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

REPLY MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN FURTHER 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

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

II. THE REACTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS FURTHER SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT, THE PLAN OF ALLOCATION, AND THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES 3

A. The Court-Approved Robust Notice Program 3

B. The Settlement Class's Reaction Supports Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation 5

C. The Settlement Class's Reaction Supports Approval of the Fee and Expense Application 7

III. CONCLUSION 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

In re AremisSoft Corp. Sec. Litig.,
210 F.R.D. 109 (D.N.J. 2002).....7

In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig.,
2005 WL 6716404 (D.N.J. Apr. 25, 2005).....7

Beneli v. BCA Fin. Servs., Inc.,
324 F.R.D. 89 (D.N.J. 2018).....8

In re Bisys Sec. Litig.,
2007 WL 2049726 (S.D.N.Y. July 16, 2007).....8

Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.,
2017 WL 4776626 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2017) 6

City of Southfield Fire & Police Ret. Sys. v. Hayward Holdings, Inc.,
2026 WL 2185221 (D.N.J. July 29, 2026) 6

In re Facebook, Inc., IPO Sec. & Derivative Litig.,
343 F. Supp. 3d 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2018), *aff'd sub nom.*, 822 Fed. App'x 40 (2nd Cir. 2020).....7

Flynn-Murphy v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC,
2025 WL 3771284 (D.N.J. Dec. 31, 2025).....8

Girsh v. Jepson,
521 F.2d 153 (3d Cir. 1975) 5

Johnson v. Comodo Grp., Inc.,
2026 WL 296417 (D.N.J. Feb. 4, 2026) 7

In re Lucent Techs., Inc., Sec. Litig.,
307 F. Supp. 2d 633 (D.N.J. 2004).....6, 7

In re Rite Aid Corp. Sec. Litig.,
396 F.3d 294 (3d Cir. 2005) 8

In re Schering Plough Corp. Enhance Sec. Litig.,
2013 WL 5505744 (D.N.J. Oct. 1, 2013) 5

Whiteley v. Zynerba Pharms., Inc.,
2021 WL 4206696 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 16, 2021) 6, 8

In re Wilmington Tr. Sec. Litig.,
2018 WL 6046452 (D. Del. Nov. 19, 2018) 6

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1715(b) 5

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, and Lead Counsel, respectfully submit this reply memorandum of law in further support of (i) Lead Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Settlement and Plan of Allocation (Dkt. No. 102); and (ii) Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses (Dkt. No. 103) (the "Motions").[1]

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The proposed Settlement resolves this litigation in exchange for an all-cash, non-reversionary payment of $19.5 million. As detailed in the Motions, the proposed Settlement is the product of Lead Plaintiffs' and Lead Counsel's vigorous investigation, zealous prosecution, and arm's-length settlement negotiations before a highly experienced mediator. The Settlement is a favorable result for Settlement Class Members given both the size of the recovery and the significant risks that Lead Plaintiffs faced in proving that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements with scienter, in establishing loss causation and damages, and the costs and delay of further litigation.

[1] Unless otherwise defined, all capitalized terms herein have the same meanings as in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-2) (the "Stipulation"); and internal citations and quotations are omitted.

The Settlement has also now been overwhelmingly endorsed by the Settlement Class, none of whom have objected or sought exclusion. Since the Court granted preliminary approval, the Court-approved Claims Administrator, under the supervision of Lead Counsel, has completed the extensive notice program set out in the Court's July 21, 2026 Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Authorizing Dissemination of Notice of Settlement (Dkt. No. 101) ("Preliminary Approval Order"). The notice program included, *inter alia*, mailing the Postcard Notice to over 101,000 potential Settlement Class Members, publication of a Summary Notice in *The Wall Street Journal* and *PR Newswire*, and the establishment of a dedicated Settlement website run by the Claims Administrator. Following this comprehensive notice program, ***no objections were received*** with respect to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, or the requested fees and expenses, and ***no requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class were received***. The complete lack of objections or opt-outs represents a significant endorsement by the Settlement Class of the proposed Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and the requested fees and expenses.

The absence of any objections is especially noteworthy here given that the great majority of the Settlement Class is comprised of institutional investors, who have the staff and resources to object if they believe there is cause to do so. None did so here. Moreover, Lead Plaintiffs, experienced and sophisticated institutional

investors that actively oversaw the Action themselves, have each expressly endorsed the Settlement and the requested attorneys' fees and expenses. *See* Dkt. No. 103-3, at ¶¶ 2-6; Dkt. No. 103-4, at ¶¶ 2-6; Dkt. No. 103-5, at ¶¶ 2-6.

As explained below, the overwhelmingly positive reaction of the Settlement Class further supports a finding that the proposed Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and request for attorneys' fees and expenses are fair and reasonable, and should be approved.

II. THE REACTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS FURTHER SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT, THE PLAN OF ALLOCATION, AND THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel respectfully submit that their opening papers demonstrated why approval of the Motions is warranted. Now that the time for objecting or requesting exclusion from the Settlement Class has passed, the lack of any objections or requests for exclusion establishes that the "reaction of the class" factor also strongly supports approval of both Motions.

A. The Court-Approved Robust Notice Program

In accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, 101,828 copies of the Postcard Notice and 4,080 copies of the Notice Packet have been mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and their nominees. *See* Supplemental Declaration of Luiggy Segura Regarding: (A) Dissemination of Postcard Notice and Notice Packet; (B) Call Center Services and Settlement Website; and (C) Report on

Requests for Exclusion Received (the "Suppl. Segura Decl."), attached hereto as Exhibit 1, at ¶ 4. The notices informed Settlement Class Members of the terms of the proposed Settlement and Plan of Allocation, and that Lead Counsel would apply for an award of attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 22% of the Settlement Fund and payment of Litigation Expenses (including potential reimbursement awards to Lead Plaintiffs as authorized by the PSLRA) in an amount not to exceed $350,000. *See* Postcard Notice at 2; Notice ¶¶ 5, 58. The notices also apprised Settlement Class Members of (a) their right to object to the proposed Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or the request for attorneys' fees and expenses; (b) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and (c) the October 28, 2026 deadline for receipt of objections and requests for exclusion. *See* Postcard Notice at 2; Notice at p. 3 and ¶¶ 59, 66-67.

In addition, the Summary Notice was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and over *PR Newswire* on August 26, 2026. *See* 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 (Dkt. No. 103-6) at ¶ 12. The Summary Notice informed readers of the proposed Settlement, how to obtain copies of the longer Notice and Claim Form, and the deadlines for the submission of Claim Forms, objections, and requests for exclusion.

On October 14, 2026, 14 days before the objection and exclusion deadline, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel filed their opening papers in support of the Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and fee and expense request. These papers are available on the public docket (Dkt. Nos. 102-103), and they were also posted on the Settlement Website, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com, the next day. *See* Suppl. Segura Decl. ¶ 6. In addition, notice of the Settlement was provided by Defendants to appropriate federal and state officials pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b), on July 24, 2026. Dkt. No. 104.

As noted above, following implementation of this comprehensive notice program, not a single Settlement Class Member submitted an objection to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, or Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses. In addition, no requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class were received. *See* Suppl. Segura Decl. ¶ 7.

B. The Settlement Class's Reaction Supports Approval of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation

The absence of any objections or requests for exclusion from Settlement Class Members is a significant factor that supports a finding that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *See Girsh v. Jepson*, 521 F.2d 153, 157 (3d Cir. 1975). Under *Girsh*, courts consider whether "the number of objectors, in proportion to the total class, indicates that the reaction of the class to the settlement is favorable." *In re Schering Plough Corp. Enhance Sec. Litig.*, 2013 WL 5505744, at *2 (D.N.J. Oct.

1, 2013). The absence of any objectors weighs strongly in favor of approval. *See, e.g.*, *City of Southfield Fire & Police Ret. Sys. v. Hayward Holdings, Inc.*, 2026 WL 2185221, at *5 (D.N.J. July 29, 2026) ("The absence of any objections or exclusions by Class Members strongly weigh in favor of approval of the Settlement."); *Whiteley v. Zynerba Pharms., Inc.*, 2021 WL 4206696, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 16, 2021) (lack of objections was "persuasive evidence of the fairness and adequacy of the proposed settlement, and weighs in favor of a final approval"); *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.*, 2017 WL 4776626, at *4 n.3 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2017) ("the lack of objectors provides a strong indication that the settlement is fair and reasonable"); *In re Lucent Techs., Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 307 F. Supp. 2d 633, 643 (D.N.J. 2004) ("[U]nanimous approval of the proposed settlement by the class members is entitled to nearly dispositive weight."). Thus, in addition to the significant risks of continued litigation and other factors addressed in Lead Plaintiffs' opening motion papers, the reaction of the Settlement Class strongly supports approval of the proposed Settlement.

The lack of objections here is particularly notable given that, based on public filings on Form 13F, institutional investors owned the substantial majority of the Kornit common stock throughout the Class Period. As courts have recognized, an absence of objections from such sophisticated institutional investors—who readily possess the resources, financial motivation, and legal staff to object to anything that they believe to be unfair or unreasonable—particularly supports approval. *See In re*

Wilmington Tr. Sec. Litig., 2018 WL 6046452, at *5 (D. Del. Nov. 19, 2018) (lack of objections by institutional investors, who owned a significant percentage of securities at issue, "weighs in favor of the settlements"); *In re Facebook, Inc., IPO Sec. & Derivative Litig.*, 343 F. Supp. 3d 394, 410 (S.D.N.Y. 2018) ("That not one sophisticated institutional investor objected to the Proposed Settlement is indicia of its fairness."), *aff'd sub nom.*, 822 Fed. App'x 40 (2nd Cir. 2020); *In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 2005 WL 6716404, at *3-4 (D.N.J. Apr. 25, 2005) (the reaction of the class "weigh[ed] heavily in favor of approval" where "no objections were filed by any institutional investors who had great financial incentive to object").

The uniformly favorable reaction of the Settlement Class also supports approval of the Plan of Allocation. *See, e.g.*, *Lucent*, 307 F. Supp. 2d at 649 ("The favorable reaction of the Class supports approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation. . . . [N]o Class Member has objected to the Plan of Allocation."); *In re AremisSoft Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 210 F.R.D. 109, 127 (D.N.J. 2002) (same).

C. The Settlement Class's Reaction Supports Approval of the Fee and Expense Application

The uniformly positive reaction of the Settlement Class should also be considered with respect to Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. Courts recognize that the absence of any objections to the requested fees and expenses weighs in favor of a finding that they are fair and reasonable. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Comodo Grp., Inc.*, 2026 WL 296417, at *6 (D.N.J.

Feb. 4, 2026) ("There have been no objections [to the fee request]. This factor weighs in favor of approving Plaintiff's fee request."); *Flynn-Murphy v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC*, 2025 WL 3771284, at *22 (D.N.J. Dec. 31, 2025) (the "dearth of objections strongly supports approval of the requested fee"); *Zynerba Pharms.*, 2021 WL 4206696, at *11 ("The lack of any objections is strongly indicative of approval by the Class. Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of approv[al] of the requested fees."); *Beneli v. BCA Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 324 F.R.D. 89, 109 (D.N.J. 2018) (the absence of objections "strongly supports approval of Class Counsel's requested fee award").

As with approval of the Settlement, the lack of objections by institutional investors in particular supports approval of the fee request. *See, e.g.*, *In re Rite Aid Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 396 F.3d 294, 305 (3d Cir. 2005) (the fact that "a significant number of investors in the class were 'sophisticated' institutional investors that had considerable financial incentive to object had they believed the requested fees were excessive" and did not do so, supported approval of the fee request); *In re Bisys Sec. Litig.*, 2007 WL 2049726, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 16, 2007) (noting that only one individual raised any objection, "even though the class included numerous institutional investors who presumably had the means, the motive, and the sophistication to raise objections if they thought the [requested] fee was excessive").

Accordingly, the uniformly positive reaction of the Settlement Class strongly supports approval of the fee and expense request.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and the additional points and authorities set forth in their opening papers, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel respectfully request that the Court approve the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and the request for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. Copies of the (i) [Proposed] Judgment Approving Class Action Settlement, (ii) [Proposed] Order Approving Plan of Allocation of Net Settlement Fund, and (iii) [Proposed] Order Awarding Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses are attached hereto as Exhibits 2, 3, and 4.

Dated: November 11, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

By: */s/ James E. Cecchi*
James E. Cecchi

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
Kevin G. Cooper
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, New Jersey 07068
Telephone: (973) 994-1700
Facsimile: (973) 994-1744
jcecchi@carellabyrne.com
kcooper@carellabyrne.com

Liaison Counsel for the Lead Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP
Hannah Ross (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Avi Josefson (admitted *pro hac vice*)
James A. Harrod (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Alec T. Coquin (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Mathews R. de Carvalho (admitted *pro hac vice*)
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Telephone: (212) 554-1400
Facsimile: (212) 554-1444
hannah@blbglaw.com
avi@blbglaw.com
jim.harrod@blbglaw.com
alec.coquin@blbglaw.com
mathews.decarvalho@blbglaw.com

Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs

VMT LAW, P.C.
Thomas C. Michaud
Francis E. Judd
79 Alfred Street
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Telephone: (313) 578-1200
Facsimile: (313) 578-1201
tmichaud@vmtlaw.com
fjudd@vmtlaw.com

Additional Counsel for Lead Plaintiff Genesee County Employees' Retirement System

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on November 11, 2026, I caused this Reply Memorandum of Law in Further 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 and its attachments to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system. Notice of this filing will be sent to all counsel of record by operation of the Court's electronic filing system and the filing will be available for viewing and downloading from the CM/ECF system.

Dated: November 11, 2026

/s/ James E. Cecchi

James E. Cecchi
CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: (973) 994-1700
Facsimile: (973) 994-1744
jcecchi@carellabyrne.com

Liaison Counsel for the Lead Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class

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

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF LUIGGY SEGURA REGARDING: (A) DISSEMINATION OF POSTCARD NOTICE AND NOTICE PACKET; (B) CALL CENTER SERVICES AND SETTLEMENT WEBSITE; AND (C) REPORT ON REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION RECEIVED

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

1. I am the Vice President of Securities Operations 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"), JND was appointed to supervise and administer the notice procedure as well as the processing of claims in connection with the Settlement of the above-captioned action (the "Action").[1] I am over 21 years of age and am not a party to the Action.

2. I submit this declaration as a supplement to my previously filed declaration, the Declaration of Luiggy Segura Regarding: (A) Dissemination of

[1] Unless otherwise defined herein, 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").

Postcard Notice and Notice Packet; (B) Publication of the Summary Notice; and (C) Report on Requests for Exclusion Received to Date, dated October 14, 2026 (Dkt. No. 103-6) (the "Initial Mailing Declaration"). The following statements are based on my personal knowledge and information provided to me by other experienced JND employees, and, if called as a witness, I could testify competently thereto.

UPDATE ON DISSEMINATION OF NOTICE

3. Since the initial mailing of the Postcard Notice and Notice Packets on August 12, 2026 (the "Initial Mailing"), JND has undertaken substantial efforts to ensure that brokers/nominees responded in a timely manner either by providing JND with the names and addresses of potential Settlement Class Members or by requesting notices, in bulk, to forward directly onto their clients. To that end, JND caused reminder postcards to be mailed to the brokers/nominees and third-party filers who did not respond to the Initial Mailing, advising these entities of their obligation to facilitate notice of the Settlement to their clients who purchased or otherwise acquired ordinary shares of Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit") during the Class Period, including pursuant and/or traceable to the November 2021 secondary offering. JND also reached out via telephone and email to the top 100 brokers/nominees and third-party filers.

4. Since the Initial Mailing, JND has continued to disseminate copies of the Postcard Notice and Notice Packet in response to requests from potential

Settlement Class Members and brokers/nominees. As of November 10, 2026, an aggregate of 101,828 Postcard Notices and 4,080 Notice Packets have been mailed by JND to potential Settlement Class Members and their brokers or nominees.

UPDATE ON CALL CENTER SERVICES AND SETTLEMENT WEBSITE

5. JND continues to maintain the toll-free telephone number (855-961-0955) and Interactive Voice Recording ("IVR") to accommodate inquiries about the Settlement from potential Settlement Class Members. JND has promptly responded to each telephone inquiry and will continue to respond to Settlement Class Member inquiries via the toll-free telephone number.

6. JND also continues to maintain the website dedicated to the Settlement, www.KornitSecuritiesLitigation.com (the "Settlement Website"), to assist potential Settlement Class Members. On October 15, 2026, JND posted to the Settlement Website copies of the papers in support of Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval. JND will continue operating, maintaining and, as appropriate, updating the Settlement Website until the conclusion of the administration of the Settlement.

REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION RECEIVED

7. The Postcard Notice, Notice, Summary Notice, and Settlement Website informed potential Settlement Class Members that requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class were to be sent to JND such that they were received no later than October 28, 2026. JND has monitored all mail delivered to the P.O. Box for the

Settlement. As of the date of this Declaration, JND has not received any requests for exclusion.

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

Executed this 11th day of November, 2026.

Luiggy Segura

LUIGGY SEGURA

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

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT APPROVING CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, a consolidated securities class action is pending in this Court entitled *In re Kornit Digital Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 2:23-cv-888-MCA-AME (the "Action");

WHEREAS, (a) 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 (defined below); and (b) Defendants Kornit Digital Ltd. ("Kornit" or the "Company"), Ronen Samuel, and Alon Rozner (collectively, the "Individual Defendants," and together with Kornit, the "Defendants," and together with Lead Plaintiffs, the "Parties") have entered into a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (the "Stipulation"), that provides for a complete dismissal with prejudice of the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action on the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation, subject to the approval of this Court (the "Settlement");

WHEREAS, unless otherwise defined in this Judgment, the capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as they have in the Stipulation;

WHEREAS, by Order dated July 21, 2026 (the "Preliminary Approval Order"), this Court: (a) found, pursuant to Rule 23(e)(1)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, that it (i) would likely be able to approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate under Rule 23(e)(2) and (ii) would likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of the Settlement; (b) ordered

that notice of the proposed Settlement be provided to potential Settlement Class Members; (c) provided Settlement Class Members with the opportunity either to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or to object to the proposed Settlement; and (d) scheduled a hearing regarding final approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, due and adequate notice has been given to the Settlement Class;

WHEREAS, the Court conducted a hearing on November 18, 2026 (the "Settlement Hearing") to consider, among other things: (a) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and should therefore be approved; and (b) whether a judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice as against the Defendants; and

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered the Stipulation, all papers filed and proceedings held herein in connection with the Settlement, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing therefor;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

1. **Jurisdiction** – The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action, and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Parties and each of the Settlement Class Members.

2. **Incorporation of Settlement Documents** – This Judgment incorporates and makes a part hereof: (a) the Stipulation filed with the Court on July 2, 2026; and (b) the Postcard Notice, the Notice and the Summary Notice, all of which were filed with the Court on October 14, 2026.

3. **Class Certification for Settlement Purposes** – The Court hereby certifies, for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the Settlement Class consisting of: all persons

and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired ordinary shares of 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. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) Defendants; (b) Immediate Family Members of the Individual Defendants; (c) the Former Underwriter Defendants; (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; and (i) the legal representatives, heirs, 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.

4. **Settlement Class Findings** – For purposes of the Settlement only, the Court finds that each element required for certification of the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been met: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Action would be impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over any individual questions; (c) the claims of Lead Plaintiffs in the Action are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests

of the Settlement Class; and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the Action.

5. Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Court hereby certifies Lead Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoints Lead Counsel Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class. The Court finds that Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class both in terms of litigating the Action and for purposes of entering into and implementing the Settlement and have satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) and 23(g), respectively.

6. **Notice** – The Court finds that the dissemination of the Postcard Notice, Notice, and Claim Form and the publication of the Summary Notice: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (iv) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (v) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and (vi) their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) 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.

7. **CAFA Notice** – The Court finds that the notice requirements set forth in the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, to the extent applicable to the Action, have been satisfied.

8. **Final Settlement Approval and Dismissal of Claims** – Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation in all respects (including, without limitation: the amount of the Settlement; the Releases provided for therein; and the dismissal with prejudice of the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action), and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class. Specifically, the Court finds that: (a) Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have adequately represented the Settlement Class; (b) the Settlement was negotiated by the Parties at arm's length; (c) the relief provided for the Settlement Class under the Settlement is adequate taking into account the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal; the proposed means of distributing the Settlement Fund to the Settlement Class; and the proposed attorneys' fee award; and (d) the Settlement treats members of the Settlement Class equitably relative to each other. The Parties are directed to implement, perform, and consummate the Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions contained in the Stipulation.

9. The Action and all of the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action by Lead Plaintiffs and the other Settlement Class Members are hereby dismissed with prejudice. The Parties shall bear their own costs and expenses, except as otherwise expressly provided in the Stipulation.

10. **Binding Effect** – The terms of the Stipulation and of this Judgment shall be forever binding on Defendants, Lead Plaintiffs, and all other Settlement Class Members (regardless of

whether or not any individual Settlement Class Member submits a Claim Form or seeks or obtains a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund), as well as their respective successors and assigns.

11. **Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 12 below, 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, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this 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.

(b) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 12 below, 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, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendants' Claim against Lead Plaintiffs and the other Released Plaintiffs' Parties, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendants' Claims against any of the Released Plaintiffs' Parties.

12. Notwithstanding paragraphs 11(a) – (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action by any of the Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

13. **Rule 11 Findings** – The Court finds and concludes that the Parties and their respective counsel have complied in all respects with the requirements of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in connection with the institution, prosecution, defense, and settlement of the Action.

14. **No Admissions** – Defendants deny any wrongdoing, liability, or violation of law or regulation whatsoever, and neither this Judgment, the Term Sheet, the Stipulation (whether or not consummated), including the exhibits thereto and the Plan of Allocation contained therein (or any other plan of allocation that may be approved by the Court), the negotiations leading to the execution of the Term Sheet and the Stipulation, nor any proceedings taken pursuant to or in connection with the Term Sheet, the Stipulation, and/or approval of the Settlement (including any arguments proffered in connection therewith):

(a) shall be offered against any of the Released Defendants' Parties as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Released Defendants' Parties with respect to the truth of any fact alleged by Lead Plaintiffs or the validity of any claim that was or could have been asserted or the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in this Action or in any other litigation, or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Released Defendants' Parties, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Released Defendants' Parties, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil,

criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation;

(b) shall be offered against any of the Released Plaintiffs' Parties as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Released Plaintiffs' Parties that any of their claims are without merit, that any of the Released Defendants' Parties had meritorious defenses, or that damages recoverable under the Complaint would not have exceeded the Settlement Amount, or with respect to any liability, negligence, fault, or wrongdoing of any kind, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Released Plaintiffs' Parties, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation; or

(c) shall be construed against any of the Released Persons as an admission, concession, or presumption that the consideration to be given under the Settlement represents the amount which could be or would have been recovered after trial;

provided, however, that the Parties and the Released Persons and their respective counsel may refer to this Judgment and the Stipulation to effectuate the protections from liability granted hereunder and thereunder or otherwise to enforce the terms of the Settlement.

15. **Retention of Jurisdiction** – Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the Parties for purposes of the administration, interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of the Settlement; (b) the disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) any motion for an award of attorneys' fees and/or Litigation Expenses by Lead Counsel in the Action that will be paid from the Settlement Fund; (d) any motion

to approve the Plan of Allocation; (e) any motion to approve the Class Distribution Order; and (f) the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to the Action.

16. Separate orders shall be entered regarding approval of a plan of allocation and the motion of Lead Counsel for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. Such orders shall in no way affect or delay the finality of this Judgment and shall not affect or delay the Effective Date of the Settlement.

17. **Termination of Settlement** – If the Settlement is terminated as provided in the Stipulation or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Judgment shall be vacated and rendered null and void, and shall be of no further force and effect, except as otherwise provided by the Stipulation, and this Judgment shall be without prejudice to the rights of Lead Plaintiffs, the other Settlement Class Members, and Defendants, and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions in the Action as of May 12, 2026, as provided in the Stipulation.

18. **Entry of Final Judgment** – There is no just reason to delay the entry of this Judgment as a final judgment in this Action. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed to immediately enter this final judgment in this Action.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of _____, 2026.

_____

The Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo
United States District Judge

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING
PLAN OF ALLOCATION OF NET SETTLEMENT FUND

This matter came on for hearing on November 18, 2026 (the "Settlement Hearing") on Lead Plaintiffs' motion to approve the proposed plan of allocation ("Plan of Allocation") of the Net Settlement Fund created under the Settlement in the above-captioned class action (the "Action"). The Court having considered all matters submitted to it at the Settlement Hearing; and it appearing that notice 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 substantially in the form approved by the Court was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and transmitted over *PR Newswire* pursuant to the specifications of the Court; and the Court having considered and determined the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed Plan of Allocation,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. This Order approving the proposed Plan of Allocation incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement, dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-2) (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 approving the proposed Plan of Allocation, and over the subject matter of the Action and all Parties to the Action, including all Settlement Class Members.

3. Notice of Lead Plaintiffs' motion for approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation was given to all Settlement Class Members who or which could be identified with reasonable effort. The form and method of notifying the Settlement Class of the motion for approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation 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 laws and rules, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

4. Over 101,000 Postcard Notices and 4,000 Notice Packets (*i.e.*, the Notice and Claim Form) were mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and nominees, and the Notice, which included the Plan of Allocation, was posted on the Settlement Website. No objections to the Plan of Allocation were submitted.

5. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Claimants as set forth in the Plan of Allocation provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund among Settlement Class Members with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity.

6. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Plan of Allocation is, in all respects, fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class. Accordingly, the Court hereby approves the Plan of Allocation proposed by Lead Plaintiffs.

7. Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Order approving the Plan of Allocation shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment.

8. 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 _____ day of _____, 2026.

_____

The Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo
United States District Judge

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER AWARDING
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES

This matter came on for hearing on November 18, 2026 (the "Settlement Hearing") on Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses. The Court having considered all matters submitted to it at the Settlement Hearing; and it appearing that notice substantially in the form approved by the Court, which advised of Lead Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses, was mailed to all Settlement 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 over *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 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 (Dkt. No. 103-2) and the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated July 2, 2026 (Dkt. No. 99-2) (the "Stipulation"), and all terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in those documents.

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 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 attorneys' fees and 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 22% of the Settlement Fund or $4,290,000, plus interest earned at the same rate as the Settlement Fund. Plaintiffs' Counsel are also hereby awarded $136,695.22 for payment of their litigation expenses. These attorneys' fees and expenses shall be paid from the Settlement Fund and the Court finds these sums to be fair and reasonable. Lead Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded among 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.

5. In making this award of attorneys' fees and payment of litigation expenses from the Settlement Fund, the Court has considered and found that:

a. The Settlement has created a fund of $19,500,000 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, who are sophisticated institutional investors that actively supervised the Action;

c. Over 101,000 Postcard Notices and 4,000 Notice Packets stating that Lead Counsel would apply for attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 22% of the Settlement Fund and payment of Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $350,000 were mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and Nominees and no objections to the requested award of attorneys' fees or Litigation Expenses were submitted;

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;

f. Had Plaintiffs' 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 4,200 hours, with a lodestar value of approximately $3.78 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 Genesee County Employees' Retirement System is hereby awarded $7,500 from the Settlement Fund for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

7. Lead Plaintiffs Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Tichoniim Havera Menahelet LTD and Kranot Hishtalmut Le Morim Ve Gananot Havera Menahelet LTD (together, the "Teachers

Funds") are hereby awarded $7,500 from the Settlement Fund for their reasonable costs and expenses directly related to their representation of the Settlement Class.

8. Lead Plaintiff Hachshara Insurance Company Ltd. is hereby awarded $7,500 from the Settlement Fund for its reasonable costs and expenses directly related to its representation of the Settlement Class.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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 _____ day of _____ 2026.

_____

The Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo
United States District Judge