation") and all capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation.

2. The Court has jurisdiction to enter this Order and over the subject matter of the Action and all parties to the Action, including all Settlement Class Members.

3. Notice of Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses was given to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort.

The form and method of notifying the Settlement Class of the motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(7)), due process, and all other applicable law and rules; constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

4. Plaintiffs' Counsel are hereby awarded attorneys' fees in the amount of 23.8% of the Settlement Fund, which sum the Court finds to be fair and reasonable. Plaintiffs' Counsel are also hereby awarded $2,473,243.51 in payment of litigation expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund, which sum the Court finds to be fair and reasonable. Lead Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded amongst Plaintiffs' Counsel in a manner which they, in good faith, believe reflects the contributions of such counsel to the institution, prosecution, and settlement of the Action.

5. In making this award of attorneys' fees and payment of litigation expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund, the Court has considered and found that:

(a) The Settlement has created a fund of $130,000,000 in cash that has been funded into escrow pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation, and that numerous Settlement Class Members who submit acceptable Claim Forms will benefit from the Settlement that occurred because of the efforts of Plaintiffs' Counsel;

(b) The fee sought has been reviewed and approved as reasonable by Lead Plaintiffs, which are sophisticated institutional investors that actively supervised the Action;

(c) Over 1,000,000 copies of the Notice were mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and nominees stating that Lead Counsel would apply for an award of attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 24% of the Settlement Fund and for payment of Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $4,000,000, and just one objection to the

requested fee and expense application was received, which the Court has considered and rejected for the reasons set forth on the record during the November 17, 2021 hearing;

(d) Lead Counsel conducted the litigation and achieved the Settlement with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(e) The Action raised a number of complex issues;

(f) Had Lead Counsel not achieved the Settlement there would remain a significant risk that Lead Plaintiffs and the other members of the Settlement Class may have recovered less or nothing from Defendants;

(g) Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted over 38,900 hours to the Action, with a lodestar value of approximately $18.85 million, to achieve the Settlement; and

(h) The amount of attorneys' fees awarded and expenses to be paid from the Settlement Fund are fair and reasonable and consistent with awards in similar cases.

6. Lead Plaintiff Sjunde AP-Fonden is hereby awarded $13,600.00 from the Settlement Fund as reimbursement for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

7. Lead Plaintiff Union Asset Management Holding AG is hereby awarded $71,250.00 from the Settlement Fund as reimbursement for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

8. Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Court's approval regarding any attorneys' fees and expense application shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment.

9. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby retained over the Parties and the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to this Action, including the administration, interpretation, effectuation, or enforcement of the Stipulation and this Order.

10. In the event that the Settlement is terminated or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by the Stipulation.

11. There is no just reason for delay in the entry of this Order, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

SO ORDERED this 22nd day of November, 2021.

s/ Cathy L. Waldor
The Honorable Cathy L. Waldor
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE ALLERGAN GENERIC DRUG PRICING SECURITIES LITIGATION	Case No. 2:16-cv-09449 (KSH) (CLW)

DECLARATION OF RICHARD A. GRÖTTHEIM, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF SJUNDE AP-FONDEN, IN SUPPORT OF (A) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (B) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

I, Richard A. Gröttheim, declare as follows:

1. I am the Chief Executive Officer of Sjunde AP-Fonden ("AP7"), one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action (the "Action").[1] I submit this declaration in support of: (a) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed settlement of the Action for $130 million in cash (the "Settlement") and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; (b) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel; and (c) AP7's request to recover the reasonable costs and expenses it incurred in connection with the prosecution of this litigation. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.

I. Background

A. AP7

2. Based in Stockholm, Sweden, AP7 is part of the Swedish national pension system. AP7 is the governmental alternative to the private investment funds offered by the Swedish

[1] Capitalized terms that are not defined in this declaration have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated as of July 8, 2021 ("Stipulation"). ECF No. 223-1.

premium pension system. More than five million Swedes use AP7 Såfa - the government's default fund for the premium pension system - to save for their pensions. Since its inception, AP7 Såfa has given pension savers higher average returns and lower management fees than the private funds available in the Swedish premium pension marketplace. AP7 currently has approximately $51 billion in premium pension assets under management.

3. On February 2, 2017, the Court issued an Order appointing AP7 and Union Asset Management Holding AG ("Union") as co-"Lead Plaintiffs" in the Action pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA"), and approving AP7's selection of Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check, LLP ("Kessler Topaz") and Union's selection of Motley Rice LLC ("Motley Rice") as co-"Lead Counsel" in the Action. On June 6, 2017, the Court approved Union's substitution of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP for Motley Rice as counsel for Union and co-Lead Counsel in the Action.

4. AP7 has monitored the prosecution and settlement of this Action through my active and continuous involvement as detailed below. I have had regular communications with Kessler Topaz concerning the prosecution and settlement of this case. I have communicated with Kessler Topaz throughout the litigation, including in connection with each material event in the case and when important decisions needed to be made. When necessary, I briefed other representatives of AP7 on the status of the Action.

5. Based on its active participation in the prosecution of this Action, AP7 has been able to capably oversee the prosecution of this case as well as the ultimate settlement of the Action. AP7 was able to directly observe the substantial efforts undertaken by Lead Counsel to obtain an excellent proposed recovery for the Settlement Class, notwithstanding the meaningful and multiple risks Lead Plaintiffs faced in this litigation.

6. AP7, consistent with its strong interest in the outcome of this litigation and the exercise of its fiduciary duties to the Settlement Class, worked diligently to ensure that the recovery in this Action was maximized to the greatest extent possible in light of the risks and circumstances of the case.

B. AP7's Extensive Participation in the Prosecution and Settlement of this Action

7. Throughout the course of the litigation, AP7 engaged in frequent discussions with Kessler Topaz concerning case developments and strategy, and received frequent status reports from Kessler Topaz. Among other things, in its role as a Lead Plaintiff, AP7 has:

a. Analyzed the merits of the potential case prior to seeking appointment as Lead Plaintiff in this Action, including evaluating: (i) the potential alleged wrongdoing and securities violations against Allergan and the other Defendants; and (ii) the critical legal and procedural issues involved in prosecuting the Action;

b. Reviewed, with the assistance of AP7's Swedish external legal counsel, and commented on pleadings filed in the Action, including the Consolidated Second Amended Class Action Complaint (the "Complaint");

c. Reviewed, with the assistance of AP7's Swedish external legal counsel, and commented on briefs filed in the Action, including the documents filed in support of and in opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss the Complaint and Lead Plaintiffs' motion for class certification;

d. Consulted with Kessler Topaz regarding counsel's review and assessment of the more than 2.6 million pages of document discovery obtained from Defendants and third parties;

e. Engaged in extensive efforts concerning AP7's production of documents in response to Defendants' discovery requests, which included overseeing electronic searches and searches of custodial files in response to requests for the production of documents and transmitting these materials to Kessler Topaz, as well as written responses to document requests and interrogatories;

f. Participated in the mediation process and consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and

g. Evaluated and approved the mediator's recommendation issued by former United States District Judge Layn R. Phillips ("Judge Phillips") that the Action be settled for $130 million in cash.

8. In addition, in connection with Lead Plaintiffs' class certification motion, I was deposed by Defendants' counsel on July 9, 2020, and spent a substantial amount of time preparing for the deposition. Also, I participated in the full-day mediation session before Judge Phillips conducted via Zoom videoconferencing.

9. AP7 has reviewed the briefs and other documents related to the Settlement, including those that are presently being submitted in support of (a) final approval of the Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (b) approval of Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses.

II. AP7 Strongly Endorses Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation

10. Based on AP7's oversight of the prosecution and negotiations for the proposed settlement of this Action, AP7 strongly endorses the Settlement and believes it provides an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class, especially when measured against the substantial risks

of establishing liability and damages. AP7 also strongly endorses the proposed Plan of Allocation, and believes that it represents a fair and reasonable method for valuing claims submitted by Settlement Class Members, and for distributing the Net Settlement Fund to Settlement Class Members who submit valid and timely proof of claim forms.

III. AP7 Fully Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

11. AP7 also fully supports Lead Counsel's requested fee of 23.8% of the Settlement Fund for all Plaintiffs' Counsel. AP7 takes seriously its role as a Lead Plaintiff to ensure that the attorneys' fees are fair in light of the result achieved for the Settlement Class and reasonably compensate Plaintiffs' Counsel for the work involved and the substantial risks they undertook in litigating the Action. AP7 has evaluated the fee request and believes that it is fair and reasonable in light of the outstanding result obtained for the Settlement Class, the excellent work performed by Plaintiffs' Counsel, and the risks undertaken by counsel in this Action.

12. AP7 further believes Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses are reasonable and represent costs and expenses necessary for the prosecution and resolution of this securities class action. As a result, AP7 has approved the request for payment of expenses submitted by Plaintiffs' Counsel.

13. Based on the foregoing, and consistent with its obligation to the Settlement Class to obtain the best result at the most efficient cost, AP7 fully supports Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses.

IV. AP7's Request for Reimbursement of its Costs and Expenses

14. AP7 understands that reimbursement of a lead plaintiff's reasonable costs and expenses is authorized under the PSLRA. For this reason, in connection with Lead Counsel's

request for payment of Litigation Expenses, AP7 seeks reimbursement for the time that it dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class in the Action.

15. As Chief Executive Officer of AP7, my primary responsibilities involve investment related matters, including developing long-term investment strategies, as well as the day-to-day management of AP7 and its staff. I also oversee any litigation in which AP7 is involved.

16. The time that I devoted to the representation of the Settlement Class in this Action was time that I otherwise would have expected to spend on other work for AP7 and, thus, represented a cost to AP7. AP7 seeks reimbursement in the amount of $13,600.00 (40 hours at $340 per hour)[2] for the time I devoted to supervising and participating in the Action.

V. Conclusion

17. In conclusion, AP7 was closely involved with the prosecution and settlement of this Action, strongly endorses the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes that it represents an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class in light of the risks of continued litigation. AP7 also endorses the proposed Plan of Allocation as fair and reasonable for the Settlement Class. AP7 further respectfully requests that the Court approve Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses for Plaintiffs' Counsel. And finally, AP7 requests reimbursement for its costs under the PSLRA as set forth above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United State of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, this 8 day of October, 2021.

RICHARD A. GRÖTTHEIM
Chief Executive Officer
Sjunde AP-Fonden

[2] The hourly rate used for purposes of this request is based on my annual salary and benefits.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE ALLERGAN GENERIC DRUG PRICING SECURITIES LITIGATION	Case No. 2:16-cv-09449 (KSH) (CLW)

DECLARATION OF JOCHEN RIECHWALD, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL OF UNION ASSET MANAGEMENT HOLDING AG, IN SUPPORT OF (A) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (B) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

I, JOCHEN RIECHWALD, declare as follows:

1. I am the Assistant General Counsel of Union Asset Management Holding AG ("Union AG"), one of the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action (the "Action").[1] I submit this declaration in support of: (a) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the proposed settlement of the Action for $130 million in cash (the "Settlement") and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; (b) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel; and (c) Union AG's request to recover the reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the prosecution of this litigation. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.

[1] Capitalized terms that are not defined in this declaration have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated as of July 8, 2021 ("Stipulation"). ECF No. 223-1.

I. Background

A. Union AG

2. Union AG is the parent holding company of the Union Investment Group. The Union Investment Group, based in Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, was founded in 1956, and is one of Germany's leading asset managers for retail and institutional clients with more than €359 billion assets under management as of September 30, 2019.

3. On February 2, 2017, the Court issued an Order appointing Union AG and Sjunde AP-Fonden ("AP7") as co-"Lead Plaintiffs" in the Action pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PSLRA"), and approving Union's selection of Motley Rice LLC ("Motley Rice") and AP7's selection of Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check, LLP as co-"Lead Counsel" in the Action. On June 6, 2017, the Court approved Union's substitution of Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP ("Bernstein Litowitz") for Motley Rice as counsel for Union and co-Lead Counsel in the Action.

4. Union AG has monitored the prosecution and settlement of this Action through the active and continuous involvement of myself, as well as Dr. Carsten Fischer, Union AG's General Counsel. We have had regular communications with Bernstein Litowitz concerning the prosecution and settlement of this case. We have communicated with Bernstein Litowitz throughout the litigation, including in connection with each material event in the case and when important decisions needed to be made. When necessary, we briefed other representatives of Union AG on the status of the Action.

5. Based on its active participation in the prosecution of this Action, Union AG has been able to capably oversee the prosecution of this case as well as the ultimate settlement of the Action. Union AG was able to directly observe the substantial efforts undertaken by Lead Counsel

to obtain an excellent proposed recovery for the Settlement Class, notwithstanding the meaningful and multiple risks Lead Plaintiffs faced in this litigation.

6. Union AG, consistent with its strong interest in the outcome of this litigation and the exercise of its fiduciary duties to the Settlement Class, worked diligently to ensure that the recovery in this Action was maximized to the greatest extent possible in light of the risks and circumstances of the case.

B. Union AG's Extensive Participation in the Prosecution and Settlement of this Action

7. Leading up to and following the substitution of Bernstein Litowitz for Motley Rice as co-Lead Counsel on June 6, 2017, Union AG engaged in frequent discussions with Bernstein Litowitz concerning case developments and strategy, and received frequent status reports from Bernstein Litowitz. Among other things, in its role as a Lead Plaintiff, Union AG has:

a. Analyzed the merits of the potential case prior to seeking appointment as Lead Plaintiff in this Action, including evaluating: (i) the potential alleged wrongdoing and securities violations against Allergan and the other Defendants; and (ii) the critical legal and procedural issues involved in prosecuting the Action;

b. Reviewed and commented on pleadings filed in the Action, including the Consolidated Second Amended Class Action Complaint (the "Complaint");

c. Reviewed and commented on briefs filed in the Action, including the documents filed in support of and in opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss the Complaint and Lead Plaintiffs' motion for class certification;

d. Consulted with Bernstein Litowitz regarding counsel's review and assessment of the more than 2.6 million pages of document discovery obtained from Defendants and third parties;

e. Engaged in extensive efforts concerning Union's production of documents in response to Defendants' discovery requests, which included identifying all Union investment management and other personnel involved in managing Union's investments in Allergan, liaising with our IT staff and vendors to search for and collect those documents, and transmitting the materials to Bernstein Litowitz;

f. Participated in the mediation process and consulted with Lead Counsel concerning the settlement negotiations that ultimately led to the agreement in principle to settle the Action; and

g. Evaluated and approved the mediator's recommendation issued by former United States District Judge Layn R. Phillips ("Judge Phillips") that the Action be settled for $130 million in cash.

8. In addition, in connection with Lead Plaintiffs' class certification motion, I was deposed by Defendants' counsel, and spent a substantial amount of time preparing for the deposition. Also, Dr. Fischer and I participated in the full-day mediation session before Judge Phillips conducted via Zoom videoconferencing.

9. Union AG has reviewed the briefs and other documents related to the Settlement, including those that are presently being submitted in support of (a) final approval of the Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and (b) approval of Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses.

II. Union AG Strongly Endorses Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation

10. Based on Union AG's oversight of the prosecution and negotiations for the proposed settlement of this Action, Union AG strongly endorses the Settlement and believes it provides an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class, especially when measured against the

substantial risks of establishing liability and damages. Union AG also strongly endorses the proposed Plan of Allocation, and believes that it represents a fair and reasonable method for valuing claims submitted by Settlement Class Members, and for distributing the Net Settlement Fund to Settlement Class Members who submit valid and timely proof of claim forms.

III. Union AG Fully Supports Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses

11. Union AG also fully supports Lead Counsel's requested fee of 23.8% of the Settlement Fund for all Plaintiffs' Counsel. Union AG takes seriously its role as a Lead Plaintiff to ensure that the attorneys' fees are fair in light of the result achieved for the Settlement Class and reasonably compensate Plaintiffs' Counsel for the work involved and the substantial risks they undertook in litigating the Action. Union AG has evaluated the fee request and believes that it is fair and reasonable in light of the outstanding result obtained for the Settlement Class, the excellent work performed by Plaintiffs' Counsel, and the risks undertaken by counsel in this Action.

12. Union AG further believes Plaintiffs' Counsel's litigation expenses are reasonable and represent costs and expenses necessary for the prosecution and resolution of this securities class action. As a result, Union AG has approved the request for payment of expenses submitted by Plaintiffs' Counsel.

13. Based on the foregoing, and consistent with its obligation to the Settlement Class to obtain the best result at the most efficient cost, Union AG fully supports Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses.

IV. Union AG's Request for Reimbursement of Costs and Expenses

14. Union AG understands that reimbursement of a lead plaintiff's reasonable costs and expenses is authorized under the PSLRA. For this reason, in connection with Lead Counsel's

request for payment of Litigation Expenses, Union AG seeks reimbursement for the time that it dedicated to the representation of the Settlement Class in the Action.

15. One of my responsibilities as Assistant General Counsel of Union AG is to monitor outside litigation matters, including Union AG's activities in securities class actions where (as here) it has been appointed lead plaintiff. In addition to me, the following lawyers of Union AG also participated in the prosecution and settlement of this Action: Dr. Carsten Fischer (General Counsel) and Julia Luther (Senior Legal Counsel). Two members of our information technology group also spent significant time assisting Union in its document collection efforts: Werner Stöhr and Thomas Nelius.

16. The time that we devoted to the representation of the Settlement Class in this Action was time that we otherwise would have expected to spend on other work for Union AG and, thus, represented a cost to Union AG. Union AG seeks reimbursement in the amount of $71,250.00 for the time of the following personnel:

Personnel	Hours[2]	Hourly Rate[3]	Total
Dr. Carsten Fischer	35	$500	$17,500.00
Jochen Riechwald	90	$425	$38,250.00
Julia Luther	20	$325	$6,500.00
Werner Stöhr	15	$200	$3,000.00
Thomas Nelius	30	$200	$6,000.00
TOTAL	**190**		**$71,250.00**

[2] While Union AG devoted a significant amount of time to this Action, its request for reimbursement of costs is based on a very conservative estimate of the number of hours we spent on this litigation.

[3] The hourly rates used for purposes of this request are based on comparable rates for lawyers of similar experience working in the Frankfurt, Germany market. For example, prior to joining Union, Dr. Fischer was a lawyer at Dechert, where his hourly rate was €590. Similarly, I was a lawyer at Willkie Farr & Gallagher prior to joining Union, where my last hourly rate was €420; and, prior to joining Union, Ms. Luther was a lawyer at Bird & Bird, where her hourly rate was €300.

V. Conclusion

17. In conclusion, Union AG was closely involved with the prosecution and settlement of this Action, strongly endorses the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and believes that it represents an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class in light of the risks of continued litigation. We have reviewed and endorse the proposed Plan of Allocation as fair and reasonable for the Settlement Class. Union AG further respectfully requests that the Court approve Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses for Plaintiffs' Counsel. And finally, Union AG requests reimbursement for its costs and expenses under the PSLRA as set forth above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United State of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, this 12th day of October, 2021.

JOCHEN RIECHWALD
Assistant General Counsel
Union Asset Management Holding AG

Exhibit 7G

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F62-A931-FCA24374B52E

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

STEPHEN AND JUNE VITIELLO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, **Plaintiffs,** **v.** **BED BATH & BEYOND INC., *et al.*,** **Defendants.**	**No. 2:20-cv-04240-MCA-MAH**

DECLARATION OF LEAD PLAINTIFF KAVIN BAKHDA IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT, AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES, AND REIMBURSEMENT OF TIME FOR LEAD PLAINTIFF

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F62-A931-FCA24374B52E

I, Kavin Bakhda, hereby declare, under the penalty of perjury, as follows:

1. I am the Court-appointed Lead Plaintiff in this action. I reside in Singapore. The claims in this action were assigned to me by my mother, Ragini Dhanvantray. *See* ECF 19-2 at 2 n.2.[1]

2. I submit this declaration in support of the final approval of the proposed Settlement, an award of Lead Counsel's attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses (as set forth in the memorandum of law in support of the motion for attorneys' fees and expenses), and an award of $5,000 to reimburse me for the time I spent representing the Class and assisting Lead Counsel in achieving the Settlement for the Class. The statements contained herein are based upon my personal knowledge and upon information made available to me in my official capacity.

A. Background

3. I am a Business Development Manager at Rikvin Capital in Singapore. I have a finance and accounting degree from Curtin University and have more than five years of investing experience.

4. In February 2020, prior to the filing of the above-captioned lawsuits, my parents and I contacted Bernstein Liebhard LLP ("Bernstein Liebhard") to

[1] Otherwise undefined terms have the definitions set forth in the October 25, 2021 Stipulation of Settlement.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F62-A931-FCA24374B52E

discuss my mother's legal rights and options under the U.S. federal securities laws to recover the substantial losses she suffered from her investments in Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc. ("BBBY"). My parents designated me as the point person to communicate with Bernstein Liebhard given my experience working with and overseeing attorneys in my professional capacity. I have been in regular contact with Bernstein Liebhard since February 2020.

5. After the above-captioned lawsuits were filed in April 2020, my mother, in consultation with both me and my father, decided that I should pursue the Lead Plaintiff role in these actions as the assignee of my mother's claims. We made this decision for practical reasons. We are a close-knit family; my parents had made me the point person to communicate with Bernstein Liebhard about my mother's legal rights and options; I have repeatedly worked with and supervised attorneys in my professional capacity; and, in light of the COVID pandemic, it was safer for me to travel to the U.S. (if that were necessary) than either of my parents.

6. I moved for appointment as lead plaintiff on June 15, 2020. Four other shareholders also moved. My motion was challenged by another movant, but I was deemed the most adequate movant by the Court and appointed as Lead Plaintiff on August 14, 2020.

7. During the period of September 3, 2019 and February 11, 2020, inclusive (the "Class Period"), I (as assignee) purchased shares of BBBY common

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F63-A931-FCA24374B52E

stock. I suffered substantial losses as a result of the misstatements and omissions during the Class Period that are alleged in this case. For that reason, I was highly motivated to work with Lead Counsel to see that the recovery was maximized for my mother and all Class members.

B. The Litigation of the Action

8. I carefully monitored and was involved in the prosecution of the Action and supervised the activities of Bernstein Liebhard on behalf of the Class. Among other things, I: (i) reviewed the amended complaint and opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss; (ii) communicated with Bernstein Liebhard regarding developments in the Action; (iii) participated in settlement negotiations; and (iv) reviewed and approved the terms of the Settlement.

9. No major decisions were made by Lead Counsel in this case without my approval, including the decision to enter the Settlement.

C. Settlement Discussions

10. I believe I am well-positioned and qualified to evaluate the reasonableness and adequacy of the Settlement in this Action.

11. On August 4, 2021, after mediation statements were exchanged between the parties and a two-day mediation was held before an experienced mediator, the parties reached an agreement in principle to settle the Action for $7

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F63-A931-FCA24374B52E

million. I approved this agreement and authorized Lead Counsel to enter the Settlement.

12. Based on my involvement in this Action, I strongly endorse the Settlement and believe it provides a very good result for the Class.

D. The Plan of Allocation

13. Based on the explanation of the analysis of the proposed Plan of Allocation completed by Lead Counsel's retained financial consultant in the Action, I endorse the proposed Plan of Allocation. I understand from my communications with Bernstein Liebhard that the Plan of Allocation represents a fair and reasonable method for valuing claims submitted by members of the Class, and for distributing the Net Settlement Fund to members of the Class who submit valid and timely Claim Forms.

E. Lead Counsel's Fee and Expense Application

14. As a Lead Plaintiff, I take seriously my role to ensure that the attorneys' fees are fair in light of the result achieved for the Class and reasonably compensate Lead Counsel for the work involved and substantial risks they undertook in litigating the Action on a fully contingency-fee basis.

15. I endorse the application for attorneys' fees of 33 1/3% of the Settlement. Indeed, the retainer I signed at the beginning of the case provided for a 33 1/3% fee in any settlement.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F62-A931-FCA24374B52E

16. I understand that this fee payment, if approved by the Court, will cover all other Plaintiffs' Counsel who contributed to the prosecution of the Action at the direction of Lead Counsel. I believe that such approval is warranted as the payment represents a fair and reasonable fee to Plaintiffs' Counsel for their efforts in assisting the prosecution of the Action.

17. I also believe that the litigation expenses being requested for reimbursement were necessary for the prosecution and successful resolution of the Action. Therefore, I also endorse the application by Plaintiffs' Counsel for the reimbursement of their litigation expenses.

F. Lead Plaintiff's PSLRA Reimbursement Application

18. I personally spent 20 hours representing the Class, including by: (i) gathering relevant documents for my motion to be appointed as lead plaintiff: (ii) reviewing the amended complaint and opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss; (iii) communicating regularly with Bernstein Liebhard regarding strategy and developments in the Action; (iv) participating in settlement negotiations; and (v) reviewing and approving the Settlement. My normal hourly rate is $250. Thus, the value of my time spent on this case is $5,000.

19. In light of the work I performed in the fulfillment of my fiduciary obligations to the Class, I believe that my requested reimbursement of $5,000 is fair and reasonable and warrants this Court's approval.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F567AEE2-4D91-4F62-A931-FCA24374B52E

CONCLUSION

20. Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Court approve the Settlement, the Fee and Expense Application, and the requested reimbursement for the time I spent on this case and helping to achieve this settlement.

21. I, Kavin Bakhda, declare, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746, under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true. 04/18/2022

Executed this _, day of April, 2022

DocuSigned by:
28DEAA1E97904E1...

KAVIN BAKHDA