Certified: --

E-31-22

Filed with the Clerk of the Nassau County Legislature on April 26, 2022 12:46pm

NIFS ID: CLAT21000018

Capital:

Contract ID #: CQAT20000007

NIFS Entry Date: 12/28/2021

Department: County Attorney

Service: outside counsel

Term: January 29, 2020 to completion of services

Contract Delayed:

Slip Type: Amendment		
CRP:		
Time Extension:		
Addl. Funds:		
Blanket Resolution:		
Revenue:	Federal Aid:	State Aid:
Vendor Submitted an Unsolicited Solicitation:		

1) Mandated Program:	**No**
2) Comptroller Approval Form Attached:	**Yes**
3) CSEA Agmt. & 32 Compliance Attached:	**No**
4) Significant Adverse Information Identified? (if yes, attach memo):	**No**
5) Insurance Required:	**Yes**

Vendor/Municipality Info:	
Name: **Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP**	ID#:**131548757**
Main Address: **270 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016**	
Main Contact: **Mark Rifkin**	
Main Phone:	

Department:
Contact Name: **Mary Nori**
Address: **1 West Street Mineola, New York 11501**
Phone: **(516) 571-6083**
Email: **mnori@nassaucountyny.gov**

Contract Summary

Purpose: This is an amendment (#1) to an outside counsel contract to provide legal services to the County in connection with the Berliner case. This amendment increases the maximum amount by $139,672.00.

Method of Procurement: Contract amendment. Please see procurement history below.

Procurement History: A total of three candidates were solicited to represent the County in a similar case entitled Hall v. Nassau County Department of Assessment, et al. The three firms were 1) Wolf Haldenstein, 2) Hoguet Newman and 3) Duane Morris. Two proposals were received. Duane Morris opted not to submit. After interviews were conducted of the two responding firms, the committee unanimously chose Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP ("Wolf Haldenstein") based on their overall response to the proposal, demonstrated capacity to handle this assignment, the requisite staff to ensure the case would be handled properly, extensive experience in both suing and defending municipalities, and overall best value to the County. The Berliner

action, the subject case of this amendment, was filed against the County after the committee selected Wolf Haldenstein for the Hall matter, and involved similar issues raised in the Hall litigation. Both Hall and Berliner involved challenges to the county's assessment system. Due to the complexity of these new class action certified litigation, the court-ordered expedited discovery, expedited trial date, the high exposure to the County and the similar issues raised in both matters, the County Attorney determined it was in the best interest of the County to retain Wolf Haldenstein as special counsel in the Berliner matter.
Description of General Provisions: As described above.
Impact on Funding / Price Analysis: This amendment increases the maximum amount by $139,672.00. The amended maximum amount shall be $524,672.00.
Change in Contract from Prior Procurement: N/A
Recommendation: Approve as Submitted

Advisement Information

Fund	Control	Resp. Center	Object	Index Code	Sub Object	Budget Code	Line	Amount
GEN	10	1100	DE	ATGEN1100	DE502	ATGEN1100 DE502	02	$139,672.00
						TOTAL		**$139,672.00**

Additional Info	
Blanket Encumbrance	
Transaction	
Renewal	
% Increase	
% Decrease	

Funding Source	Amount
Revenue Contract:	
County	$139,672.00
Federal	$0.00
State	$0.00
Capital	$0.00
Other	$0.00
Total	**$139,672.00**

Routing Slip

Department			
NIFS Entry	Mary Nori	12/29/2021 04:45PM	Approved
NIFS Final Approval	Daniel Gregware	12/30/2021 09:38AM	Approved
Final Approval	Daniel Gregware	12/30/2021 09:38AM	Approved
County Attorney			
Approval as to Form	Mary Nori	12/30/2021 09:43AM	Approved
RE & Insurance Verification	Mary Nori	12/30/2021 09:44AM	Approved
NIFS Approval	Jaclyn Delle	01/07/2022 11:37AM	Approved
Final Approval	Jaclyn Delle	01/07/2022 11:37AM	Approved
OMB			
NIFS Approval	Jeff Nogid	01/05/2022 10:02AM	Approved
NIFA Approval	Irfan Qureshi	01/05/2022 03:32PM	Approved
Final Approval	Irfan Qureshi	01/05/2022 03:32PM	Approved
Compliance & Vertical DCE			
Procurement Compliance Approval	Robert Cleary	01/07/2022 01:01PM	Approved
DCE Compliance Approval	Robert Cleary	01/07/2022 01:01PM	Approved
Vertical DCE Approval	Arthur Walsh	04/08/2022 09:35AM	Approved
Final Approval	Arthur Walsh	04/08/2022 09:35AM	Approved
Legislative Affairs Review			
Final Approval	Christopher Leimone	04/26/2022 12:24PM	Approved
Legislature			
Final Approval			In Progress
Comptroller			
Intake Approval			Pending
Claims Approval			Pending

Legal Approval			Pending
Accounting / NIFS Approval			Pending
Deputy Approval			Pending
Final Approval			Pending
NIFA			
NIFA Approval			Pending

AMENDMENT NO. 1

AMENDMENT (together with any appendices or exhibits hereto, this "Amendment") dated as of the date that this Amendment is executed by Nassau County (the "Effective Date"), between (i) **Nassau County**, a municipal corporation having its principal office at 1550 Franklin Avenue, Mineola, New York 11501 (the "County"), acting for and on behalf of the **Office of the Nassau County Attorney**, having its principal office at One West Street, Mineola, New York 11501 (the "Department"), and (ii)) **Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP**, with an office located at 270 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016 ("Counsel" or "Contractor").

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, pursuant to County contract number CQAT20000007 between the County and Counsel, executed on behalf of the County on March 15, 2021 (the "Original Agreement"), Counsel provides legal services to the County in connection with the following class action litigation: ERIC BERLINER, ROBERT FINE , MICHAEL ARYEH and JILL PESCE, Individually and On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated v. NASSAU COUNTY, NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENT, ASSESSMENT REVIEW COMMISSION, LAURA CURRAN In Her Official Capacity As County Executive, and DAVID F. MOOG In His Official Capacity As County Assessor For Nassau County, Index No. 605904/2019 ("Berliner"), which services are more fully described in the Original Agreement (the services contemplated by the Original Agreement, the "Services"); and

WHEREAS, the term of the Original Agreement is from January 29, 2020 until completion of Services (the "Original Term"); and

WHEREAS, the maximum amount that the County agreed to reimburse Counsel for Services under the Original Agreement, as full compensation for the Services, was Three Hundred Eighty-Five Thousand Dollars ($385,000.00) (the "Maximum Amount"); and

WHEREAS, the County and Counsel desire to increase the Maximum Amount.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and mutual covenants contained in this Amendment, the parties agree as follows:

1. Maximum Amount. The Maximum Amount in the Original Agreement shall be increased by One Hundred Thirty-Nine Thousand Six Hundred Seventy-Two Dollars ($139,672.00) (the "Amendment Maximum Amount"), so that the maximum amount that the County shall pay to Counsel as full consideration for all Services provided under the Original Agreement, as amended by this Amendment (the "Amended Agreement") shall be Five Hundred Twenty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Seventy-Two Dollars ($524,672.00) (the "Amended Maximum Amount").

2. Full Force and Effect. All the terms and conditions of the Original Agreement not expressly amended by this Amendment shall remain in full force and effect and govern the relationship of the parties for the term of the Amended Agreement.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Amendment as of the Effective Date.

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP

By: _____

Name: Mark C. Rifkin

Title: Partner

Date: Nov. 30, 2021

NASSAU COUNTY

By: _____

Name: ~~John B. Chiara~~ Jessica Mclinskie Karpakis

Title: Acting County Attorney

Date: 12/29/21

NASSAU COUNTY

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: County Executive

☐ Deputy County Executive

Date: _____

PLEASE EXECUTE IN BLUE INK

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF ~~NASSAU~~ New York

On the 2nd day of December in the year 2021 before me personally came Mark C. Rifkin to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he or she resides in the County of New York; that he or she is the Partner of Wolf Haldenstein, the corporation described herein and which executed the above instrument; and that he or she signed his or her name thereto by authority of the board of directors of said corporation.

NOTARY PUBLIC

THOMAS H. BURT
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 02BU6405040
Qualified in Westchester County
Commission Expires March 2, 2026

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF NASSAU)

Jessica Mallinak Kalpakis

On the 29th day of December in the year 2021 before me personally came ~~John B. Chiara~~ to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he resides in the County of Nassau; that he is Acting County Attorney of the County of Nassau, the municipal corporation described herein and which executed the above instrument; and that he signed his name thereto pursuant to Section 1101 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

NOTARY PUBLIC

DIANA CATAPANO
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF NEW YORK
NO. 01CA6089854
QUALIFIED IN NASSAU COUNTY
COMMISSION EXPIRES MAR. 31, 2023

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF NASSAU)

On the ____ day of _____ in the year 20__ before me personally came _____ to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he or she resides in the County of _____; that he or she is a Deputy County Executive of the County of Nassau, the municipal corporation described herein and which executed the above instrument; and that he or she signed his or her name thereto pursuant to Section 205 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

NOTARY PUBLIC

NIFA Nassau County Interim Finance Authority

Contract Approval Request Form (As of January 1, 2015)

1. Vendor: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

2. Amount requiring NIFA approval: $139,672.00

Amount to be encumbered: $139,672.00

Slip Type: Amendment

If new contract - $ amount should be full amount of contract
If advisement - NIFA only needs to review if it is increasing funds above the amount previously approved by NIFA
If amendment - $ amount should be full amount of amendment only

3. Contract Term: to January 29, 2020 to completion of services

Has work or services on this contract commenced? Yes

If yes, please explain: Contract amendment.

4. Funding Source:

General Fund (GEN)	X	Grant Fund (GRT)
Capital Improvement Fund (CAP)		Other

Federal %	0
State %	0
County %	100

Is the cash available for the full amount of the contract?	Yes
If not, will it require a future borrowing?	No
Has the County Legislature approved the borrowing?	N/A
Has NIFA approved the borrowing for this contract?	N/A

5. Provide a brief description (4 to 5 sentences) of the item for which this approval is requested:

This is an amendment (#1) to an outside counsel contract to provide legal services to the County in connection with the Berliner case. This amendment increases the maximum amount by $139,672.00.

6. Has the item requested herein followed all proper procedures and thereby approved by the:

Nassau County Attorney as to form	Yes
Nassau County Committee and/or Legislature	

Date of approval(s) and citation to the resolution where approval for this item was provided:

7. Identify all contracts (with dollar amounts) with this or an affiliated party within the prior 12 months:

Contract ID	Posting Date	Amount Added in Prior 12 Months

AUTHORIZATION

To the best of my knowledge, I hereby certify that the information contained in this Contract Approval Request Form and any additional information submitted in connection with this request is true and accurate and that all expenditures that will be made in reliance on this authorization are in conformance with the Nassau County Approved Budget and not in conflict with the Nassau County Multi-Year Financial Plan. I understand that NIFA will rely upon this information in its official deliberations.

IQURESHI 01/05/2022

Authenticated User ***Date***

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE

To the best of my knowledge, I hereby certify that the information listed is true and accurate and is in conformance with the Nassau County Approved Budget and not in conflict with the Nassau County Multi-Year Financial Plan.

Regarding funding, please check the correct response:

I certify that the funds are available to be encumbered pending NIFA approval of this contract.

If this is a capital project:

I certify that the bonding for this contract has been approved by NIFA.

Budget is available and funds have been encumbered but the project requires NIFA bonding authorization.

Authenticated User ***Date***

NIFA

Amount being approved by NIFA:

Payment is not guaranteed for any work commenced prior to this approval.

Authenticated User ***Date***

NOTE: All contract submissions MUST include the County's own routing slip, current NIFS printouts for all relevant accounts and relevant Nassau County Legislature communication documents and relevant supplemental information pertaining to the item requested herein.

NIFA Contract Approval Request Form MUST be filled out in its entirety before being submitted to NIFA for review.

NIFA reserves the right to request additional information as needed.

Jack Schnirman
Comptroller

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER
240 Old Country Road
Mineola, New York 11501

COMPTROLLER APPROVAL FORM FOR PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL OR HUMAN SERVICES CONTRACTS

Attach this form along with all personal, professional or human services contracts, contract renewals, extensions and amendments.

CONTRACTOR NAME: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

CONTRACTOR ADDRESS: 270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

FEDERAL TAX ID #: [redacted]

Instructions: **Please check the appropriate box ("☑") after one of the following roman numerals and provide all the requested information.**

I. ☐ The contract was awarded to the lowest, responsible bidder after advertisement for sealed bids. The contract was awarded after a request for sealed bids was published in _____ [newspaper] on _____ [date]. The sealed bids were publicly opened on _____ [date]. _____ [#] of sealed bids were received and opened.

II. ☐ The contractor was selected pursuant to a Request for Proposals.
The Contract was entered into after a written request for proposals was issued on _____ [date]. Potential proposers were made aware of the availability of the RFP by advertisement in _____ [newspaper], posting on industry websites, via email to interested parties and by publication on the County procurement website. Proposals were due on _____ [date]. _____ [state #] proposals were received and evaluated. The evaluation committee consisted of: _____
_____
_____ (list # of persons on committee and their respective departments). The proposals were scored and ranked. As a result of the scoring and ranking, the highest-ranking proposer was selected.

III. X This is a renewal, extension or amendment of an existing contract.
The contract was originally executed by Nassau County on March 15, 2021. This is a renewal or extension pursuant to the contract, or an amendment within the scope of the contract or RFP. The original contract was entered into after three candidates were solicited to represent the County in a similar case entitled Hall v. Nassau County Department of Assessment, et al. The three firms were 1) Wolf Haldenstein, 2) Hoguet Newman and 3) Duane Morris. Two proposals were received. Duane Morris opted not to submit. After interviews were conducted of the two responding firms, the

committee unanimously chose Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP ("Wolf Haldenstein") based on their overall response to the proposal, demonstrated capacity to handle this assignment, the requisite staff to ensure the case would be handled properly, extensive experience in both suing and defending municipalities, and overall best value to the County. The Berliner action, the subject case of this amendment, involves a challenge to the County wide assessment system, and arose while Counsel was representing the County in the class action litigation known as Hall v. Nassau County, Department of Assessment of Nassau County, et. al. ("Hall litigation"). Both cases question the methodology used in the 2020 reassessment. Due to the complexity of this class-action certified litigation, the court-ordered expedited discovery and expedited trial date, and light of the similar issues raised in Hall litigation (which also involves a challenge to the County's assessment system), the County Attorney's Office determined the expertise and assistance of special counsel was in the County's best interest.

IV. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 1 of 1993, as amended, at least three proposals were solicited and received. The attached memorandum from the department head describes the proposals received, along with the cost of each proposal.

☐ **A.** The contract has been awarded to the proposer offering the lowest cost proposal; **OR:**

☐ **B.** The attached memorandum contains a detailed explanation as to the reason(s) why the contract was awarded to other than the lowest-cost proposer. The attachment includes a specific delineation of the unique skills and experience, the specific reasons why a proposal is deemed superior, and/or why the proposer has been judged to be able to perform more quickly than other proposers.

V. ☐ Pursuant to Executive Order No. 1 of 1993 as amended, the attached memorandum from the department head explains why the department did not obtain at least three proposals.

☐ **A.** There are only one or two providers of the services sought or less than three providers submitted proposals. The memorandum describes how the contractor was determined to be the sole source provider of the personal service needed or explains why only two proposals could be obtained. If two proposals were obtained, the memorandum explains that the contract was awarded to the lowest cost proposer, or why the selected proposer offered the higher quality proposal, the proposer's unique and special experience, skill, or expertise, or its availability to perform in the most immediate and timely manner.

☐ **B.** The memorandum explains that the contractor's selection was dictated by the terms of a federal or New York State grant, by legislation or by a court order. (Copies of the relevant documents are attached).

☐ **C.** Pursuant to General Municipal Law Section 104, the department is purchasing the services required through a New York State Office of General Services contract no._____, and the attached memorandum explains how the purchase is within the scope of the terms of that contract.

☐ **D.** Pursuant to General Municipal Law Section 119-o, the department is purchasing the services required through an inter-municipal agreement.

VI. ☐ This is a human services contract with a not-for-profit agency for which a competitive process has not been initiated. Attached is a memorandum that explains the reasons

for entering into this contract without conducting a competitive process, and details when the department intends to initiate a competitive process for the future award of these services. For any such contract, where the vendor has previously provided services to the county, attach a copy of the most recent evaluation of the vendor's performance. If the contractor has not received a satisfactory evaluation, the department must explain why the contractor should nevertheless be permitted to contract with the county.

In certain limited circumstances, conducting a competitive process and/or completing performance evaluations may not be possible because of the nature of the human services program, or because of a compelling need to continue services through the same provider. In those circumstances, attach an explanation of why a competitive process and/or performance evaluation is inapplicable.

VII. ☐ This is a public works contract for the provision of architectural, engineering or surveying services. The attached memorandum provides details of the department's compliance with Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 928 of 1993, including its receipt and evaluation of annual Statements of Qualifications & Performance Data, and its negotiations with the most highly qualified firms.

Instructions with respect to Sections VIII, IX and X: **All Departments must check the box for VIII. Then, check the box for either IX or X, as applicable.**

VIII. X Participation of Minority Group Members and Women in Nassau County Contracts. The selected contractor has agreed that it has an obligation to utilize best efforts to hire MWBE sub-contractors. Proof of the contractual utilization of best efforts as outlined in Exhibit "EE" may be requested at any time, from time to time, by the Comptroller's Office prior to the approval of claim vouchers.

IX. ☐ Department MWBE responsibilities. To ensure compliance with MWBE requirements as outlined in Exhibit "EE", Department will require vendor to submit list of sub-contractor requirements prior to submission of the first claim voucher, for services under this contract being submitted to the Comptroller.

X. X Vendor will not require any sub-contractors.

In addition, if this is a contract with an individual or with an entity that has only one or two employees: ☐ a review of the criteria set forth by the Internal Revenue Service, *Revenue Ruling No.* 87-41, 1987-1 C.B. 296, attached as Appendix A to the Comptroller's Memorandum, dated February 13, 2004, concerning independent contractors and employees indicates that the contractor would not be considered an employee for federal tax purposes.

Department Head Signature

4/29/21

Date

NOTE: ***Any information requested above, or in the exhibit below, may be included in the county's "staff summary" form in lieu of a separate memorandum.***

Compt. form Pers./Prof. Services Contracts: Rev. 01/18

COUNTY OF NASSAU

POLITICAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION DISCLOSURE FORM

1. Has the vendor or any corporate officers of the vendor provided campaign contributions pursuant to the New York State Election Law in (a) the period beginning April 1, 2016 and ending on the date of this disclosure, or (b), beginning April 1, 2018, the period beginning two years prior to the date of this disclosure and ending on the date of this disclosure, to the campaign committees of any of the following Nassau County elected officials or to the campaign committees of any candidates for any of the following Nassau County elected offices: the County Executive, the County Clerk, the Comptroller, the District Attorney, or any County Legislator?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, to what campaign committee?

2. VERIFICATION: This section must be signed by a principal of the consultant, contractor or Vendor authorized as a signatory of the firm for the purpose of executing Contracts.

The undersigned affirms and so swears that he/she has read and understood the foregoing statements and they are, to his/her knowledge, true and accurate.

The undersigned further certifies and affirms that the contribution(s) to the campaign committees identified above were made freely and without duress, threat or any promise of a governmental benefit or in exchange for any benefit or remuneration.

Electronically signed and certified at the date and time indicated by:
Mark C. Rifkin [RIFKIN@WHAFH.COM]

Dated: 12/23/2021 12:36:23 PM

Vendor: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

Title: Partner

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

All questions on these questionnaires must be answered by all officers and any individuals who hold a ten percent (10%) or greater ownership interest in the proposer. Answers typewritten or printed in ink. If you need more space to answer any question, make as many photocopies of the appropriate page(s) as necessary and attach them to the questionnaire.

COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE CAREFULLY AND COMPLETELY. FAILURE TO SUBMIT A COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE MAY MEAN THAT YOUR BID OR PROPOSAL WILL BE REJECTED AS NON-RESPONSIVE AND IT WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR AWARD

1. Principal Name: Benjamin Y. Kaufman
Date of birth: [redacted]
[redacted]
Country: US

Business Address: 270 Madison Avenue
City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016
Country US
Telephone: 2125454650

Other present address(es):
City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016
Country: US
Telephone: 9177547474

List of other addresses and telephone numbers attached

2. Positions held in submitting business and starting date of each (check all applicable)

President		Treasurer	
Chairman of Board		Shareholder	
Chief Exec. Officer		Secretary	
Chief Financial Officer		Partner	05/13/2013
Vice President			
(Other)			

3. Do you have an equity interest in the business submitting the questionnaire?
YES [X] NO [ ] If Yes, provide details.

As of June 1, 2020, I have a 40% equity interest in the firm.

4. Are there any outstanding loans, guarantees or any other form of security or lease or any other type of contribution made in whole or in part between you and the business submitting the questionnaire?
YES [ ] NO [X] If Yes, provide details.

5. Within the past 3 years, have you been a principal owner or officer of any business or notfor-profit organization other than the one submitting the questionnaire?
YES [ ] NO [X] If Yes, provide details.

6. Has any governmental entity awarded any contracts to a business or organization listed in Section 5 in the past 3 years while you were a principal owner or officer?

YES [ ] NO [X] If Yes, provide details.

NOTE: An affirmative answer is required below whether the sanction arose automatically, by operation of law, or as a result of any action taken by a government agency. Provide a detailed response to all questions checked "YES". If you need more space, photocopy the appropriate page and attach it to the questionnaire.

7. In the past (5) years, have you and/or any affiliated businesses or not-for-profit organizations listed in Section 5 in which you have been a principal owner or officer:

a. Been debarred by any government agency from entering into contracts with that agency?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

b. Been declared in default and/or terminated for cause on any contract, and/or had any contracts cancelled for cause?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

c. Been denied the award of a contract and/or the opportunity to bid on a contract, including, but not limited to, failure to meet pre-qualification standards?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

d. Been suspended by any government agency from entering into any contract with it; and/or is any action pending that could formally debar or otherwise affect such business's ability to bid or propose on contract?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

8. Have any of the businesses or organizations listed in response to Question 5 filed a bankruptcy petition and/or been the subject of involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during the past 7 years, and/or for any portion of the last 7 year period, been in a state of bankruptcy as a result of bankruptcy proceedings initiated more than 7 years ago and/or is any such business now the subject of any pending bankruptcy proceedings, whenever initiated?

YES [ ] NO [X] If 'Yes', provide details for each such instance. (Provide a detailed response to all questions check "Yes". If you need more space, photocopy the appropriate page and attached it to the questionnaire.)

9.

a. Is there any felony charge pending against you?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

b. Is there any misdemeanor charge pending against you?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

c. Is there any administrative charge pending against you?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

d. In the past 10 years, have you been convicted, after trial or by plea, of any felony, or of any other crime, an element of which relates to truthfulness or the underlying facts of which related to the conduct of business? Y
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

e. In the past 5 years, have you been convicted, after trial or by plea, of a misdemeanor?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

f. In the past 5 years, have you been found in violation of any administrative or statutory charges?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

10. In addition to the information provided in response to the previous questions, in the past 5 years, have you been the subject of a criminal investigation and/or a civil anti-trust investigation by any federal, state or local prosecuting or investigative agency and/or the subject of an investigation where such investigation was related to activities performed at, for, or on behalf of the submitting business entity and/or an affiliated business listed in response to Question 5?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

11. In addition to the information provided, in the past 5 years has any business or organization listed in response to Question 5, been the subject of a criminal investigation and/or a civil anti-trust investigation and/or any other type of investigation by any government agency, including but not limited to federal, state, and local regulatory agencies while you were a principal owner or officer?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

12. In the past 5 years, have you or this business, or any other affiliated business listed in response to Question 5 had any sanction imposed as a result of judicial or administrative proceedings with respect to any professional license held?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

13. For the past 5 tax years, have you failed to file any required tax returns or failed to pay any applicable federal, state or local taxes or other assessed charges, including but not limited to water and sewer charges?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

I, Benjamin Kaufman , hereby acknowledge that a materially false statement willfully or fraudulently made in connection with this form may result in rendering the submitting business entity and/or any affiliated entities non-responsible, and, in addition, may subject me to criminal charges.

I, Benjamin Kaufman , hereby certify that I have read and understand all the items contained in this form; that I supplied full and complete answers to each item therein to the best of my knowledge, information and belief; that I will notify the County in writing of any change in circumstances occurring after the submission of this form; and that all information supplied by me is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that the County will rely on the information supplied in this form as additional inducement to enter into a contract with the submitting business entity.

CERTIFICATION

A MATERIALLY FALSE STATEMENT WILLFULLY OR FRAUDULENTLY MADE IN CONNECTION WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE MAY RESULT IN RENDERING THE SUBMITTING BUSINESS ENTITY NOT RESPONSIBLE WITH RESPECT TO THE PRESENT BID OR FUTURE BIDS, AND, IN ADDITION, MAY SUBJECT THE PERSON MAKING THE FALSE STATEMENT TO CRIMINAL CHARGES.

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP

Name of submitting business

Electronically signed and certified at the date and time indicated by:
Benjamin Kaufman [KAUFMAN@WHAFH.COM]

PARTNER

Title

12/28/2021 10:43:12 AM

Date

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

All questions on these questionnaires must be answered by all officers and any individuals who hold a ten percent (10%) or greater ownership interest in the proposer. Answers typewritten or printed in ink. If you need more space to answer any question, make as many photocopies of the appropriate page(s) as necessary and attach them to the questionnaire.

COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE CAREFULLY AND COMPLETELY. FAILURE TO SUBMIT A COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE MAY MEAN THAT YOUR BID OR PROPOSAL WILL BE REJECTED AS NON-RESPONSIVE AND IT WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR AWARD

1. Principal Name: Mark Rifkin
Date of birth: [redacted]
[redacted]
Country: US

Business Address: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP
City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016
Country US
Telephone: 2125454762

Other present address(es):
City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016
Country: US
Telephone: 2125454762

List of other addresses and telephone numbers attached

2. Positions held in submitting business and starting date of each (check all applicable)

President		Treasurer	
Chairman of Board		Shareholder	
Chief Exec. Officer		Secretary	
Chief Financial Officer		Partner	06/02/2003
Vice President			
(Other)			

3. Do you have an equity interest in the business submitting the questionnaire?
YES [X] NO [ ] If Yes, provide details.
Partner

4. Are there any outstanding loans, guarantees or any other form of security or lease or any other type of contribution made in whole or in part between you and the business submitting the questionnaire?
YES [ ] NO [X] If Yes, provide details.

5. Within the past 3 years, have you been a principal owner or officer of any business or notfor-profit organization other than the one submitting the questionnaire?
YES [ ] NO [X] If Yes, provide details.

6. Has any governmental entity awarded any contracts to a business or organization listed in Section 5 in the past 3 years while you were a principal owner or officer?

YES [ ] NO [X] If Yes, provide details.

NOTE: An affirmative answer is required below whether the sanction arose automatically, by operation of law, or as a result of any action taken by a government agency. Provide a detailed response to all questions checked "YES". If you need more space, photocopy the appropriate page and attach it to the questionnaire.

7. In the past (5) years, have you and/or any affiliated businesses or not-for-profit organizations listed in Section 5 in which you have been a principal owner or officer:

a. Been debarred by any government agency from entering into contracts with that agency?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

b. Been declared in default and/or terminated for cause on any contract, and/or had any contracts cancelled for cause?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

c. Been denied the award of a contract and/or the opportunity to bid on a contract, including, but not limited to, failure to meet pre-qualification standards?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

d. Been suspended by any government agency from entering into any contract with it; and/or is any action pending that could formally debar or otherwise affect such business's ability to bid or propose on contract?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

8. Have any of the businesses or organizations listed in response to Question 5 filed a bankruptcy petition and/or been the subject of involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during the past 7 years, and/or for any portion of the last 7 year period, been in a state of bankruptcy as a result of bankruptcy proceedings initiated more than 7 years ago and/or is any such business now the subject of any pending bankruptcy proceedings, whenever initiated?

YES [ ] NO [X] If 'Yes', provide details for each such instance. (Provide a detailed response to all questions check "Yes". If you need more space, photocopy the appropriate page and attached it to the questionnaire.)

9.

a. Is there any felony charge pending against you?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

b. Is there any misdemeanor charge pending against you?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

c. Is there any administrative charge pending against you?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

d. In the past 10 years, have you been convicted, after trial or by plea, of any felony, or of any other crime, an element of which relates to truthfulness or the underlying facts of which related to the conduct of business? Y
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

e. In the past 5 years, have you been convicted, after trial or by plea, of a misdemeanor?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

f. In the past 5 years, have you been found in violation of any administrative or statutory charges?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

10. In addition to the information provided in response to the previous questions, in the past 5 years, have you been the subject of a criminal investigation and/or a civil anti-trust investigation by any federal, state or local prosecuting or investigative agency and/or the subject of an investigation where such investigation was related to activities performed at, for, or on behalf of the submitting business entity and/or an affiliated business listed in response to Question 5?

YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

11. In addition to the information provided, in the past 5 years has any business or organization listed in response to Question 5, been the subject of a criminal investigation and/or a civil anti-trust investigation and/or any other type of investigation by any government agency, including but not limited to federal, state, and local regulatory agencies while you were a principal owner or officer?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

12. In the past 5 years, have you or this business, or any other affiliated business listed in response to Question 5 had any sanction imposed as a result of judicial or administrative proceedings with respect to any professional license held?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

13. For the past 5 tax years, have you failed to file any required tax returns or failed to pay any applicable federal, state or local taxes or other assessed charges, including but not limited to water and sewer charges?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

I, Mark Rifkin , hereby acknowledge that a materially false statement willfully or fraudulently made in connection with this form may result in rendering the submitting business entity and/or any affiliated entities non-responsible, and, in addition, may subject me to criminal charges.

I, Mark Rifkin , hereby certify that I have read and understand all the items contained in this form; that I supplied full and complete answers to each item therein to the best of my knowledge, information and belief; that I will notify the County in writing of any change in circumstances occurring after the submission of this form; and that all information supplied by me is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that the County will rely on the information supplied in this form as additional inducement to enter into a contract with the submitting business entity.

CERTIFICATION

A MATERIALLY FALSE STATEMENT WILLFULLY OR FRAUDULENTLY MADE IN CONNECTION WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE MAY RESULT IN RENDERING THE SUBMITTING BUSINESS ENTITY NOT RESPONSIBLE WITH RESPECT TO THE PRESENT BID OR FUTURE BIDS, AND, IN ADDITION, MAY SUBJECT THE PERSON MAKING THE FALSE STATEMENT TO CRIMINAL CHARGES.

Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

Name of submitting business

Electronically signed and certified at the date and time indicated by:
Mark Rifkin [RIFKIN@WHAFH.COM]

Partner

Title

12/23/2021 12:39:36 PM

Date

Business History Form

The contract shall be awarded to the responsible proposer who, at the discretion of the County, taking into consideration the reliability of the proposer and the capacity of the proposer to perform the services required by the County, offers the best value to the County and who will best promote the public interest.

In addition to the submission of proposals, each proposer shall complete and submit this questionnaire. The questionnaire shall be filled out by the owner of a sole proprietorship or by an authorized representative of the firm, corporation or partnership submitting the Proposal.

NOTE: All questions require a response, even if response is "none" or "not-applicable." No blanks.

(USE ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY TO FULLY ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS).

Date: 12/28/2021

1) Proposer's Legal Name: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

2) Address of Place of Business: 270 Madison Avenue

City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016

Country: US

3) Mailing Address (if different): 270 Madison Avenue

City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016

Country: US

Phone: (212) 545-4600

Does the business own or rent its facilities? Rent If other, please provide details:

4) Dun and Bradstreet number: 270 Madison Avenue

5) Federal I.D. Number: [redacted]

6) The proposer is a: Partnership (Describe)

7) Does this business share office space, staff, or equipment expenses with any other business?

YES [X] NO [ ] If yes, please provide details:

Wolf Haldenstein has been at 270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY since 1924. The Firm presently rents 2 floors and sublets office space to the following tenants:
Gardner & Weiss
Michael Black
Kimmel and Kimmel
Phyllis Levitas
Rate Financials
Leonard Reiss
Meyer Muschel
Stuart Birbach

8) Does this business control one or more other businesses?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, please provide details:

9) Does this business have one or more affiliates, and/or is it a subsidiary of, or controlled by, any other business?
YES [X] NO [ ] If yes, please provide details:
The Firm has one affiliate: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLC (affiliated limited liability corporation-Illinois).

10) Has the proposer ever had a bond or surety cancelled or forfeited, or a contract with Nassau County or any other government entity terminated?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, state the name of bonding agency, (if a bond), date, amount of bond and reason for such cancellation or forfeiture: or details regarding the termination (if a contract).

11) Has the proposer, during the past seven years, been declared bankrupt?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, state date, court jurisdiction, amount of liabilities and amount of assets

12) In the past five years, has this business and/or any of its owners and/or officers and/or any affiliated business, been the subject of a criminal investigation and/or a civil anti-trust investigation by any federal, state or local prosecuting or investigative agency? And/or, in the past 5 years, have any owner and/or officer of any affiliated business been the subject of a criminal investigation and/or a civil anti-trust investigation by any federal, state or local prosecuting or investigative agency, where such investigation was related to activities performed at, for, or on behalf of an affiliated business.
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

13) In the past 5 years, has this business and/or any of its owners and/or officers and/or any affiliated business been the subject of an investigation by any government agency, including but not limited to federal, state and local regulatory agencies? And/or, in the past 5 years, has any owner and/or officer of an affiliated business been the subject of an investigation by any government agency, including but not limited to federal, state and local regulatory agencies, for matters pertaining to that individual's position at or relationship to an affiliated business.
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

14) Has any current or former director, owner or officer or managerial employee of this business had, either before or during such person's employment, or since such employment if the charges pertained to events that allegedly occurred during the time of employment by the submitting business, and allegedly related to the conduct of that business:
a) Any felony charge pending?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

b) Any misdemeanor charge pending?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

c) In the past 10 years, you been convicted, after trial or by plea, of any felony and/or any other crime, an element of which relates to truthfulness or the underlying facts of which related to the conduct of business?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

d) In the past 5 years, been convicted, after trial or by plea, of a misdemeanor?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

e) In the past 5 years, been found in violation of any administrative, statutory, or regulatory provisions?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

15) In the past (5) years, has this business or any of its owners or officers, or any other affiliated business had any sanction imposed as a result of judicial or administrative proceedings with respect to any professional license held?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such investigation, an explanation of the circumstances and corrective action taken.

16) For the past (5) tax years, has this business failed to file any required tax returns or failed to pay any applicable federal, state or local taxes or other assessed charges, including but not limited to water and sewer charges?
YES [ ] NO [X] If yes, provide details for each such year. Provide a detailed response to all questions checked 'YES'. If you need more space, photocopy the appropriate page and attach it to the questionnaire.

17 Conflict of Interest:

a) Please disclose any conflicts of interest as outlined below. NOTE: If no conflicts exist, please expressly state "No conflict exists."

(i) Any material financial relationships that your firm or any firm employee has that may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in acting on behalf of Nassau County.

No conflict exists.

(ii) Any family relationship that any employee of your firm has with any County public servant that may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in acting on behalf of Nassau County.

No conflict exists.

(iii) Any other matter that your firm believes may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in acting on behalf of Nassau County.

No conflict exists.

b) Please describe any procedures your firm has, or would adopt, to assure the County that a conflict of interest would not exist for your firm in the future.

The Firm will send an email to all employees advising them that as a potential Nassau County Vendor, no employee can have 1) any material financial relationships that may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in acting on behalf of Nassau County, and 2) any family relationships with any County public servant that may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in acting on behalf of Nassau County.

A. Include a resume or detailed description of the Proposer's professional qualifications, demonstrating extensive experience in your profession. Any prior similar experiences, and the results of these experiences, must be identified.

Have you previously uploaded the below information under in the Document Vault?
YES [ ] NO [X]

Is the proposer an individual?
YES [ ] NO [X] Should the proposer be other than an individual, the Proposal MUST include:

i) Date of formation;

05/01/1888

ii) Name, addresses, and position of all persons having a financial interest in the company, including shareholders, members, general or limited partner. If none, explain.

Mark C. Rifkin, 270 Madison Ave., 9th Floor, New York, NY 10016
Benjamin Y. Kaufman, 270 Madison Ave., 9th Floor, New York, NY 10016

No individuals with a financial interest in the company have been attached..

iii) Name, address and position of all officers and directors of the company. If none, explain.

Mark C. Rifkin, 270 Madison Ave., 9th Floor, New York, NY 10016
Benjamin Y. Kaufman, 270 Madison Ave., 9th Floor, New York, NY 10016

No officers and directors from this company have been attached.

iv) State of incorporation (if applicable);

NY

v) The number of employees in the firm;

35

vi) Annual revenue of firm;

[redacted]

vii) Summary of relevant accomplishments

Please see the attached brochure Wolf Haldenstein Qualifications, Experience, & Firm Culture.

1 File(s) Uploaded: WHAFH_Firm_Resume.pdf

viii) Copies of all state and local licenses and permits.

B. Indicate number of years in business.

132

C. Provide any other information which would be appropriate and helpful in determining the Proposer's capacity and reliability to perform these services.

Please see the attached brochure Wolf Haldenstein Qualifications, Experience, & Firm Culture included in response to Question A(vii).

D. Provide names and addresses for no fewer than three references for whom the Proposer has provided similar services or who are qualified to evaluate the Proposer's capability to perform this work.

Company	Suffolk County Executive		
Contact Person	Dennis Cohen, Chief Deputy County Executive		
Address	H. Lee Dennison Bldg., 100 Veterans Memorial Highway		
City	Hauppauge	State/Province/Territory	NY
Country	US		
Telephone	(632) 852-1600		
Fax #			
E-Mail Address	dennis.cohen@suffolkcountyny.gov		

Company	Metropolitan Transportation Authority		
Contact Person	Ivy Stempel, Sr. Counsel		
Address	2 Broadway		
City	New York	State/Province/Territory	NY
Country	US		
Telephone	(212) 878-7251		
Fax #			
E-Mail Address	istempel@mtahq.org		

Company	Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP		
Contact Person	Peter Cusick, Acting General Counsel		
Address	270 Madison Avenue		
City	New York	State/Province/Territory	NY
Country	US		
Telephone	(212) 312-9000		
Fax #			
E-Mail Address	pcusick@nysif.com		

I, Mark Rifkin , hereby acknowledge that a materially false statement willfully or fraudulently made in connection with this form may result in rendering the submitting business entity and/or any affiliated entities non-responsible, and, in addition, may subject me to criminal charges.

I, Mark Rifkin , hereby certify that I have read and understand all the items contained in this form; that I supplied full and complete answers to each item therein to the best of my knowledge, information and belief; that I will notify the County in writing of any change in circumstances occurring after the submission of this form; and that all information supplied by me is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that the County will rely on the information supplied in this form as additional inducement to enter into a contract with the submitting business entity.

CERTIFICATION

A MATERIALLY FALSE STATEMENT WILLFULLY OR FRAUDULENTLY MADE IN CONNECTION WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE MAY RESULT IN RENDERING THE SUBMITTING BUSINESS ENTITY NOT RESPONSIBLE WITH RESPECT TO THE PRESENT BID OR FUTURE BIDS, AND, IN ADDITION, MAY SUBJECT THE PERSON MAKING THE FALSE STATEMENT TO CRIMINAL CHARGES.

Name of submitting business: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

Electronically signed and certified at the date and time indicated by:
Mark Rifkin [RIFKIN@WHAFH.COM]

Partner
Title

12/28/2021 10:21:46 AM
Date

PROVIDING EXEMPLARY LEGAL SERVICES SINCE 1888

FIRM RESUME

Founded in 1888, Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP is a full service law firm specializing in complex litigation in federal and state courts nationwide. The firm's practice includes litigation, both hourly and contingent, in securities, antitrust, wage & hour, consumer fraud, false marketing, ERISA, and general and commercial matters, whistleblower, false claim, trust & estate, corporate investigation, and white collar matters, and FINRA arbitration. The Firm has a particular specialty in complex class action and other representative litigation – including investor, shareholder, antitrust, ERISA, consumer, employee, and biotechnology matters – under both federal and state law.

Wolf Haldenstein's total practice approach distinguishes it from other firms. Our longstanding tradition of a close attorney/client relationship ensures that each one of our clients receives prompt, individual attention and does not become lost in an institutional bureaucracy. Our team approach is at the very heart of Wolf Haldenstein's practice. All of our lawyers are readily available to all of our clients and to each other. The result of this approach is that we provide our clients with an efficient legal team having the broad perspective, expertise and experience required for any matter at hand. We are thus able to provide our clients with cost effective and thorough counsel focused on our clients' overall goals.

270 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10016
TELEPHONE: 212-545-4600
TELECOPIER: 212-686-0114
WWW.WHAFH.COM

SYMPHONY TOWERS
750 B STREET, SUITE 2770
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
TELEPHONE: 619-239-4599
TELECOPIER: 619-234-4599

70 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, IL 60602
TELEPHONE: 312-984-0000
TELECOPIER: 312-214-3110

Wolf Haldenstein
Legal Excellence Since 1888

Wolf Haldenstein has been recognized by state and federal courts throughout the country as being highly experienced in complex litigation, particularly with respect to securities, consumer, ERISA, FLSA and state overtime and expense deductions, and antitrust class actions and shareholder rights litigation.

Among its colleagues in the plaintiffs' bar, as well as among its adversaries in the defense bar, Wolf Haldenstein is known for the high ability of its attorneys, and the exceptionally high quality of its written and oral advocacy.

The nature of the Firm's activities in both individual and representative litigation is extremely broad. In addition to a large case load of securities fraud and other investor class actions, Wolf Haldenstein has represented classes of corn and rice farmers in connection with the devaluation of their crops; canned tuna consumers for tuna companies' violations of antitrust laws; merchants compelled to accept certain types of debit cards; insurance policyholders for insurance companies' deceptive sales practices; victims of unlawful strip searches under the civil rights laws; and various cases involving violations of Internet users' on-line privacy rights.

The Firm's experience in class action securities litigation, in particular public shareholder rights under state law and securities fraud claims arising under the federal securities laws and regulations is particularly extensive. The Firm was one of the lead or other primary counsel in securities class action cases that have recouped billions of dollars on behalf of investor classes, in stockholder rights class actions that have resulted in billions of dollars in increased merger consideration to shareholder classes, and in derivative litigation that has recovered billions of dollars for corporations.

Its pioneering efforts in difficult or unusual areas of securities or investor protection laws include: groundbreaking claims that have been successfully brought under the Investment Company Act of 1940 regarding fiduciary responsibilities of investment companies and their advisors toward their shareholders; claims under ERISA involving fiduciary duties of ERISA trustees who are also insiders in possession of adverse information regarding their fund's primary stockholdings; the fiduciary duties of the directors of Delaware corporations in connection with change of control transactions; the early application of the fraud-on-the-market theory to claims against public accounting firms in connection with their audits of publicly traded corporations; and the application of federal securities class certification standards to state law claims often thought to be beyond the reach of class action treatment.

Wolf Haldenstein has repeatedly received favorable judicial recognition. The following representative judicial comments over the past decade indicate the high regard in which the Firm is held:

- *In re Empire State Realty Trust, Inc. Investor Litig.*, No. 650607/2012 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co.) – On May 2, 2013, Justice O. Peter Sherwood praised the Firm in its role as chair of the committee of co-lead counsel as follows: "It is apparent to me, having presided over this case, that class counsel has performed in an excellent manner, and you have represented your clients quite well. You should be complimented for that." In awarding attorneys' fees, the Court stated that the fee was "intended to reward class counsel handsomely for the very good result achieved for the Class, assumption of the high risk of Plaintiffs prevailing and the efficiency of effort that resulted in the settlement of the case at an early stage without protracted motion practice." May 17, 2013 slip. op. at 5 (citations omitted).

- *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009) – On April 9, 2013, Justice Richard B. Lowe III praised the Firm's efforts as follows: "[W]hen you have challenging cases, the one thing you like to ask for is that the legal representation on both sides rise to that level. Because when you have lawyers who are professionals, who are confident, who are experienced, each of you know that each side has a job to do [. . . .] I want to tell you that I am very satisfied with your performance and with your, quite frankly, tenacity on both sides. And it took six years, but look at the history of the litigation. There were two appeals all of the way to the Court of Appeals [. . . .] And then look at the results. I mean, there are dissents in the Court of Appeals, so that shows you the complexity of the issues that were presented in this litigation [. . . .] [I]t shows you effort that went into this and the professionalism that was exhibited [. . . .] So let me just again express my appreciation to both sides."

- *K.J. Egleston L.P. v. Heartland Industrial Partners, et al.*, 2:06-13555 (E.D. Mich.) – where the Firm was Lead Counsel, Judge Rosen, at the June 7, 2010 final approval hearing, praised the Firm for doing "an outstanding job of representing [its] clients," and further commented that "the conduct of all counsel in this case and the result they have achieved for all of the parties confirms that they deserve the national recognition they enjoy."

- *Klein, et al. v. Ryan Beck Holdings, Inc., et al.*, 06-cv-3460 (DAB) (S.D.N.Y. 2010) – where the Firm was Lead Counsel, Judge Deborah A. Batts described the Firm's successful establishment of a settlement fund as follows: "[a] miracle that there is a settlement fund at all." Judge Batts continued: "As I said earlier, there is no question that the litigation is complex and of a large and, if you will, *pioneering magnitude ...*" (Emphasis added).

- *Parker Friedland v. Iridium World Communications, Ltd.*, 99-1002 (D.D.C.) – where the Firm was co-lead counsel, Judge Laughrey said (on October 16, 2008), "[a]ll of the attorneys in this case have done an outstanding job, and I really appreciate the quality of work that we had in our chambers as a result of this case."

- *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation*, MDL-02-1486 (N.D. Cal.) – where the Firm was co-lead counsel, Judge Hamilton said (on August 15, 2007), "I think I can conclude on the basis with my five years with you all, watching this litigation progress and seeing it wind to a conclusion, that the results are exceptional. The percentages, as you have outlined them, do put this [case] in one of the upper categories of results of this kind of [antitrust] class action. I am aware of the complexity . . . I thought that you all did an exceptionally good job of bringing to me only those matters that really required the Court's attention. You did an exceptionally good job at organizing and managing the case, assisting me in management of the case. There was excellent coordination between all the various different plaintiffs' counsel with your group and the other groups that are part of this litigation. . . . So my conclusion is the case was well litigated by both sides, well managed as well by both sides."

- *In re Comdisco Sec. Litigation*, 01 C 2110 (N.D. Ill. July 14, 2005) – Judge Milton Shadur observed: "It has to be said . . . that the efforts that have been extended [by Wolf Haldenstein] on behalf of the plaintiff class in the face of these obstacles have been exemplary. And in my view [Wolf Haldenstein] reflected the kind of professionalism that the critics of class actions . . . are never willing to recognize. . . . I really cannot speak too highly of the services rendered by class counsel in an extraordinary difficult situation."

- *Good Morning to You Productions Corp. v. Warner/Chappell Music, Inc.*, No. CV 13-04460-GHK (MRWx) (C.D. Cal., Aug. 16, 2016) – Judge George H. King

stated: "Not all, or perhaps even most, plaintiffs' class counsel could have litigated this case as successfully as did class counsel against such a fierce and exceptionally accomplished opponent."

- *Bokelman et al. v. FCH Enterprises, Inc.*, (Case No. 1:18-cv-209, D. Haw., May 3, 2019): Judge Robert J. Bryan said, "I've been impressed by the quality of the work you've done throughout here, and that is reflected, I think, in the fact that no one has objected to the settlement."

Recent Noteworthy Results

Wolf Haldenstein's performance in representative litigation has repeatedly resulted in favorable results for its clients. The Firm has helped recover ***billions of dollars*** on behalf of its clients in the cases listed below. Recent examples include the following:

- On May 13, 2019, in *Apple Inc. v. Pepper*, No. 17-204, the Supreme Court affirmed a decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals holding that iPhone purchasers have standing to sue Apple for monopolizing the market for iPhone apps in this longstanding antitrust class action. Wolf Haldenstein has been Lead Counsel for the plaintiffs since 2007. The case was commenced in federal district court in Oakland. The Supreme Court's decision clears the way for the plaintiffs to proceed on the merits of their claim.

- On June 11, 2018, the United States Supreme Court issued a highly anticipated decision in *China Agritech, Inc. v. Michael H. Resh, et al.* Wolf Haldenstein represented the plaintiffs/respondents, having commenced the action on behalf of aggrieved shareholders of *China Agritech* after two prior cases had failed at the class certification stage.

- *In re Genetically Modified Rice Litigation*, MDL 1811 (E.D. Mo.) - Wolf Haldenstein represented U.S. rice farmers in this landmark action against Bayer A.G. and its global affiliates, achieving a global recovery of $750 million. The case arose from the contamination of the nation's long grain rice crop by Bayer's experimental and unapproved genetically modified Liberty Link rice.

- *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009) - a class action brought on behalf of over 27,500 current and former tenants of New York City's iconic Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village housing complexes. On April 9,

2013, Justice Richard B. Lowe III of the New York Supreme Court finally approved settlement of the action, which totals over $173 million, sets aside $68.75 million in damages, re-regulates the apartments at issue, and sets preferential rents for the units that will save tenants significant monies in the future. The settlement also enables the tenants to retain an estimated $105 million in rent savings they enjoyed between 2009 and 2012. **The settlement is by many magnitudes the largest tenant settlement in United States history.**

- *In re Empire State Realty Trust, Inc. Investor Litig.*, Index No. 650607/2012 – The firm served as Chair of the Executive Committee of Co-Lead Counsel for the Plaintiffs in a class action settlement finally approved on May 2, 2013 that provides for the establishment of a $55 million settlement fund for investors, in addition to substantial tax deferral benefits estimated to be in excess of $100 million.

- *American International Group Consolidated Derivative Litigation*, Civil Action No. 769-VCS (Del. Ch.) The Firm acted as co-lead counsel and the settlement addressed claims alleging that the D&O Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Company and otherwise committed wrongdoing to the detriment of AIG in connection with various allegedly fraudulent schemes during the 1999-2005 time period.

- *In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation*, Master File No. 09 MD 2058 (S.D.N.Y.) (firm was co-lead counsel in parallel derivative action pending in Delaware (*In Re Bank of America Stockholder Derivative Litigation*, C.A. No. 4307-CS (Del. Ch.)) (increase of settlement cash recovery from $20 million to $62.5 million).

- *The Investment Committee of the Manhattan and Bronx Service Transit Operating Authority Pension Plan v. JPMorgan Chase Bank,* N.A., 1:09-cv-04408-SAS (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered $150 million).

- *In re Tremont Sec. Law, State Law and Insurance Litig*., No. 08-civ-11117 (TPG) (SDNY) (class recovered $100 million). The firm was court-appointed co-lead counsel in the Insurance Action, 08 Civ. 557, and represented a class of persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Variable Universal Life ("VUL") insurance policies or Deferred Variable Annuity ("DVA") policies issued by Tremont International Insurance Limited or Argus International Life Bermuda Limited from May 10, 1994 - December 11, 2008 to the extent the investment

accounts of those policies were exposed to the massive Ponzi scheme orchestrated by Bernard L. Madoff through one or more Rye funds.

- *In re Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation*, 21 MC 92 (SAS) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered $586 million). Wolf Haldenstein served as Co-Lead Counsel of one of the largest securities fraud cases in history. Despite the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit's decision to vacate the district court's class certification decision, on remand, counsel for plaintiffs were able to press on to a settlement on April 1, 2009, ultimately recovering in excess of a half-billion dollars.

FIRM PRACTICE AREAS

Class Action Litigation

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader in class and derivative action litigation and is currently or has been the court-appointed lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or executive committee member in some of the largest and most significant class action and derivative action lawsuits in the United States. For example, the class action *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009) was recently described by a sitting member of the U.S. House of Representatives as the greatest legal victory for tenants in her lifetime. In *Roberts*, the Firm obtained a victory in the New York Court of Appeals requiring the reregulation of thousands of apartment units in the Stuyvesant Town complex in Manhattan, New York. Many of the firm's other successful results are summarized within.

Private Actions for Institutional Investors

In addition to its vast class action practice, the Firm also regularly represents institutional clients such as public funds, investment funds, limited partnerships, and qualified institutional buyers in private actions. The Firm has represented institutional clients in non-class federal and state actions concerning a variety of matters, including private placements, disputes with investment advisors, and disputes with corporate management.

The Firm has also acted as special counsel to investors' committees in efforts to assert and advance the investors' interests without resorting to litigation. For example, the Firm served as Counsel to the Courtyard by Marriott Limited Partners Committee for several years in its dealings with Host Marriott Corporation, and as Special Counsel to the Windsor Park Properties 7 and 8 limited partners to insure the fairness of their liquidation transactions.

Antitrust Litigation

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader in antitrust and competition litigation. The Firm actively seeks to enforce the federal and state antitrust laws to protect and strengthen the rights and claims of businesses, organizations, Taft-Hartley funds, and consumers throughout the United States. To that end, Wolf Haldenstein commences large, often complex, antitrust and trade regulation class actions and other cases that target some of the most powerful and well-funded corporate interests in the world. Many of these interests exert strong influence over enforcement policy that is in the hands of elected officials, so that private enforcement provides the only true assurance that unfair and

anticompetitive conduct will be duly scrutinized for compliance with the law. These cases frequently bring to light concealed, unlawful behavior such as price fixing, monopolization, market allocation, monopoly leveraging, essential facilities, tying arrangements, vertical restraints, exclusive dealing, and refusals to deal. Wolf Haldenstein's Antitrust Practice Group has successfully prosecuted numerous antitrust cases and aggressively advocates remedies and restitution for businesses and investors wronged by violations of the antitrust laws. For example, in *In re DRAM Antitrust Litigation*, No. 02-cv-1486 (PJH) (N.D. Cal.) the firm successfully prosecuted an antitrust case resulting in a $315 million recovery. Many of the firm's successful results are summarized within.

Wolf Haldenstein attorneys currently serve as lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or as executive committee members in some of the largest and most significant antitrust class action lawsuits. The firm was most recently appointed lead counsel in the Salmon Antitrust Indirect Litigation pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

Overtime and Compensation Class Actions

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader class action litigation on behalf of employees who have not been paid overtime or other compensation they are entitled to receive, or have had improper deductions taken from their compensation. These claims under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act and state labor laws allege improper failure to pay overtime and other wages, and improper deductions from compensation for various company expenses. Wolf Haldenstein has served as lead or co-lead counsel, or other similar lead role, in some of the most significant overtime class actions pending in the United States, and has recovered hundreds of millions of dollars in recovered wages for its clients. For example, in *LaVoice v. Citigroup Global Markets, Inc*., Case No. C 07-801 (CW) (N.D. Cal.)) a $108 million settlement was secured for the class. Many of the firm's other successful wage and hour results are summarized within.

Other Substantial Recoveries In Class Action And Derivative Cases in Which Wolf Haldenstein Was Lead Counsel or Had Another Significant Role

- *In re Beacon Associates Litigation*, Master File No. 09 Civ. 0777 (LBS) (S.D.N.Y.) (**$219 million** settlement in this and related action).

- *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, No. 100956/2007 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty.) (**$173 Million** settlement).

- *In re Mutual Fund Investment Litigation*, MDL No. 1586 (D. Md.) (derivative counsel in consolidated cases against numerous mutual fund companies involved in market timing resulting in class/derivative settlements totaling more than **$300 million**).

- *Inland Western Securities Litigation*, Case No. 07 C 6174 (N.D. Ill.) (settlement value of shares valued between **$61.5 million** and **$90 million**).

- *In re Direxion Shares ETF Trust*, No. 09-Civ-8011 (KBF) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$8 million**).

- *In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation*, MDL Docket No. 1264 (JFN) (E.D. Mo.) (class recovered **$490 million**).

- *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation*, (MD-02 1486 (N.D. Cal.) (class recovered **$325 million**).

- *In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Civ. No. 00-473-A (E.D. Va.) (class recovered **$160 million** in cash and securities).

- *Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos.*, 94 Civ. 2373, 94 Civ. 2546 (S.D.N.Y.) (securities fraud) (class recovered **$116.5 million** in cash).

- *In re Starlink Corn Products Liability Litigation*, (N.D. Ill.) (class recovered **$110 million**).

- *In Computer Associates 2002 Class Action Sec. Litigation*, 2:02-CV-1226 (E.D.N.Y.) (**$130 million** settlement in this and two related actions).

- *In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation, Civ. No.* 02-12338 (MEL) (D. Mass.) (classes recovered **$52.5 million**).

- *In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc., Securities Litigation*, C.A. No. 03-10165-RWZ (D. Mass) (class recovered **$50 million**).

- *In re Iridium Securities Litigation*, C.A. No. 99-1002 (D.D.C.) (class recovered **$43 million**).

- *In re J.P. Morgan Chase Securities Litigation*, MDL No. 1783 (N.D. Ill.) (settlement providing for adoption of corporate governance principles relating to potential corporate transactions requiring shareholder approval).

- *LaVoice v. Citigroup Global Markets, Inc.*, Case No. C 07-801 (CW) (N.D. Cal.)) (**$108 million** settlement).

- *Steinberg v. Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc.*, Case No. 06-cv-2628 (BEN) (S.D. Cal.) (**$50 million** settlement).

- *Poole v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc.*, Case No. CV-06-1657 (D. Or.) (**$43.5 million** settlement).

- *In re Wachovia Securities, LLC Wage and Hour Litigation*, MDL No. 07-1807 DOC (C.D. Cal.) (**$39 million** settlement).

- *In re Wachovia Securities, LLC Wage and Hour Litigation (Prudential)*, MDL No. 07-1807 DOC (C.D. Cal.) (**$11 million** settlement).

- *Basile v. A.G. Edwards, Inc.*, 08-CV-00338-JAH-RBB (S.D. Cal.) (**$12 million** settlement).

- *Miguel Garcia, et al. v. Lowe's Home Center, Inc. et al.* – Case No. GIC 841120 (Barton) (Cal. Sup. Ct, San Diego) (co-lead, **$1.65 million** settlement w/ average class member recovery of $5,500, attorney fees and cost awarded separately).

- *Neil Weinstein, et al. v. MetLife, Inc., et al.* – Case No. 3:06-cv-04444-SI (N.D.Cal) (co-lead, **$7.4 million** settlement).

- *Creighton v. Oppenheimer*, Index No. 1:06 - cv - 04607 - BSJ - DCF (S.D.N.Y.) (**$2.3 million** settlement).

- *Klein v. Ryan Beck*, 06-CV-3460 (DAB)(S.D.N.Y.) (**$1.3 million** settlement).

- *In re American Pharmaceutical Partners, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*, Consolidated C.A. No. 1823-N (Del. Ch. Ct.) (**$14.3 million** settlement).

- *Egleston v. Collins and Aikman Corp.*, 06-cv-13555 (E.D. Mich.) (class recovered **$12 million**).

- *In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Global Technology Fund Securities Litigation,* 02 CV 7854 (JFK) (SDNY); and *In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Focus Twenty Fund Securities Litigation*, 02 CV 10221 (JFK) (SDNY) (class recovered **$39 million** in combined cases).

- *In re CNL Hotels & Resorts, Inc. Securities Litigation,* No. 6:04-cv-1231 (Orl-31) (class recovered **$35 million**, and lawsuit also instrumental in **$225 million** benefit to corporation).

- *In re Cablevision Systems Corp. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, Master File No. 06-CV-4130-DGT-AKT (**$34.4 million** recovery).

- *In re Monster Worldwide, Inc. Stock Option Derivative Litigation,* Master File No. 06cv4622 (S.D.N.Y.) (**$32 million** recovery and corporate governance reforms).

- *Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.,* Docket No. 98-1148 (S.D. Tex.) (class recovered **$29 million**).

- *In re Arakis Energy Corporation Securities Litigation*, 95 CV 3431 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$24 million**).

- *In re E.W. Blanche Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Civ. No. 01-258 (D. Minn.) (class recovered **$20 million**).

- *In re Globalstar Securities Litigation,* Case No. 01-CV-1748 (SHS) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$20 million**).

- *In re Luxottica Group S.p.A. Securities Litigation,* No. CV 01-3285 (E.D.N.Y) (class recovered **$18.25 million**).

- *In re Musicmaker.com Securities Litigation,* CV-00-2018 (C.D. Cal.) (class recovered **$13.75 million**).

- *In re Comdisco Securities Litigation,* No. 01 C 2110 (MIS) (N.D. Ill.) (class recovered **$13.75 million**).

- *In re Acclaim Entertainment, Inc., Securities Litigation,* C.A. No. 03-CV-1270 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$13.65 million**).

- *In re Concord EFS, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 02-2097 (MA) (W.D. Tenn) (class recovered **$13.25 million**).

- *In re Bausch & Lomb, Inc. Securities Litigation,* 01 Civ. 6190 (CJS) (W.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$12.5 million**).

- *In re Allaire Corp. Securities Litigation,* 00-11972 (D. Mass.) (class recovered **$12 million**).

- *Bamboo Partners LLC v. Robert Mondavi Corp.,* No. 26-27170 (Cal. Sup. Ct.) (class recovered **$10.8 million**).

- *Curative Health Services Securities Litigation,* 99-2074 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$10.5 million**).

- *City Partnership Co. v. Jones Intercable*, 99 WM-1051 (D. Colo.) (class recovered **$10.5 million**).

- *In re Aquila, Inc.,* (ERISA Litigation), 04-865 (W.D. Mo.) (**$10.5 million** recovery for the class).

- *In re Tenfold Corporation Securities Litigation,* 2:00-CV-652 (D. Utah) (class recovered **$5.9 million**).

- *In re Industrial Gas Antitrust Litigation*, 80 C 3479 and related cases (N.D. Ill.) (class recovered **$50 million**).

- *In re Chor-Alkalai and Caustic Soda Antitrust Litigation*, 86-5428 and related cases (E.D. Pa.) (class recovered **$55 million**).

- *In re Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation,* MDL No. 878 (N.D. Fla.) (class recovered **$126 million**).

- *In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation,* No. 1:94-cv-00897, M.D.L. 997 (N.D. Ill.) (class recovered **$715 million**).

- *Landon v. Freel,* M.D.L. No. 592 (S.D. Tex.) (class recovered **$12 million**).

- *Holloway v. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.,* No. 84 C 814 EU (N.D. Okla.) (class recovered **$38 million**).

- *In re The Chubb Corp.* Drought Insurance Litigation, C-1-88-644 (S.D. Ohio) (class recovered **$100 million**).

- *Wong v. Megafoods,* Civ-94-1702 (D. Ariz.) (securities fraud) (class recovered **$12.25 million**).

- *In re Del Val Financial Corp. Securities Litigation,* 92 Civ 4854 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$11.5 million**).

- *In re Home Shopping Network Shareholders Litigation,* Consolidated Civil Action No. 12868, (Del. Ch. 1995) (class recovered **$13 million**).

- *In re Paine Webber Limited Partnerships Litigation,* 94 Civ 8547 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$200 million**).

- *In re Bristol-Meyers Squibb Co. Securities Litigation,* 92 Civ 4007 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$19 million**).

- *In re Spectrum Information Technologies Securities Litigation,* CV 93-2245 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$13 million**).

- *In re Chase Manhattan Securities Litigation,* 90 Civ. 6092 (LJF) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$17.5 million**).

- *Prostic v. Xerox Corp.*, No. B-90-113 (EBB) (D. Conn.) (class recovered **$9 million**).

- *Steiner v. Hercules,* Civil Action No. 90-442-RRM (D. Del.) (class recovered **$18 million**).

- *In re Ambase Securities Litigation,* 90 Civ 2011 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$14.6 million**).

- *In re Southmark Securities Litigation,* CA No. 3-89-1402-D (N.D. Tex.) (class recovered **$70 million**).

- *Steiner v. Ideal Basic Industries, Inc.*, No. 86-M 456 (D. Colo. 1989) (securities fraud) (class recovered **$18 million**).

- *Tucson Electric Power Derivative Litigation,* 2:89 Civ. 01274 TUC. ACM (corporation recovered **$30 million**).

- *Alleco Stockholders Litigation,* (Md. Cir. Ct. Pr. Georges County) (class recovered **$16 million**).

- *In re Revlon Group, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, No. 8362 (Del. Ch.) (class recovered **$30 million**).

- *In re Taft Broadcasting Company Shareholders Litigation,* No. 8897 (Del. Ch.) (class recovered **$20 million**).

- *In re Southland Corp. Securities Litigation,* No. 87-8834-K (N.D.Tex.) (class recovered **$20 million**).

- *In re Crocker Bank Securities Litigation*, CA No. 7405 (Del. Ch.) (class recovered **$30 million**).

- *In re Warner Communications Securities Litigation,* No. 82 Civ. 8288 (JFK) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **$17.5 million**).

- *Joseph v. Shell Oil,* CA No. 7450 (Del. Ch.) (securities fraud) (class recovered **$200 million**).

- *In re Flight Transportation Corp. Securities Litigation,* Master Docket No. 4-82-874, MDL No. 517 (D. Minn.) (recovery of over **$50 million**).

- *In re Whittaker Corporation Securities Litigation,* CA000817 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles County) (class recovered **$18 million**).

- *Naevus International, Inc. v. AT&T Corp.,* C.A. No. 602191/99 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) (consumer fraud) (class recovered **$40 million**).

- *Sewell v. Sprint PCS Limited Partnership*, C.A. No. 97-188027/CC 3879 (Cir. Ct. for Baltimore City) (consumer fraud) (class recovered **$45.2 million**).

- *In re Vytorin/Zetia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation,* 2:08-cv-285 (D.N.J.) (class recovered **$41.5 million**).

- *Egleston v. Verizon*, No. 104784/2011 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) – Wolf Haldenstein represented a class of New York Verizon Centrex customers in an action against Verizon stemming from overbilling of certain charges. The Firm secured a settlement with a total value to the Class of over **$5 million**, which

provided, among other things, each class member with full refunds of certain disputed charges, plus interest.

- *Zelouf Int'l Corp. v. Nahal Zelouf*, Index No. 653652/2014 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co. 2015). In an important trial decision following an appraisal proceeding triggered by the freeze-out merger of a closely-held corporation, which also included shareholder derivative claims, Justice Kornreich of the New York Supreme Court refused to apply a discount for lack of marketability to the minority interest in the former corporation and found that the insiders stole more than $14 million dollars; the minority shareholder recovered over **$9 million**.

- *Zelouf Int'l Corp. v. Zelouf*, 45 Misc.3d 1205(A) (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co., 2014). The Court rejected application of a discount for lack of marketability and awarded a **$10,031,438.28** judgment following an eleven day bench trial in the Commercial Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York (New York County) on the value of a minority interest in a closely held corporation.

- *Thompson et al. v. Bethpage Federal Credit Union et al.*, No. 2:17-cv-00921-GRB (E.D.N.Y.) (**$3.6 million** settlement)

FEDERAL APPELLATE AND DISTRICT COURT OPINIONS

- *Apple Inc. v. Pepper*, 139 S. Ct. 1514 (2019)
- *China Agritech, Inc. v. Resh*, 138 S. Ct. 1800 (2018)
- *In re Packaged Seafood Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 242 F. Supp. 3d 1033 (S.D. Cal. 2017)
- *In re Packaged Seafood Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 332 F.R.D. 308 (S.D. Cal. 2019)
- *DeFrees v. Kirkland*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52780 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2012).
- *In re Beacon Associates Litig.*, 745 F. Supp. 2d 386 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); *In re Beacon Associates Litig.*, 282 F.R.D. 315 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).
- *Messner v. Northshore University HealthSystem*, 669 F.3d 802, No. 10-2514 (7th Cir. Jan. 13, 2012).
- *In re Text Message Antitrust Litigation*, 630 F.3d, 622 (7th Cir. 2010).
- *In re Apple & ATTM Antitrust Litig.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 98270 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2010).
- *Freeland v. Iridium World Communications Ltd.*, 545 F.Supp.2d 59 (D.D.C. 2008).
- *In re Apple & AT&TM Antitrust Litig.*, 596 F. Supp. 2d 1288 (N.D. Cal. 2008).
- *Harzewski v. Guidant Corp.*, 489 F.3d 799 (7th Cir. 2007).
- *In re JP Morgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation*, No. 06 C 4674, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93877 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 18, 2007).
- *Schoenbaum v. E.I. Dupont De Nemours and Co.*, 2007 WL 2768383 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 20, 2007).
- *Jeffries v. Pension Trust Fund*, 99 Civ. 4174 (LMM), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61454 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2007).

- *Klein v. Ryan Beck*, 06-Civ. 3460 (WCC), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51465 (S.D.N.Y. July 13, 2007).
- *Cannon v. MBNA Corp.* No. 05-429 GMS, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48901 (D. Del. 2007).
- *In re Aquila ERISA Litig.*, 237 F.R.D. 202 (W.D. Mo. 2006).
- *Smith v.* Aon Corp., 238 F.R.D. 609 (N.D. Ill. 2006).
- *In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation*, 233 F.R.D. 52 (D. Mass. 2005).
- *In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 03-10165, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29656 (D. Mass. Nov. 28, 2005).
- *In re Luxottica Group, S.p.A. Securities Litigation*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9071 (E.D.N.Y. May 12, 2005).
- *In re CNL Hotels & Resorts, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38876, No. 6:04-cv-1231-Orl-31KRS (M.D. Fla. May 9, 2005).
- *Johnson v. Aegon USA, Inc.*, 1:01-CV-2617 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 20, 2004).
- *Freeland v. Iridium World Communications, Ltd.*, 99-1002 (D.D.C. Aug. 31, 2004).
- *In re Acclaim Entertainment, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 03-CV-1270 (E.D.N.Y. June 22, 2004).
- *In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation*, 308 F. Supp. 2d 20 (D. Mass. 2004).
- *In re Concord EFS, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 02-2697 (W.D. Tenn. Jan. 7, 2004).
- *In re Pharmatrak, Inc. Privacy Litig.*, 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 8758 (1st Cir. May 9, 2003).
- *In re Enterprise Mortgage Acceptance Co., LLC, Sec. Litig.*, 02-Civ. 10288 (SWK) (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 5, 2003).
- *In re PerkinElmer, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 286 F. Supp. 2d 46 (D. Mass. 2003).

- *In re Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation*, 241 F. Supp. 2d 281 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).
- *In re Comdisco Securities Litigation*, No. 01 C 2110, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5047 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2003).
- *Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.*, 257 F.3d 475 (2001), clarified, 279 F.3d 313 (5th Cir. 2002).
- *City Partnership Co. v. Cable TV Fund 14-B*, 213 F.R.D. 576 (D. Colo. 2002).
- *In re Allaire Corporation Securities Litigation*, Docket No. 00-11972 - WGY, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18143 (D. Mass., Sept. 27, 2002).
- *In re StarLink Corn Products Liability Litigation*, 212 F.Supp.2d 828 (N.D. Ill. 2002).
- *In re Bankamerica Corp. Securities Litigation*, 263 F.3d 795 (8th Cir. 2001).
- *In re Comdisco Securities Litigation*, 166 F.Supp.2d 1260 (N.D. Ill. 2001).
- *In re Crossroads Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. A-00-CA-457 JN, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14780 (W.D. Tx. Aug. 15, 2001).
- *In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 150 F. Supp. 2d 896 (E.D. Va. 2001).
- *Lindelow v. Hill*, No. 00 C 3727, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10301 (N.D. Ill. July 19, 2001).
- *In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 148 F. Supp. 2d 654 (E.D. Va. 2001).
- *Jeffries v. Pension Trust Fund of the Pension, Hospitalization & Benefit Plan of the Electrical Industry*, 172 F. Supp. 2d 389 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).
- *Carney v. Cambridge Technology Partners, Inc.*, 135 F. Supp. 2d 235 (D. Mass. 2001).
- *Weltz v. Lee*, 199 F.R.D. 129 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).
- *Schoers v. Pfizer, Inc.*, 00 Civ. 6121, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 511 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 23, 2001).

- *Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos.*, 94 Civ. 2373 (MBM), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2001).

- *Goldberger v. Bear, Stearns & Co.*, 98 Civ. 8677 (JSM), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18714 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 28, 2000).

- *In re Newell Rubbermaid, Inc., Securities Litigation*, Case No. 99 C 6853, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15190 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 2, 2000).

- *Stanley v. Safeskin Corp.*, Case No. 99 CV 454 BTM (LSP), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14100, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P91, 221 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2000).

- *In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 115 F. Supp. 2d 620 (E.D. Va. 2000).

- *In re USA Talks.com, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14823, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P91, 231 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 2000).

- *In re Sotheby's Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 00 CIV. 1041 (DLC), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12504, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P91, 059 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2000).

- *Dumont v. Charles Schwab & Co., Inc.*, Civil Action No. 99-2840 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10906 (E.D. La. July 21, 2000).

- *Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.*, Civil Action No. H-98-1148, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21424 (S.D. Tex. July 17, 2000).

- *In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation*, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1044 (E.D. Mo. 2000).

- *In re Carnegie International Corp. Securities Litigation*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 676 (D. Md. 2000).

- *Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.*, Civil Action No. H-98-1148, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21423 (S.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2000).

- *In re Imperial Credit Industries Securities Litigation*, CV 98-8842 SVW, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2340 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2000).

- *Sturm v. Marriott Marquis Corp.*, 85 F. Supp. 2d 1356 (N.D. Ga. 2000).

- *In re Health Management Systems Securities Litigation*, 82 F. Supp. 2d 227 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).

- *Dumont v. Charles Schwab & Co., Inc.*, Civil Action No. 99-2840, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 619 (E.D. La. Jan. 19, 2000).
- *In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 110 F. Supp. 2d 427 (E.D. Va. 2000).
- *In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation*, 78 F. Supp. 2d 976 (E.D. Mo. 1999).
- *Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos.*, 94 Civ. 2373 (MBM), 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18378 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 24, 1999).
- *In re Nanophase Technologies Corp. Litigation*, 98 C 3450, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16171 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 27, 1999).
- *In re Clearly Canadian Securities Litigation*, File No. C-93-1037-VRW, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14273 Cal. Sept. 7, 1999).
- *Yuan v. Bayard Drilling Technologies, Inc.*, 96 F. Supp. 2d 1259 (W.D. Okla. 1999).
- *In re Spyglass, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 99 C 512, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11382 (N.D. Ill. July 20, 1999).
- *Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P.*, 1:97-CV-3183-TWT, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11595 (N.D. Ga. June 30, 1999).
- *Blue Cross & Blue Shield of N.J., Inc. v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, 98 CV 3287, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11363 (E.D.N.Y. June 1, 1999).
- *Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P.*, 1:97-CV-3183-TWT, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1368, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P90, 429 (N.D. Ga. Jan. 19, 1999).
- *Longman v. Food Lion, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 331 (M.D.N.C. 1999).
- *Wright v. Ernst & Young LLP*, 152 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 1998).
- *Romine v. Compuserve Corp.*, 160 F.3d 337 (6th Cir. 1998).
- *Felzen v. Andreas*, 134 F.3d 873 (7th Cir. 1998).
- *Walsingham v. Biocontrol Technology, Inc.*, 66 F. Supp. 2d 669 (W.D. Pa. 1998).
- *Sturm v. Marriott Marquis Corp.*, 26 F. Supp. 2d 1358 (N.D. Ga. 1998).

- *Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P.*, 27 F. Supp. 2d 1324 (N.D. Ga. 1998).
- *In re MobileMedia Securities Litigation*, 28 F.Supp.2d 901 (D.N.J. 1998).
- *Weikel v. Tower Semiconductor, Ltd.*, 183 F.R.D. 377 (D.N.J. 1998).
- *In re Health Management Systems Securities Litigation*, 97 Civ. 1865 (HB), 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8061 (S.D.N.Y. May 27, 1998).
- *In re Painewebber Ltd. Partnership Litigation*, 999 F. Supp. 719 (S.D.N.Y. 1998).
- *Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P.*, 1:97-cv-3183-TWT, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23222 (N.D. Ga. Feb. 10, 1998).
- *Brown v. Radica Games (In re Radica Games Securities Litigation)*, No. 96-17274, 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 32775 (9th Cir. Nov. 14, 1997).
- *Robbins v. Koger Properties*, 116 F.3d 1441 (11th Cir. 1997).
- *In re TCW/DW North American Government Income Trust Securities Litigation*, 95 Civ. 0167 (PKL), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18485 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 20, 1997).
- *Wright v. Ernst & Young, LLP*, 97 Civ. 2189 (SAS), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13630 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 1997).
- *Felzen v. Andreas*, No. 95-2279, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23646 (C.D. Ill. July 7, 1997).
- *Felzen v. Andreas*, No. 95-2279, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23647 (C.D. Ill. July 7, 1997).
- *A. Ronald Sirna, Jr., P.C. Profit Sharing Plan v. Prudential Securities, Inc.*, 964 F. Supp. 147 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).
- *Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Companies*, 94 Civ. 2373 (MBM), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4451 (S.D.N.Y. April 8, 1997).
- *Bobrow v. Mobilmedia, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 96-4715, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23806 (D.N.J. March 31, 1997).

- *Kalodner v. Michaels Stores, Inc.*, 172 F.R.D. 200 (N.D.Tex. 1997).
- *In re Painewebber Ltd. Partnerships Litigation*, 171 F.R.D. 104 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).
- *A. Ronald Sirna, Jr., P.C. Profit Sharing Plan v. Prudential Securities, Inc.*, 95 Civ. 8422 (LAK), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1226 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 7, 1997).
- *In re Painewebber Inc. Limited Partnerships Litigation*, 94 F.3d 49 (2d Cir. 1996).
- *Glassman v. Computervision Corp.*, 90 F.3d 617 (1st Cir. 1996).
- *Alpern v. Utilicorp United, Inc.*, 84 F.3d 1525 (8th Cir. 1996).
- *Shaw v. Digital Equipment Corp.*, 82 F.3d 1194 (1st Cir. 1996).
- *Dresner Co. Profit Sharing Plan v. First Fidelity Bank, N.A.*, 95 Civ. 1924 (MBM), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17913 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 3, 1996).
- *Simon v. American Power Conversion Corp.*, 945 F. Supp. 416 (D.R.I. 1996).
- *TII Industries, Inc.*, 96 Civ. 4412 (SAS), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14466 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 1996).
- *In re TCW/DW North American Government Income Trust Securities Litigation*, 941 F. Supp. 326 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 1996).
- *In re Painewebber Ltd. Partnership Litigation*, 94 Civ. 8547 (SHS), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9195 (S.D.N.Y. June 28, 1996).
- *In re Tricord Systems, Inc., Securities Litigation*, Civil No. 3-94-746, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20943 (D. Minn. April 5, 1996).
- *In re Painewebber Limited Partnership Litigation*, 94 Civ. 8547 (SHS), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1265 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 6, 1996).
- *Riley v. Simmons*, 45 F.3d 764 (3d Cir. 1995).
- *Stepak v. Addison*, 20 F.3d 398 (11th Cir. 1994).
- *Zitin v. Turley*, [1991 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 96,123 (D. Ariz. June 20, 1994).

- *In re Southeast Hotel Properties Limited Partnership Investor Litigation*, 151 F.R.D. 597 (W.D.N.C. 1993).
- *County of Suffolk v. Long Island Lighting Co.*, 907 F.2d 1295 (2d Cir. 1990).

- *McWilliams v. City of Long Beach*, 56 Cal. 4th 613 (2013).
- *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 89 A.D.3d 444 (N.Y. App. Div. 1st Dep't 2011).
- *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009).
- *Ardon v. City of Los Angeles*, 52 Cal. 4th 241 (2011).
- *In re Tyson Foods, Inc., Consolidated Shareholder Litigation*, 919 A.2d 563 (Del. Ch. 2007).
- *Naevus Int'l v. AT&T Corp.*, 283 A.D.2d 171, 724 N.Y.S.2d 721 (2001).
- *Paramount Communications, Inc. v. QVC Network, Inc.*, 637 A.2d 34 (Del. Super. Ct. 1994).
- *In re Western National Corp. Shareholders Litigation*, Consolidated C.A. No. 15927, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 82 (May 22, 2000).
- *In re Cencom Cable Income Partners, L.P. Litigation*, C.A. No. 14634, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 90 (May 5, 2000).
- *In re Cencom Cable Income Partners, L.P. Litigation*, Consolidated C.A. No. 14634, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 10 (Jan. 27, 2000).
- *In re Marriott Hotels Properties II Limited Partnership Unitholders Litigation*, Consolidated C.A. No. 14961, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 17 (Jan. 24, 2000).
- *Romig v. Jefferson-Pilot Life Insurance Company*, 132 N.C. App. 682, 513 S.E.2d 598 (Ct. App. 1999), *aff'd*, 351 N.C. 349, 524 S.E.2d 804 (N.C. 2000).
- *Wallace v. Wood*, 752 A.2d 1175 (Del. Ch. 1999).
- *Greenwald v. Batterson*, C.A. No. 16475, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 158 (July 26, 1999).
- *Brown v. Perrette*, Civil Action No. 13531, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 92 (May 18, 1999).
- *In re Cencom Cable Income Partners, L.P. Litigation*, C.A. No. 14634, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 146 (Oct. 15, 1997).

- *In re Marriott Hotel Properties II Limited Partnership Unitholders Litigation,* Consolidated C.A. No. 14961, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 128 (Sept. 17, 1997).
- *In re Cheyenne Software Shareholders Litigation,* Consolidated C.A. No. 14941, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 142 (Nov. 7, 1996).
- *Seinfeld v. Robinson,* 246 A.D.2d 291, 676 N.Y.S.2d 579 (N.Y. 1998).
- *Werner v. Alexander*, 130 N.C. App. 435, 502 S.E.2d 897 (N.C. Ct. App. 1998).

The qualifications of the attorneys in the Wolf Haldenstein Litigation Group are set forth below and are followed by descriptions of some of the Firm's attorneys who normally practice outside the Litigation Group who contribute significantly to the class action practice from time to time.

PARTNERS

MARK C. RIFKIN: ***admitted:*** New York; Pennsylvania; New Jersey; U.S. Supreme Court; U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fifth, and D.C. Circuits; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Eastern and Western Districts of Pennsylvania, the District of New Jersey, the Eastern District of Wisconsin and the Western District of Michigan. ***Education:*** Princeton University (A.B. 1982); Villanova University School of Law (J.D. 1985). Contributor, Packel & Poulin, *Pennsylvania Evidence* (1987).

A highly experienced securities class action and shareholder rights litigator, Mr. Rifkin has recovered hundreds of millions of dollars for victims of corporate fraud and abuse in federal and state litigation across the country. Since 1990, Mr. Rifkin has served as lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or trial counsel in many class and derivative actions in securities, intellectual property, antitrust, insurance, consumer and mass tort litigation throughout the country.

Unique among his peers in the class action practice, Mr. Rifkin has extensive trial experience. Over the past thirty years, Mr. Rifkin has tried many complex commercial actions in federal and state courts across the country in class and derivative actions, including *In re National Media Corp. Derivative Litig.*, C.A. 90-7574 (E.D. Pa.), *Upp v. Mellon Bank, N.A.*, C.A. No. 91-5229 (E.D. Pa.), where the verdict awarded more than $60 million in damages to the Class (later reversed on appeal, 997 F.2d 1039 (3d Cir. 1993)), and *In re AST Research Securities Litigation*, No. 94-1370 SVW (C.D. Cal.), as well as a number of commercial matters for individual clients, including *Zelouf Int'l Corp. v. Zelouf*, Index No. 653652/2013 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2015), in which he obtained a $10 million judgment for his client.

Mr. Rifkin also has extensive appellate experience. Over thirty years, Mr. Rifkin has argued dozens of appeals on behalf of appellants and appellees in several federal appellate courts, and in the highest appellate courts in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Mr. Rifkin has earned the AV®-Preeminent rating by Martindale-Hubbell® for more than 20 years, and has been selected for inclusion in the New York Metro SuperLawyers® listing since 2010. In 2014, Mr. Rifkin was named a "Titan of the Plaintiff's Bar" by Law360®.

In 2015, Mr. Rifkin received worldwide acclaim for his role as lead counsel for the class in *Good Morning To You Productions Corp. v. Warner/Chappell Music, Inc.*, No. CV 13-04460-GHK (MRWx), in federal court in Los Angeles, successfully challenging the copyright to "Happy Birthday to You," the world's most famous song. In recognition of his historic victory, Mr. Rifkin was named a Trailblazer in Intellectual Property by the National Law Journal in 2016. In 2018, Mr. Rifkin led a team of lawyers from Wolf Haldenstein who represented the plaintiffs in *We Shall Overcome Foundation, et al. v. The Richmond Organization, Inc., et al.*, No. 16-cv-02725-DLC (S.D.N.Y.), which successfully challenged the copyright to "We Shall Overcome," called the "most powerful song of the 20th century" by the Librarian of Congress.

Mr. Rifkin lectures frequently to business and professional organizations on a variety of securities, shareholder, intellectual property, and corporate governance matters. Mr. Rifkin is a guest lecturer to graduate and undergraduate economics and finance students on corporate governance and financial disclosure topics. He also serves as a moot court judge for the A.B.A. and New York University Law School. Mr. Rifkin appears frequently in print and broadcast media on diverse law-related topics in corporate, securities, intellectual property, antitrust, regulatory, and enforcement matters.

BETSY C. MANIFOLD: ***admitted*:** Wisconsin; New York; California; U.S. District Courts for the Western District of Wisconsin, Eastern and Southern Districts of New York, and Northern, Central and Southern Districts of California. ***Education***: Elmira College; Middlebury College (B.A., *cum laude*, 1980); Marquette University (J.D., 1986); New York University. Thomas More Scholar. Recipient, American Jurisprudence Award in Agency. Member: The Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Languages: French.

Ms. Manifold served as co-lead counsel in the following cases to recovery on behalf of employees: *Miguel Garcia, et al. v. Lowe's Home Center, Inc. et al.* – Case No. GIC 841120 (Barton) (Cal. Sup. Ct, San Diego) ($1.65 million settlement w/ average class member recovery of $5,500, attorney fees and cost awarded separately) and *Neil Weinstein, et al.*

v. MetLife, Inc., et al. – Case No. 3:06-cv-04444-SI (N.D. Cal) ($7.4 million settlement). Ms. Manifold also served as co-lead counsel in the following derivative actions: *In re Atmel Corporation Derivative Litigation*, Master File No. CV 06-4592-JF (N.D. Cal.) ($9.65 million payment to Atmel) and *In re Silicon Storage Technology Inc. Derivative Litig.*, Case No. C 06-04310 JF (N.D. Cal.) (cash payment and re-pricing of options with a total value of $5.45 million). Ms. Manifold also worked as lead counsel on the following class action: *Lewis v. American Spectrum Realty*, Case No. 01 CC 00394, Cal. Sup. Ct (Orange County) ($6.5 million settlement).

BENJAMIN Y. KAUFMAN: ***admitted*:** New York. ***Education***: Yeshiva University, B.A.; Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University, J.D. Mr. Kaufman focuses on class actions on behalf of defrauded investors and consumers. Mr. Kaufman's successful securities litigations include *In re Deutsche Telekom AG Securities Litigation*, No. 00-9475 (S.D.N.Y.), a complex international securities litigation requiring evidentiary discovery in both the United States and Europe, which settled for $120 million. Mr. Kaufman was also part of the team that recovered $46 million for investors in *In re Asia Pulp & Paper Securities Litigation*, No. 01-7351 (S.D.N.Y.); and $43.1 million, with contributions of $20 million, $14.85 million and $8.25 million from Motorola, the individual defendants, and defendant underwriters respectively, in *Freeland v. Iridium World Communications, Ltd*.

Mr. Kaufman's outstanding representative results in derivative and transactional litigations include: *In re Trump Hotels Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (Trump personally contributed some of his holdings; the company increased the number of directors on its board, and certain future transactions had to be reviewed by a special committee); *Southwest Airlines Derivative Litigation (Carbon County Employee Retirement System v. Kelly* (Dist. Ct. Dallas Cnty., Tex.)) (a derivative matter that resulted in significant reforms to the air carrier's corporate governance and safety and maintenance practices and procedures for the benefit of Southwest and its shareholders).

He argued the appeal in *In re Comverse Technology, Inc. Derivative Litig.*, 56 A.D.3d 49 (1st Dep't 2008) which led to the seminal New York Appellate Division opinion which clarified the standards of demand futility, and held that a board of directors loses the protection of the business judgment rule where there is evidence of self-dealing and poor judgment by the directors; and *In re Topps Company, Inc. Shareholders Litigation* which resulted in a 2007 decision which vindicated the rights of shareholders under the rules of comity and doctrine of forum non conveniens and to pursue claims in the most relevant forum notwithstanding the fact that jurisdiction might exist as well in the state

of incorporation. Mr. Kaufman has also lectured and taught in the subjects of corporate governance as well as transactional and derivative litigation.

In addition, Mr. Kaufman represents many corporate clients in complex commercial matters, including *Puckett v. Sony Music Entertainment*, No. 108802/98 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cnty. 2002) (a complex copyright royalty class action); *Shropshire v. Sony Music Entertainment*, No. 06-3252 (S.D.N.Y.), and *The Youngbloods v. BMG Music*, No. 07-2394 (S.D.N.Y.); and *Mich II Holdings LLC v. Schron*, No. 600736/10 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cnty.) (represented certain defendants in connection with real estate dispute and successfully litigated motion to dismiss all claims against those defendants; he continues to represent those clients' interests in several related litigations in New York and Delaware). Mr. Kaufman has also represented clients in arbitrations and litigation involving oppressed minority shareholders in closely held corporations.

Prior to joining Wolf Haldenstein, and prior to joining Milberg in August of 1998, Mr. Kaufman was a Court Attorney for the New York State Supreme Court, New York County (1988-1990) and Principal Law Clerk to Justice Herman Cahn of the Commercial Division of the New York State Supreme Court, New York County (1990-1998).

Mr. Kaufman is an active member of the Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association, the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists and the Jewish Lawyers Guild. He has also lectured on corporate governance issues to institutional investor conferences across the United States and abroad. Mr. Kaufman is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Hebrew Academy of the Five Towns and Rockaways.

THOMAS H. BURT: ***admitted*:** New York; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Eastern District of Michigan. ***Education***: American University (B.A. 1993); New York University (J.D. 1997). Articles Editor with New York University Review of Law and Social Change. Mr. Burt is a litigator with a practice concentrated in securities class actions and complex commercial litigation. After practicing criminal defense with noted defense lawyer Jack T. Litman for three years, he joined Wolf Haldenstein, where he has worked on such notable cases as *In re Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation*, No. 21 MC 92 (SAS) (S.D.N.Y.) (a novel and sweeping amalgamation of over 300 class actions which resulted in a recovery of $586 million); *In re MicroStrategy Securities Litigation*, No. 00-473-A (E.D. Va.) (recovery of $192 million); *In re DRAM Antitrust Litigation*, No. 02-cv-1486 (PJH) (N.D. Cal.) (antitrust case resulting in $315 million recovery); *In re Computer Associates 2002 Class Action Securities*

Litigation, No. 02-cv-1226 (TCP) (E.D.N.Y.)(settled, together with a related fraud case, for over $133 million); *K.J. Egleston L.P. v. Heartland Industrial Partners, et al.*, 2:06-13555 (E.D. Mich.) (recovery included personal assets from former Reagan Administration budget director David A. Stockman); and *Parker Friedland v. Iridium World Communications, Ltd.*, 99-1002 (D.D.C.)(recovery of $43.1 million). Mr. Burt has spoken on several occasions to investor and activist groups regarding the intersection of litigation and corporate social responsibility. Mr. Burt writes and speaks on both securities and antitrust litigation topics. He has served as a board member and officer of the St. Andrew's Society of the State of New York, New York's oldest charity.

RACHELE R. BYRD: ***admitted:*** California; U.S. District Courts for the Southern, Northern, Central and Eastern Districts of California; U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. ***Education:*** Point Loma Nazarene College (B.A., 1994); University of California, Hastings College of the Law (J.D., 1997). Member: State Bar of California. Former Deputy Alternate Public Defender for the County of San Diego. Ms. Byrd is located in the firm's San Diego office. She practices corporate derivative and class action litigation including securities, consumer, antitrust, employment and general corporate and business litigation. Ms. Byrd has played a significant role in litigating numerous class and derivative actions, including *In re Apple & AT&TM Antitrust Litigation*, Master File No. C 07-05152 JW (N.D. Cal.) (antitrust class action against Apple Inc. and AT&T Mobility LLC regarding aftermarkets for iPhone wireless service and applications); *Ardon v. City of Los Angeles* (2011) 52 Cal.4th 241 (challenging the City of Los Angeles' telephone users tax on behalf of the City's taxpayers); *McWilliams v. City of Long Beach*, 2013 Cal. LEXIS 3510, Cal. Supreme Ct. No. S202037 (April 25, 2013) (challenging the City of Long Beach's telephone users tax on behalf of the City's taxpayers); *DeFrees, et al. v. Kirkland, et al*., No. CV 11-04272 GAF(SPx) (C.D. Cal.) (shareholder derivative action); *Bamboo Partners LLC, et al. v. Robert Mondavi Corp., et a*l. (shareholder class action that settled for $10.8 million in 2007); and *Lewis, et al. v. American Spectrum Realty, Inc., et al*., (shareholder class action that settled for $6.5 million in 2004).

MATTHEW M. GUINEY: ***admitted:*** New York; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern District of New York. ***Education*****:** The College of William & Mary (B.A. in Government and Economics 1998); Georgetown University Law Center (J.D. 2002). Mr. Guiney's primary areas of practice are securities class actions under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Exchange Act of 1934, complex commercial litigation, *Employee Retirement Income Security Act* (*ERISA*) actions on behalf of plan participants, *Fair Labor Standards*

Act of 1938 actions concerning overtime payment, and fiduciary duty actions under various state laws. Mr. Guiney has helped recover hundreds of millions of dollars for victims of corporate fraud and abuse in federal and state litigation across the country. Some of Mr. Guiney's notable results on behalf of investors include: *Mallozzi v. Industrial Enterprises of America, Inc. et al*., 1:07-cv-10321-DLC (S.D.N.Y.) ($3.4 million settlement on behalf of shareholders); *In re Luxottica Group S.p.A. Securities Litigation*, No. CV 01-3285 (JBW) (MDG) (E.D.N.Y.) ($18.5 million settlement on behalf of shareholders); *In re MBNA Corp. ERISA Litigation,* Master Docket No. 05-429 (GMS), (D. Del) ($4.5 million settlement on behalf of plan participants). Recent publications include: *Citigroup and Judicial Immunity in ERISA: An Emerging Trend?*, Compensation and Benefits Review, Vol. 42, No. 3, 172-78 (May/June 2010) (with Mark C. Rifkin); *Case of the Moenchies: Moench Provision Expansion,* Employment Law360/Securities Law360 Newswires, Guest Column (June 2, 2010) (with Mark C. Rifkin).

MALCOLM T. BROWN: ***admitted:*** United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, District of New Jersey and Eastern District of Pennsylvania; United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. ***Education:*** University of Pennsylvania (B.A., Political Science 1988) and Rutgers University School of Law (J.D. 1994). Mr. Brown's primary areas of practice are securities, derivative, M&A litigation and consumer class actions. Recent notable decisions include: *Johnson v. Ford Motor Co.*, 309 F.R.D. 226 (S.D. W. Va. 2015); *Thomas v. Ford Motor Co.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43268 (D.S.C. Mar. 31, 2014); *In re Merkin Sec. Litig*., 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 178084 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 24, 2015). Prior to joining Wolf Haldenstein, Mr. Brown was a business litigation attorney who represented financial institutions, corporations and partnerships and advised clients on business disputes, reorganizations, dissolutions and insurance coverage matters. Notable decisions include: *Garment v. Zoeller*, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20736 (S.D.N.Y. June 19, 2001), *aff'd* 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 9966 (2d Cir. May 24, 2002); *Bainton v. Baran*, 731 N.Y.S.2d 161 (1st Dep't 2001).

SPECIAL COUNSEL

JUSTICE HERMAN CAHN: ***admitted:*** New York. ***Education***: Harvard Law School and a B.A. from City College of the City University of New York. Justice Herman Cahn was first elected as Judge of the Civil Court of the City of New York in 1976. He subsequently served as an Acting Justice of the Supreme Court from 1980 until 1992, when he was elected to the Supreme Court. Throughout his decades on the bench, he principally handled civil cases, with the exception of 1981 until 1987, when he presided

over criminal matters. Justice Cahn was instrumental in the creation of, and a founding Justice in, the Commercial Division within the New York State Supreme Court. He served as a Justice of the Commercial Division from its inception in 1993.

Among his most notable recent cases are the consolidated cases stemming from the Bear Stearns merger with JP Morgan (*In re Bear Stearns Litigation*); litigation regarding the America's Cup Yacht Race (*Golden Gate Yacht Club v. Société Nautique de Genève*); litigation stemming from the attempt to enjoin the construction of the new Yankee Stadium (*Save Our Parks v. City of New York*); and the consolidated state cases regarding the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site (*World Trade Center Properties v. Alliance Insurance; Port Authority v. Alliance Insurance*).

Justice Cahn is a member of the Council on Judicial Administration of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. He has also recently been appointed to the Character and Fitness Committee of the Appellate Division, First Department. He is on the Register of Mediators for the United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Before ascending the bench, Justice Cahn practiced law in Manhattan. He was first admitted to the New York bar in 1956. He is admitted to practice in numerous courts, including the New York State courts, the Southern District of New York and the United States Supreme Court.

ROBERT ALTCHILER: ***admitted*****:** New York; Connecticut. ***Education:*** State University of New York at Albany (B.S., 1985); George Washington University Law School (J.D., 1988). Mr. Altchiler heads the firm's White Collar and Investigations practice group. Robert's practice focuses primarily in the areas of White Collar criminal investigations, corporate investigations, litigation, tax and general corporate counseling. Robert has successfully defended individuals and corporations in a wide array of multifaceted investigations in areas such as mortgage fraud, securities fraud, tax fraud, prevailing wage, money laundering, Bank Secrecy Act, embezzlement, bank and wire fraud, theft of trade secrets, criminal copyright infringement, criminal anti-counterfeiting, Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA), International Traffic In Arms Regulations (ITAR), racketeering, continuing criminal enterprises, and circumvention of trade restrictions, among many others. Robert also specializes in non-criminal investigations related to various topics, including finding money allegedly being hidden by individuals, ascertaining the identities of individuals actually involved in corporate matters (when a

client believes those identities are being concealed), and running undercover "sting" operations as part of civil and commercial litigation support.

Robert conducts corporate investigations and, when appropriate, when the client instructs, refers the results to law enforcement for prosecution. In one recent example, a corporate CEO came to learn assets and materials were being diverted by employees, and that the corporation was "bleeding" money as a result. The CEO needed assistance in ascertaining the identities and extent of involvement of the wrongdoers, as well as the level of theft involved. Robert directed a corporate investigation that revealed the nature of the problem. He then referred the investigation to federal authorities, which arrested the wrongdoers and prosecuted them. The wrongdoers were convicted. In addition, the amount of the theft was included in a court ordered restitution judgment and the corporation will be repaid in full.

In 1988, Robert started his legal career as a prosecutor in New York City. As a prosecutor, in addition to trying several dozen serious cases, ranging from murder to fraud to narcotics violations, he also ran wiretap and grand jury investigations involving money laundering and other financial crimes, as well as a wiretap and investigation concerning a plot to assassinate a prominent NYC judge.

In addition to his practice, Robert has been an adjunct law professor at Pace University Law School since 1998, where he teaches trial advocacy. Robert has also been a featured participant and lecturer at Cardozo Law School's acclaimed Intensive Trial Advocacy Program in New York City, and has also taught at Yale Law School. Robert's trial advocacy teaching requires him to constantly integrate new developments in communication theory and trial techniques into his pedagogical methods. Given the changing way students (and prospective jurors) communicate and digest information (via Twitter, Instagram and Snapchat, for example) Robert is able to adapt his teaching to the needs of his students. By actively participating in the mock trials and by frequently demonstrating methods, he is able to continually adapt his own communication skills and integrate cutting-edge developments into his own practice.

Robert graduated from the George Washington University Law School, and graduated with honors from the Business School at the State University of New York at Albany in 1985. He is also a 1996 graduate of the National Criminal Defense College and a 1997 graduate of the National Institute for Trial Advocacy's Harvard Teacher Training Program. In 2014, Robert was asked to teach at the prestigious EATES Program at Stetson University Law School, a program designed to teach trial advocacy professors

how to better teach their students. Robert has also made dozens of television appearances on Fox, Court TV, and Tru TV, providing legal commentary on televised trials, and participating in discussions related to pertinent issues.

Of Counsel

Daniel W. Krasner: ***admitted:*** New York; Supreme Court of the United States; U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Central District of Illinois, and Northern District of Michigan. ***Education:*** Yale Law School (LL.B., 1965); Yeshiva College (B.A., 1962). Mr. Krasner is of counsel at Wolf Haldenstein. He began practicing law with Abraham L. Pomerantz, generally credited as the "Dean of the Class Action Bar." He founded the Class Litigation Group at Wolf Haldenstein in 1976.

Mr. Krasner received judicial praise for his class action acumen as early as 1978. *See, e.g.*, *Shapiro v. Consolidated Edison Co*., [1978 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) & 96,364 at 93,252 (S.D.N.Y. 1978) ("in the Court's opinion the reputation, skill and expertise of . . . [Mr.] Krasner, considerably enhanced the probability of obtaining as large a cash settlement as was obtained"); *Steiner v. BOC Financial Corp*., [1980 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) & 97,656, at 98,491.4, (S.D.N.Y. 1980) ("This Court has previously recognized the high quality of work of plaintiffs' lead counsel, Mr. Krasner"). The New York Law Journal referred to Mr. Krasner as one of the "top rank plaintiffs' counsel" in the securities and class action fields. In connection with a failed 1989 management buyout of United Airlines, Mr. Krasner testified before Congress.

More recently, Mr. Krasner has been one of the lead attorneys for plaintiffs in some of the leading Federal multidistrict cases in the United States, including the IPO Litigation in the Southern District of New York, the Mutual Fund Market Timing Litigation in the District of Maryland, and several Madoff-related litigations pending in the Southern District of New York. Mr. Krasner has also been lead attorney in several precedent-setting shareholder actions in Delaware Chancery Court and the New York Court of Appeals, including *American International Group, Inc. v. Greenberg*, 965 A.2d 763 (Del. Ch. 2009) and the companion certified appeal, *Kirschner v. KPMG LLP*, Nos. 151, 152, 2010 N.Y. LEXIS 2959 (N.Y. Oct. 21, 2010); *Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana and City of New Orleans Employees' Retirement System, derivatively on behalf of nominal defendant American International Group, Inc., v. PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP*, No. 152 (New York,

October 21, 2010); *In re CNX Gas Corp. S'holders Litig.*, C.A. No. 5377-VCL, 2010 Del. Ch. LEXIS 119 (Del. Ch., May 25, 2010); *In re CNX Gas Corp. S'holders Litig.*, C.A. No. 5377-VCL, 2010 Del. Ch. LEXIS 139, (Del. Ch. July 5, 2010), appeal refused, 2010 Del. LEXIS 324, 2010 WL 2690402 (Del. 2010).

Mr. Krasner has lectured at the Practicing Law Institute; Rutgers Graduate School of Business; Federal Bar Council; Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Rockland County, New York State, and American Bar Associations; Federal Bar Council, and before numerous other bar, industry, and investor groups.

PETER C. HARRAR: ***admitted;* New York;** United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York. ***Education***: Columbia Law School (J.D. 1984); Princeton University, Phi Beta Kappa, *magna cum laude.* Mr. Harrar is of counsel at the firm and has extensive experience in complex securities and commercial litigation on behalf of individual and institutional clients.

He has represented investment funds, hedge funds, insurance companies and other institutional investors in a variety of individual actions, class actions and disputes involving mortgage-backed securities and derivative instruments. Examples include *In re EMAC Securities Litigation*, a fraud case concerning private placements of securitized loan pools, and *Steed Finance LDC v. LASER Advisors, Inc.*, a hybrid individual and class action concerning the mispricing of swaptions.

Over the years, Mr. Harrar has also served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous securities class and derivative actions throughout the country, recovering hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of aggrieved investors and corporations. Recent examples are some of the largest recoveries achieved in resolution of derivative actions, including *American International Group Consolidated Derivative Litigation*) ($90 million), and *Bank of America/Merrill Derivative Litigation* ($62.5 million).

JEFFREY G. SMITH: ***admitted:*** New York; California; Supreme Court of the United States; U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Circuits; U.S. Tax Court; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Southern, Central and Northern Districts of California and the Districts of Colorado and Nebraska. ***Education***: Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University (M.P.A., 1977); Yale Law School (J.D., 1978); Vassar College (A.B., *cum laude generali*, 1974). At Yale Law School, Mr. Smith was a teaching assistant for the Trial Practice course and a student supervisor in

the Legal Services Organization, a clinical program. Member: The Association of the Bar of the City of New York; New York State and American (Section on Litigation) Bar Associations; State Bar of California (Member: Litigation Section); American Association for Justice. Mr. Smith has frequently lectured on corporate governance issues to professional groups of Fund trustees and investment advisors as well as to graduate and undergraduate business student groups, and has regularly served as a moot court judge for the A.B.A. and at New York University Law School. Mr. Smith has substantial experience in complex civil litigation, including class and derivative actions, tender offer, merger, and takeover litigation. Mr. Smith is rated "AV" by Martindale Hubble and, since its inception in 2006, has been selected as among the top 5% of attorneys in the New York City metropolitan area chosen to be included in the Super Lawyers Magazine.

ANITA B. KARTALOPOULOS: ***admitted*****:** New York. ***Education***: University of Toledo, B.A.; Seton Hall University, (J.D., 1982). Ms. Kartalopoulos, a former member of Milberg LLP, litigates claims in the areas of securities fraud, derivative litigation, and mergers and acquisitions. She focuses her practice on lead plaintiff litigation, as well as breach of fiduciary and transactional litigation. She works closely with the institutional investor clients, including trustees of public and private funds, throughout the U.S. providing counsel on asset recovery, fiduciary education, and risk management.

Ms. Kartalopoulos has extensive experience in litigating complex securities cases including *In re Sears, Roebuck & Co. Securities Litigation* ($215 million settlement), *In re Chiron Corp. Securities Litigation* ($30 million settlement), and others. Ms. Kartalopoulos has also achieved noteworthy results including improved corporate governance and disclosures as well as increased share value in recent litigations including in *In re Topps Co. Shareholder Litigation*, *In re Anheuser-Busch Cos. Shareholders Litigation*, *In re Net Logic*, *In re Smith International*, *In re L-3 Communication Holdings, Inc.*, *In re Republic Services, Derivative Litigation*, and many others.

Prior to entering private practice, Ms. Kartalopoulos served in senior regulatory positions involving insurance and health in the State of New Jersey, including serving as Deputy Commissioner of Insurance, for Life and Health; Director of Legal and Regulatory Affairs (Department of Health); and Executive Director of the New Jersey State Real Estate Commission. She managed the New Jersey Insurance Department's Multi-State Task Force investigating the sales practices of the Prudential Insurance Company, which resulted in a $50 million fine against Prudential and a $4 billion

recovery for policyholders. She also served on the Board of Directors of MBL Insurance Company as a rehabilitator and managed litigation on behalf of the company.

Ms. Kartalopoulos is a regular speaker at numerous conferences focused on fiduciary education, ethics, and U.S. securities litigation, including the Investment Education Symposium, the Institutional Investor European Pensions Symposium, the Canadian Hedge Funds Investment Roundtable, the New York Hedge Funds Roundtable, and the AEDBF (*Association Europeenne de Droit Bancaire et Financier*), FPPTA Trustee School, GAPPT, MATTER, LATEC. She also speaks regularly on the complex legal environment that institutional investors face when addressing losses due to securities fraud as well as their proactive and reactive alternatives.

Ms. Kartalopoulos has co-authored "Deterring Executive Compensation Excesses: Regulatory Weaknesses, Litigation Strengths" (03/05, NY, NY), and "Vintage Wine in New Bottles: The Curious Evolution of the Concept of Loss Causation" (11/05, NY, NY).

Ms. Kartalopoulos is admitted to the bar of the State of New Jersey, the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Federal and Third Circuits.

KATE MCGUIRE: ***admitted*:** New York; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York. ***Education***: University of California at Santa Cruz (B.A. 1995), Georgetown University Law Center (J.D., 1998); Member: *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal*.

Ms. McGuire has extensive experience prosecuting complex litigation. Her work encompasses consumer and data protection class actions, securities class and derivative shareholder cases and nationwide antitrust suits.

She is a member of the Firm's Consumer Protection practice group and, in that context, has worked intensively to protect classes of consumers under a range of state and federal laws. Recently, she served as a member of the co-lead counsel team in *Simerlein et al. v. Toyota Motor Corporation et al.*, 3:17-CV-01021-VAB (D. Conn.), representing more than a million owners of Sienna minivans in litigation that settled for class-wide benefits valued at between $30 and $40 million. Presently, she serves on a team representing plaintiffs in multi-district litigation against Fisher-Price and Mattel, relating to Rock 'n Play infant sleepers which are alleged to be dangerous and misleadingly marketed. She has also served as a member of the firm's lead or co-counsel teams in other consumer protection cases, including litigation based upon

allegations of misrepresentations and omissions concerning the purported safety of electronic cigarettes.

Ms. McGuire has also represented plaintiffs with respect to the protection of their civil rights. For example, she represented a blind plaintiff in a suit under the Americans with Disability Act against a major trading online trading company, and represented a group of minority business owners in federal civil rights litigation concerning disparate treatment which settled for significant governance therapeutics.

GLORIA KUI MELWANI: ***admitted***: New York, New Jersey, United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, District of New Jersey. ***Education***: New York University (B.M., Piano Performance, 2000); Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law (J.D., 2005), where she served as a Notes Editor on the Cardozo Public Law, Policy and Ethics Journal. Ms. Melwani's primary areas of focus are securities, stockholder derivative litigation, M&A litigation, and consumer litigation.

In 2018, Ms. Melwani represented the plaintiffs in *We Shall Overcome Foundation, et al. v. The Richmond Organization, Inc., et al.*, No. 16-cv-02725-DLC (S.D.N.Y.), which successfully challenged the copyright to "We Shall Overcome," called the "most powerful song of the 20th century" by the Librarian of Congress.

LYDIA KEANEY REYNOLDS: *admitted*: New York, U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the Northern and Central Districts of Illinois. ***Education***: Temple University (B.A. *magna cum laude*, Phi Beta Kappa, English, 2004); University of Pennsylvania Law School (J.D. 2007), where she was a Production Editor of the *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law*. Prior to joining Wolf Haldenstein, Ms. Reynolds was an associate at SNR Denton US LLP, n/k/a Dentons.

Ms. Reynolds has substantial experience litigating complex class actions in a variety of practice areas, including consumer fraud and securities litigation.

Ms. Reynolds joined Wolf Haldenstein as an associate in 2011. In 2015, she left Wolf Haldenstein to serve as an Assistant Attorney General in the Consumer Frauds and Protection Bureau of the Office of the New York Attorney General, and returned to the Firm in 2017. As an Assistant Attorney General, Ms. Reynolds investigated and litigated actions against financial services corporations and manufacturers and retailers who engaged in unfair or deceptive practices.

As an attorney at Wolf Haldenstein, Ms. Reynolds represented the plaintiffs in *In re Empire State Realty Trust, Inc. Investor Litig.*, No. 650607/2012 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.), arising out of the historic IPO of the Empire State Building and other properties and resulting in a $55 million recovery for the original investors. Ms. Reynolds also has significant experience litigating consumer fraud actions, including *Milman v. Thermos LLC*, No. 1:13-cv-7750 (N.D. Ill.), a consumer fraud action alleging that Thermos bottles advertised as leak-proof were not, resulting in a settlement of over $1 million in cash and products for consumers.

CARL MALMSTROM: ***admitted:*** Illinois; Minnesota; United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; Northern and Southern Districts of Illinois; Northern District of Indiana; District of Minnesota; Eastern District of Missouri; Western District of New York. ***Education:*** University of Chicago (A.B., Biological Sciences, 1999; A.M., Social Sciences, 2001); The University of Hawai'i at Manoa (M.A., Anthropology, 2004); Loyola University Chicago School of Law (J.D., 2007). Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Malmstrom worked for the City of Chicago Department of Law in the Municipal Prosecutions Division; he is a member of the Chicago Bar Association. Mr. Malmstrom has substantial experience litigating complex class actions in several practice areas, including antitrust, consumer fraud, and data security. Representative cases in which he has represented plaintiffs include *Bokelman et al. v. FCH Enterprises, Inc.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-209 (D. Haw.), involving customers of Zippy's Restaurants in Hawaii whose personal data was stolen by hackers, *In re: Experian Data Breach Litigation*, Case No. 8:15-cv-1592 (C.D. Cal.); *Freeman-Hargis v. Taxi Affiliation Services, LLC*, Case No. 2016-CH-02519 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cty.), involving customers of several taxi services in Chicago who were unlawfully charged fees for using credit cards in taxis.

ASSOCIATES

KEVIN COOPER: ***admitted***: New York; New Jersey; U.S. District Courts for the Southern District of New York and the District of New Jersey. ***Education:*** Fordham University (B.A., Legal and Policy Studies, 2011); Brooklyn Law School (J.D., 2014), where he served as an Associate Managing Editor on the Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial & Commercial Law and as a Barry L. Zaretsky Fellow in Commercial and Bankruptcy Law. Mr. Cooper's primary areas of focus are securities, derivative and M&A litigation.

BRITTANY N. DEJONG: ***admitted*****:** California; U.S. District Courts for the Southern, Northern, Central and Eastern Districts of California. ***Education:*** University of Phoenix

(B.S. 2005); Golden Gate University, School of Law (J.D. 2008), Graduated with Highest Honors, Editor – Law Review, Merit Scholarship Recipient, Member: State Bar of California. Prior to joining Wolf Haldenstein, Ms. DeJong was an associate at a boutique trial firm in San Francisco where her practice focused on multiparty litigation involving catastrophic property damage. Prior to entering private practice, Ms. DeJong worked as a Research Attorney for the Honorable Peter Busch in the Law & Motion Department at the San Francisco Superior Court. Additionally, while in law school, Ms. DeJong externed for the Honorable Susan Illston of the Northern District of California and the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

PATRICK DONOVAN: ***admitted:*** New York; U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York; United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. ***Education:*** Iona College (B.A., Business Management, 2007); St. John's University School of Law (J.D. 2011). Mr. Donovan's primary areas of focus are securities, derivative and M&A litigation.

MARISA LIVESAY: *admitted*: California; United States District Courts for the Southern, Central and Northern District of California; Ninth Circuit. ***Education***: University of Arizona (B.A., History & Spanish, 1999); University California Los Angeles Law School (J.D. 2002).

PARAPROFESSIONALS

GREGORY STONE: ***Education:*** University of Pennsylvania (B.S., Economics, 1979); University of California, Los Angeles (MBA, 1983). Mr. Stone is the Firm's Director of Case and Financial Analysis. He assists partners and associates in identifying and researching potential federal class action securities, derivative litigation and merger & acquisition (M&A) litigation. Mr. Stone has worked with leading securities class action firms in an analytical and investigative role for over 18 year throughout the United States, and has an extensive professional background in the accounting and investment professions. He plays a key role in new case development, including performing investigations into potential securities fraud class actions, derivative and other corporate governance related actions. By using a broad spectrum of financial news and legal industry research tools, Mr. Stone analyzes information that helps identify and support the theories behind the firm's litigation efforts.

Wolf Haldenstein does not discriminate or tolerate harassment against any employee or applicant because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or alienage or citizenship status and designs its hiring practices to ensure that minority group members and women are afforded equal employment opportunities without discrimination. The Firm is in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, County, and City equal employment opportunity laws.

Wolf Haldenstein is proud of its long history of support for the rights of, and employment opportunities for, women, the disadvantaged, and minority group persons, including the participation in civil rights and voter registration activities in the South in the early 1960s by partners of the Firm; the part-time employment of disadvantaged youth through various public school programs; the varied *pro bono* activities performed by many of the Firm's lawyers; the employment of many women and minority group persons in various capacities at the Firm, including at the partner level; the hiring of ex-offenders in supported job training programs; and the use of minority and women-owned businesses to provide services and supplies to the Firm.

270 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10016
Telephone: 212-545-4600
Telecopier: 212-545-4653
www.whafh.com

SYMPHONY TOWERS
750 B STREET, SUITE 1820
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
Telephone: 619-239-4599
Telecopier: 619-234-4599

111 West Jackson
SUITE 1700
CHICAGO, IL 60604
Telephone: 312-984-0000
Telecopier: 312-214-3110

COUNTY OF NASSAU

CONSULTANT'S, CONTRACTOR'S AND VENDOR'S DISCLOSURE FORM

1. Name of the Entity: Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP

Address: 270 Madison Ave

City: New York State/Province/Territory: NY Zip/Postal Code: 10016

Country: US

2. Entity's Vendor Identification Number: [redacted]

3. Type of Business: Partnership (specify)

4. List names and addresses of all principals; that is, all individuals serving on the Board of Directors or comparable body, all partners and limited partners, all corporate officers, all parties of Joint Ventures, and all members and officers of limited liability companies (attach additional sheets if necessary):

No principals have been attached to this form.

5. List names and addresses of all shareholders, members, or partners of the firm. If the shareholder is not an individual, list the individual shareholders/partners/members. If a Publicly held Corporation, include a copy of the 10K in lieu of completing this section.
If none, explain.

Mark Rifkin
Benjamin Kaufman

No shareholders, members, or partners have been attached to this form.

6. List all affiliated and related companies and their relationship to the firm entered on line 1. above (if none, enter "None"). Attach a separate disclosure form for each affiliated or subsidiary company that may take part in the performance of this contract. Such disclosure shall be updated to include affiliated or subsidiary companies not previously disclosed that participate in the performance of the contract.

None

7. List all lobbyists whose services were utilized at any stage in this matter (i.e., pre-bid, bid, post-bid, etc.). If none, enter "None." The term "lobbyist" means any and every person or organization retained, employed or designated by any client to influence - or promote a matter before - Nassau County, its agencies, boards, commissions, department heads, legislators or committees, including but not limited to the Open Space and Parks Advisory Committee and Planning Commission. Such matters include, but are not limited to, requests for proposals, development or improvement of real property subject to County regulation, procurements. The term "lobbyist" does not include any officer, director, trustee, employee, counsel or agent of the County of Nassau, or State of New York, when discharging his or her official duties.

Are there lobbyists involved in this matter?
YES [ ] NO [X]

(a) Name, title, business address and telephone number of lobbyist(s):

(b) Describe lobbying activity of each lobbyist. See below for a complete description of lobbying activities.

(c) List whether and where the person/organization is registered as a lobbyist (e.g., Nassau County, New York State):

8. VERIFICATION: This section must be signed by a principal of the consultant, contractor or Vendor authorized as a signatory of the firm for the purpose of executing Contracts.

The undersigned affirms and so swears that he/she has read and understood the foregoing statements and they are, to his/her knowledge, true and accurate.

Electronically signed and certified at the date and time indicated by:
Mark Rifkin [RIFKIN@WHAFH.COM]

Dated: 12/23/2021 12:45:43 PM

Title: Partner

The term lobbying shall mean any attempt to influence: any determination made by the Nassau County Legislature, or any member thereof, with respect to the introduction, passage, defeat, or substance of any local legislation or resolution; any determination by the County Executive to support, oppose, approve or disapprove any local legislation or resolution, whether or not such legislation has been introduced in the County Legislature; any determination by an elected County official or an officer or employee of the County with respect to the procurement of goods, services or construction, including the preparation of contract specifications, including by not limited to the preparation of requests for proposals, or solicitation, award or administration of a contract or with respect to the solicitation, award or administration of a grant, loan, or agreement involving the disbursement of public monies; any determination made by the County Executive, County Legislature, or by the County of Nassau, its agencies, boards, commissions, department heads or committees, including but not limited to the Open Space and Parks Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, with respect to the zoning, use, development or improvement of real property subject to County regulation, or any agencies, boards, commissions, department heads or committees with respect to requests for proposals, bidding, procurement or contracting for services for the County; any determination made by an elected county official or an officer or employee of the county with respect to the terms of the acquisition or disposition by the county of any interest in real property, with respect to a license or permit for the use of real property of or by the county, or with respect to a franchise, concession or revocable consent; the proposal, adoption, amendment or rejection by an agency of any rule having the force and effect of law; the decision to hold, timing or outcome of any rate making proceeding before an agency; the agenda or any determination of a board or commission; any determination regarding the calendaring or scope of any legislature oversight hearing; the issuance, repeal, modification or substance of a County Executive Order; or any determination made by an elected county official or an officer or employee of the county to support or oppose any state or federal legislation, rule or regulation, including any determination made to support or oppose that is contingent on any amendment of such legislation, rule or regulation, whether or not such legislation has been formally introduced and whether or not such rule or regulation has been formally proposed.

WOLFHAL-01 LSIMS

CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE

DATE (MM/DD/YYYY) 12/22/2021

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW. THIS CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE ISSUING INSURER(S), AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OR PRODUCER, AND THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER.

IMPORTANT: If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must have ADDITIONAL INSURED provisions or be endorsed. If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

PRODUCER	CONTACT NAME: Latifa Sims-Cherry	
Peter Waldor & Associates 220 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Livingston, NJ 07039	PHONE (A/C, No, Ext): (973) 863-2678 115	FAX (A/C, No): (973) 863-2679
	E-MAIL ADDRESS: lsims@pwains.com	
	INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE	NAIC #
	INSURER A : Valley Forge Insurance Company	20508
INSURED	INSURER B : CNA Insurance Company	20443
Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman Herz, LLP 270 Madison Ave., 9th Floor New York, NY 10016	INSURER C :	
	INSURER D :	
	INSURER E :	
	INSURER F :	

COVERAGES **CERTIFICATE NUMBER:** **REVISION NUMBER:**

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

INSR LTR	TYPE OF INSURANCE	ADDL INSD	SUBR WVD	POLICY NUMBER	POLICY EFF (MM/DD/YYYY)	POLICY EXP (MM/DD/YYYY)	LIMITS	
A	X COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY						EACH OCCURRENCE	$ 2,000,000
	CLAIMS-MADE X OCCUR	X		B6025624556	6/1/2021	6/1/2022	DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (Ea occurrence)	$ 1,000,000
							MED EXP (Any one person)	$ 10,000
							PERSONAL & ADV INJURY	$ 2,000,000
	GEN'L AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER:						GENERAL AGGREGATE	$ 4,000,000
	POLICY PRO-JECT X LOC						PRODUCTS - COMP/OP AGG	$ 4,000,000
	OTHER:						HNOA	$ 1,000,000
	AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY						COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (Ea accident)	$
	ANY AUTO						BODILY INJURY (Per person)	$
	OWNED AUTOS ONLY / SCHEDULED AUTOS						BODILY INJURY (Per accident)	$
	HIRED AUTOS ONLY / NON-OWNED AUTOS ONLY						PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident)	$
								$
B	X UMBRELLA LIAB X OCCUR						EACH OCCURRENCE	$ 5,000,000
	EXCESS LIAB CLAIMS-MADE			6074652095	6/1/2021	6/1/2022	AGGREGATE	$ 5,000,000
	DED X RETENTION $ 10,000							$
A	WORKERS COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY						X PER STATUTE OTH-ER	
	ANY PROPRIETOR/PARTNER/EXECUTIVE OFFICER/MEMBER EXCLUDED? Y / N (Mandatory in NH)	N / A		WC625624587	6/1/2021	6/1/2022	E.L. EACH ACCIDENT	$ 1,000,000
	If yes, describe under DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS below						E.L. DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE	$ 1,000,000
							E.L. DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT	$ 1,000,000

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required)

Locations:
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016
111 W Jackson Blvd, Ste 1700 Chicago IL 60604

The certificate holder is included as an additional insured under general liability, as per written contract.

CERTIFICATE HOLDER

Nassau County
Office of the Nassau County Attorney
One West Street
Mineola, NY 11501

CANCELLATION

SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, NOTICE WILL BE DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS.

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

WOLFH-1 OP ID: SS

CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE

DATE (MM/DD/YYYY) 12/27/2021

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW. THIS CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE ISSUING INSURER(S), AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OR PRODUCER, AND THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER.

IMPORTANT: If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must have ADDITIONAL INSURED provisions or be endorsed. If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

PRODUCER Shea Barclay (Tampa) Mike Shea 501 E. Kennedy Blvd, #1000 Tampa, FL 33602 Harrison Tropp 813-251-2580	CONTACT NAME: Harrison Tropp PHONE (A/C, No, Ext): 813-251-2580 FAX (A/C, No): 813-251-2585 E-MAIL ADDRESS: Harrison@sheabarclay.com
	INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE — NAIC #
	INSURER A : Hudson Excess Insurance
INSURED Wolf, Haldenstein, Adler, Freeman & Herz, LLP 270 Madison Ave New York, NY 10016	INSURER B : INSURER C : INSURER D : INSURER E : INSURER F :

COVERAGES **CERTIFICATE NUMBER:** **REVISION NUMBER:**

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

INSR LTR	TYPE OF INSURANCE	ADDL INSD	SUBR WVD	POLICY NUMBER	POLICY EFF (MM/DD/YYYY)	POLICY EXP (MM/DD/YYYY)	LIMITS	
	COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY						EACH OCCURRENCE	$
	CLAIMS-MADE OCCUR						DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (Ea occurrence)	$
							MED EXP (Any one person)	$
							PERSONAL & ADV INJURY	$
	GEN'L AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER:						GENERAL AGGREGATE	$
	POLICY PRO-JECT LOC						PRODUCTS - COMP/OP AGG	$
	OTHER:							$
	AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY						COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (Ea accident)	$
	ANY AUTO						BODILY INJURY (Per person)	$
	OWNED AUTOS ONLY / SCHEDULED AUTOS						BODILY INJURY (Per accident)	$
	HIRED AUTOS ONLY / NON-OWNED AUTOS ONLY						PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident)	$
								$
	UMBRELLA LIAB OCCUR						EACH OCCURRENCE	$
	EXCESS LIAB CLAIMS-MADE						AGGREGATE	$
	DED RETENTION $							$
	WORKERS COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY Y / N						PER STATUTE OTH-ER	
	ANY PROPRIETOR/PARTNER/EXECUTIVE OFFICER/MEMBER EXCLUDED? (Mandatory in NH)	N / A					E.L. EACH ACCIDENT	$
	If yes, describe under DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS below						E.L. DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE	$
							E.L. DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT	$
A	Prof. Liab.			ATL4000842	04/30/2021	04/30/2022	Per Claim	5,000,000
	Deductible			$200,000 PER CLAIM			Aggregate	5,000,000

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required)

CERTIFICATE HOLDER

Nassau County
Office of the Nassau
County Attorney
One West Street
Mineola, NY 11501

CANCELLATION

SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, NOTICE WILL BE DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS.

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE



SPECIAL COUNSEL AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, (together with the schedules, appendices, attachments and exhibits, if any, this "Agreement"), dated as of the date (the "Effective Date") that this Agreement is executed by Nassau County, is entered into by and between (i) Nassau County, a municipal corporation having its principal office at 1550 Franklin Avenue, Mineola, New York 11501 (the "County"), acting for and on behalf of the **Office of the Nassau County Attorney**, having its principal office at One West Street, Mineola, New York 11501 (the "Department"), and (ii) **Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP**, with an office located at 270 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016 ("Counsel" or "Contractor").

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the County desires to hire Counsel to perform the services described in this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Nassau County Charter Section 1101, the County Attorney has determined the need for the employment of special counsel; and

WHEREAS, Counsel is eminently qualified and ready to provide the necessary services;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and mutual covenants contained in this Agreement, the parties agree as follows:

1. Term. This Agreement shall commence on January 29, 2020 and shall terminate upon the completion of services, as hereinafter described, unless sooner terminated in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

2. Services. The services to be provided by Counsel under this Agreement shall consist of the representation of Nassau County related to the class action case assigned to Counsel, entitled: *ERIC BERLINER, ROBERT FINE , MICHAEL ARYEH and JILL PESCE, Individually and On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated v NASSAU COUNTY, NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENT, ASSESSMENT REVIEW COMMISSION, LAURA CURRAN In Her Official Capacity As County Executive, and DAVID F. MOOG In His Official Capacity As County Assessor For Nassau County, Index No. 605904/2019* (the "Services"). Services under this Agreement shall include, but not be limited to, motion practice; pre-trial work; discovery; class certification; motion to dismiss; trial; transactional related issues, and such other Services as may be required to fully represent the County, pre-appeal. When providing such Services, Counsel must comply with Nassau County's Litigation Management Guidelines, as may be amended (the "Guidelines"), provided under separate cover and incorporated by reference herein. Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, such Services shall conclude no earlier than entry of a verdict or a settlement or of a court-order terminating the litigation.

3. Payment. (a) Amount of Consideration. (1) The amount to be paid to Counsel as full consideration for Counsel's Services under this Agreement, including disbursements, shall not exceed the sum of Three Hundred Eighty-Five Thousand Dollars ($385,000.00) ("Maximum Amount"), provided that the parties to this Agreement may agree to increase the Maximum Amount in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Guidelines. Any increase to the Maximum Amount shall be subject to a formal written amendment fully approved and executed by both parties, including approval by the Rules Committee of the County Legislature. Compensation for professional services shall be paid at an

hourly rate according to the following fee schedule:

(i) Partner:	$495.00
(ii) Of Counsel:	$325.00
(ii) Associate:	$280.00
(iii) Paralegal:	$135.00
(iv) Interns:	$35.00

(2) Any appearances before the County Legislature, or any committee thereof for the purpose of the approval of this Agreement or any amendment thereto, are to be construed as part of the fee negotiation and approval process and Counsel agrees that no fee will be charged for any such appearances.

(3) E-Discovery. The amount to be paid to Counsel as full compensation for e-discovery costs and expenses shall not exceed the sum of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00).

(b) Vouchers; Voucher Review, Approval and Audit. Payment shall be made to Counsel in arrears and shall be contingent upon (i) Counsel submitting a claim voucher (the "Voucher") in a form satisfactory to the County, that (a) is accompanied by a contemporaneous record of hours billed stating the person(s) performing the Services and indicating with reasonable specificity, the Services provided and the payment requested in consideration for such Services, or contains a detailed, itemized list of allowable expenses; (b) certifies that the Services rendered and the payment requested are in accordance with this Agreement, and (c) is accompanied by documentation satisfactory to the County supporting the amount claimed, and upon (ii) review, approval and audit of the Voucher by the Department and/or the County Comptroller or his or her duly designated representative (the "Comptroller").

(c) Timing of Payment Claims. Counsel shall submit its claim no later than three (3) months following the County's receipt of the services that are the subject of the claim, and no more frequently than once a month.

(d) Expenses and Disbursement. Counsel shall be compensated within the Maximum Amount for all reasonable expenses and disbursements actually incurred, including but not limited to out-of-pocket disbursements for investigators, trial preparation services, court reporting services, interpreters, and other legitimate expenses in accordance with the Guidelines, except as indicated in Section 3(a)(3) above. Counsel shall obtain prior written approval from the County Attorney or his designee for all non-routine expenses and disbursements as specified in the Guidelines.

(e) No Duplication of Payments. Payments under this Agreement shall not duplicate payments for any work performed or to be performed under other agreements between Counsel and any funding source including the County.

(f) Payments in Connection with Termination or Notice of Termination. Unless a provision of this Agreement expressly states otherwise, payments to Counsel following the termination of this Agreement shall not exceed payments made as consideration for services that were (i) performed prior

to termination, (ii) authorized by this Agreement to be performed, and (iii) not performed after Counsel received notice that the County did not desire to receive such services.

4. Independent Contractor. Counsel is an independent contractor of the County. Counsel shall not, nor shall any officer, director, employee, servant, agent or independent contractor of Counsel (a "Counsel Agent"), be (i) deemed a County employee, (ii) commit the County to any obligation, or (iii) hold itself, himself, or herself out as a County employee or Person with the authority to commit the County to any obligation. As used in this Agreement the word "Person" means any individual person, entity (including partnerships, corporations and limited liability companies), and government or political subdivision thereof (including agencies, bureaus, offices and departments thereof).

5. No Arrears or Default. Counsel is not in arrears to the County upon any debt or contract and it is not in default as surety, contractor, or otherwise upon any obligation to the County, including any obligation to pay taxes to, or perform services for or on behalf of, the County.

6. Compliance with Law. (a) Generally. Counsel shall comply with any and all applicable Federal, State and local Laws, including, but not limited to those relating to conflicts of interest, human rights, a living wage, disclosure of information and vendor registration in connection with its performance under this Agreement. In furtherance of the foregoing, Counsel is bound by and shall comply with the terms of Appendix EE attached hereto and with the County's registration protocol. As used in this Agreement the word "Law" includes any and all statutes, local laws, ordinances, rules, regulations, applicable orders, and/or decrees, as the same may be amended from time to time, enacted, or adopted.

(b) Nassau County Living Wage Law. Pursuant to LL 1-2006, as amended, and to the extent that a waiver has not been obtained in accordance with such law or any rules of the County Executive, Counsel agrees as follows:

(i) Counsel shall comply with the applicable requirements of the Living Wage Law, as amended;

(ii) Failure to comply with the Living Wage Law, as amended, may constitute a material breach of this Agreement, the occurrence of which shall be determined solely by the County. Counsel has the right to cure such breach within thirty days of receipt of notice of breach from the County. In the event that such breach is not timely cured, the County may terminate this Agreement as well as exercise any other rights available to the County under applicable law.

(iii) It shall be a continuing obligation of Counsel to inform the County of any material changes in the content of its certification of compliance, attached to this Agreement as Appendix L, and shall provide to the County any information necessary to maintain the certification's accuracy.

(c) Records Access. The parties acknowledge and agree that all records, information, and data ("Information") acquired in connection with performance or administration of this Agreement remains the sole property of the County and shall be used and disclosed solely for the

purpose of performance and administration of the contract or as required by law. Counsel acknowledges that Counsel Information in the County's possession may be subject to disclosure under Article 6 of the New York State Public Officer's Law ("Freedom of Information Law" or "FOIL"). In the event that such a request for disclosure is made, the County shall make reasonable efforts to notify Counsel of such request prior to disclosure of the Information so that the Counsel may take such action as it deems appropriate.

(d) Prohibition of Gifts. In accordance with County Executive Order 2-2018, Counsel shall not offer, give, or agree to give anything of value to any County employee, agent, consultant, construction manager, or other person or firm representing the County (a "County Representative"), including members of a County Representative's immediate family, in connection with the performance by such County Representative of duties involving transactions with Counsel on behalf of the County, whether such duties are related to this Agreement or any other County contract or matter. As used herein, "anything of value" shall include, but not be limited to, meals, holiday gifts, holiday baskets, gift cards, tickets to golf outings, tickets to sporting events, currency of any kind, or any other gifts, gratuities, favorable opportunities or preferences. For purposes of this subsection, an immediate family member shall include a spouse, child, parent, or sibling. Counsel shall include the provisions of this subsection in each subcontract entered into under this Agreement.

(e) Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest. In accordance with County Executive Order 2-2018, Counsel has disclosed as part of its response to the County's Business History Form, or other disclosure form(s), any and all instances where Counsel employs any spouse, child, or parent of a County employee of the agency or department that contracted or procured the goods and/or services described under this Agreement. Counsel shall have a continuing obligation, as circumstances arise, to update this disclosure throughout the term of this Agreement.

(f) Vendor Code of Ethics. By executing this Agreement, the Contractor hereby certifies and covenants that:

(i) The Contractor has been provided a copy of the Nassau County Vendor Code of Ethics issued on June 5, 2019, as may be amended from time to time (the "Vendor Code of Ethics"), and will comply with all of its provisions;

(ii) All of the Contractor's Participating Employees, as such term is defined in the Vendor Code of Ethics (the "Participating Employees"), have been provided a copy of the Vendor Code of Ethics prior to their participation in the underlying procurement;

(iii) All Participating Employees have completed the acknowledgment required by the Vendor Code of Ethics;

(iv) The Contractor will retain all of the signed Participating Employee acknowledgements for the period it is required to retain other records pertinent to performance under this Agreement;

(v) The Contractor will continue to distribute the Vendor Code of Ethics, obtain signed Participating Employee acknowledgments as new Participating Employees are added or changed during the term of this Agreement, and retain such signed acknowledgments for the period the Contractor is required to retain other records pertinent to performance under this Agreement; and

(vi) The Contractor has obtained the certifications required by the Vendor Code of Ethics from any subcontractors or other lower tier participants who have participated in procurements for work performed under this Agreement.

7. Ownership of Records. All County Information provided to Counsel by the County shall remain the property of the County. All reports, documents or information created by Counsel on behalf of the County shall be deemed the property of the County. Upon the County's request,

completion of Services, or termination of this Agreement, all such County Information, reports, documents or information shall be returned to the County.

8. Service Standards. Regardless of whether required by Law: (a) Counsel shall, and shall cause Counsel Agents to, conduct his or her activities in connection with this Agreement so as not to endanger or harm any Person or property.

(b) Counsel shall deliver Services under this Agreement in a professional manner consistent with the best practices of the legal profession. Counsel shall take all actions necessary or appropriate to meet the obligation described in the immediately preceding sentence, including obtaining and maintaining, and causing all Counsel Agents to obtain and maintain, all approvals, licenses, and certifications ("Approvals") necessary or appropriate in connection with this Agreement.

9. No Conflict Representation. During the term of this Agreement, Counsel shall not represent any party whose interest is or may be adverse to or in conflict with, or whose interest may appear to be adverse to or in conflict with the County, nor shall it commence any action or proceeding, or act as Counsel in any action or proceeding that is adverse to the County or any County officer or employee, without the County's prior written consent.

10. Indemnification; Defense; Cooperation. (a) Counsel shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the County, the Department and its officers, employees, and agents (the "Indemnified Parties") from and against any and all liabilities arising out of or in connection with performance under this Agreement by Counsel or a Counsel Agent, provided, however, that the Counsel shall not be responsible for that portion, if any, of a Loss that is caused by the negligence of the County.

(b) Counsel shall, upon the County's demand and at the County's direction, promptly and diligently defend, at Counsel's own risk and expense, any and all suits, actions, or proceedings which may be brought or instituted against one or more Indemnified Parties for which Counsel is responsible under this Section, and, further to Counsel's indemnification obligations, Counsel shall pay and satisfy any judgment, decree, loss or settlement in connection therewith.

(c) Counsel shall, and shall cause Counsel Agents to, cooperate with the County and the Department in connection with the investigation, defense or prosecution of any action, suit or proceeding in connection with this Agreement, including the acts or omissions of Counsel and/or a Counsel Agent in connection with this Agreement.

(d) The provisions of this Section shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

11. Insurance. (a) Types and Amounts. Counsel shall obtain and maintain throughout the term of this Agreement, at its own expense: (i) one or more policies for commercial general liability insurance, which policy(ies) shall name "Nassau County" as an additional insured and have a minimum single combined limit of liability of not less than One Million Dollars ($1,000,000.00) per occurrence and Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000.00) aggregate coverage, (ii) if contracting in whole or part to provide professional services, one or more policies for professional liability insurance, which policy(ies) shall have a minimum single combined limit of liability of not less than One Million Dollars ($1,000,000.00) per claim (iii) compensation insurance for the benefit of the Counsel's employees ("Workers' Compensation Insurance"), which insurance is in compliance with the New York State Workers' Compensation Law, and (iv) such additional insurance as the County may from time to time specify.

(b) Acceptability; Deductibles; Subcontractors. All insurance obtained and maintained by

Counsel pursuant to this Agreement shall be (i) written by one or more commercial insurance carriers licensed to do business in New York State and acceptable to the County, and which is (ii) in form and substance acceptable to the County. Counsel shall be solely responsible for the payment of all deductibles to which such policies are subject. Counsel shall require any subcontractor hired in connection with this Agreement to carry insurance with the same limits and provisions required to be carried by Counsel under this Agreement.

(c) Delivery; Coverage Change; No Inconsistent Action. Prior to the execution of this Agreement, copies of current certificates of insurance evidencing the insurance coverage required by this Agreement shall be delivered to the Department. Not less than thirty (30) days prior to the date of any expiration or renewal of, or actual, proposed or threatened reduction or cancellation of coverage under, any insurance required hereunder, Counsel shall provide written notice to the Department of the same and deliver to the Department renewal or replacement certificates of insurance. Counsel shall cause all insurance to remain in full force and effect throughout the term of this Agreement and shall not take or omit to take any action that would suspend or invalidate any of the required coverages. The failure of Counsel to maintain Workers' Compensation Insurance shall render this contract void and of no effect. The failure of Counsel to maintain the other required coverages shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement upon which the County reserves the right to consider this Agreement terminated as of the date of such failure.

12. Assignment; Amendment; Waiver; Subcontracting. This Agreement and the rights and obligations hereunder may not be in whole or part (i) assigned, transferred or disposed of, (ii) amended, (iii) waived, or (iv) subcontracted, without the prior written consent of the County Executive or his or her duly designated deputy (the "County Executive"), and any purported assignment, other disposal or modification without such prior written consent shall be null and void. The failure of a party to assert any of its rights under this Agreement, including the right to demand strict performance, shall not constitute a waiver of such rights.

13. Termination. (a) Generally. This Agreement may be terminated (i) for any reason by the County upon thirty (30) days' written notice to Counsel, (ii) for "Cause" by the County immediately upon the receipt by Counsel of written notice of termination, (iii) upon mutual written Agreement of the County and the Counsel, and (iv) in accordance with any other provisions of this Agreement expressly addressing termination.

As used in this Agreement the word "Cause" includes: (i) a breach of this Agreement; (ii) the failure to obtain and maintain in full force and effect all Approvals required for the services described in this Agreement to be legally and professionally rendered; and (iii) the termination or impending termination of federal or state funding for the services to be provided under this Agreement.

(b) By Counsel. This Agreement may be terminated by Counsel if performance becomes impracticable through no fault of the Counsel, where the impracticability relates to Counsel's ability to perform its obligations and not to a judgment as to convenience or the desirability of continued performance. Termination under this subsection shall be effected by Counsel delivering to the commissioner or other head of the Department (the "Commissioner"), at least sixty (60) days prior to the termination date (or a shorter period if sixty days' notice is impossible), a notice stating (i) that Counsel is terminating this Agreement in accordance with this subsection, (ii) the date as of which this Agreement will terminate, and (iii) the facts giving rise to the Counsel's right to terminate under this subsection. A copy of the notice given to the Commissioner shall be given to the Deputy County Executive who oversees the administration of the Department (the "Applicable DCE") on the same day that notice is given to the Commissioner.

(c) Counsel Assistance upon Termination. In connection with the termination or impending termination of this Agreement the Counsel shall, regardless of the reason for termination, take all actions reasonably requested by the County (including those set forth in other provisions of this Agreement) to assist the County in transitioning Counsel's responsibilities under this Agreement. The provisions of this subsection shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

14. Accounting Procedures; Records. The Contractor shall maintain and retain, for a period of six (6) years following the later of termination of or final payment under this Agreement, complete and accurate records, documents, accounts and other evidence, whether maintained electronically or manually ("Records"), pertinent to performance under this Agreement. Records shall be maintained in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and, if the Contractor is a non-profit entity, must comply with the accounting guidelines set forth in the applicable provisions of the Code of Federal Regulations, 2 C.F.R. Part 200, as may be amended. Such Records shall at all times be available for audit and inspection by the Comptroller, the Department, any other governmental authority with jurisdiction over the provision of services hereunder and/or the payment therefore, and any of their duly designated representatives. The provisions of this Section shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

15. Limitations on Actions and Special Proceedings against the County. No action or special proceeding shall lie or be prosecuted or maintained against the County upon any claims arising out of or in connection with this Agreement unless:

(a) Notice. At least thirty (30) days prior to seeking relief, Counsel shall have presented the demand or claim(s) upon which such action or special proceeding is based in writing to the Applicable DCE for adjustment and the County shall have neglected or refused to make an adjustment or payment on the demand or claim for thirty (30) days after presentment. Counsel shall send or deliver copies of the documents presented to the Applicable DCE under this Section to each of (i) the Department and the (ii) the County Attorney (at the address specified above for the County) on the same day that documents are sent or delivered to the Applicable DCE. The complaint or necessary moving papers of Counsel shall allege that the above-described actions and inactions preceded Counsel's action or special proceeding against the County.

(b) Time Limitation. Such action or special proceeding is commenced within the earlier of (i) one (1) year of the first to occur of (A) final payment under or the termination of this Agreement, and (B) the accrual of the cause of action, and (ii) the time specified in any other provision of this Agreement.

16. Work Performance Liability. The Counsel is and shall remain primarily liable for the successful completion of all work in accordance this Agreement irrespective of whether the Counsel is using a Counsel Agent to perform some or all of the work contemplated by this Agreement, and irrespective of whether the use of such Counsel Agent has been approved by the County.

17. Consent to Jurisdiction and Venue; Governing Law. Unless otherwise specified in this Agreement or required by Law, exclusive original jurisdiction for all claims or actions with respect to this Agreement shall be in the Supreme Court in Nassau County in New York State and the parties expressly waive any objections to the same on any grounds, including venue and forum non conveniens. This Agreement is intended as a contract under, and shall be governed and construed in accordance with, the Laws of New York State, without regard to the conflict of laws provisions thereof.

18. Notices. Any notice, request, demand or other communication required to be given or made in connection with this Agreement shall be (a) in writing, (b) delivered or sent (i) by hand

delivery, evidenced by a signed, dated receipt, (ii) postage prepaid via certified mail, return receipt requested, or (iii) overnight delivery via a nationally recognized courier service, (c) deemed given or made on the date the delivery receipt was signed by a County employee, three (3) business days after it is mailed or one (1) business day after it is released to a courier service, as applicable, and (d)(i) if to the Department, to the attention of the Commissioner at the address specified above for the Department, (ii) if to an Applicable DCE, to the attention of the Applicable DCE (whose name Counsel shall obtain from the Department) at the address specified above for the County, (iii) if to the Comptroller, to the attention of the Comptroller at 240 Old Country Road, Mineola, NY 11501, and (iv) if to Counsel, to the attention of the person who executed this Agreement on behalf of Counsel at the address specified above for Counsel, or in each case to such other persons or addresses as shall be designated by written notice.

19. All Legal Provisions Deemed Included; Severability; Supremacy. (a) Every provision required by Law to be inserted into or referenced by this Agreement is intended to be a part of this Agreement. If any such provision is not inserted or referenced or is not inserted or referenced in correct form then (i) such provision shall be deemed inserted into or referenced by this Agreement for purposes of interpretation and (ii) upon the application of either party this Agreement shall be formally amended to comply strictly with the Law, without prejudice to the rights of either party.

(b) In the event that any provision of this Agreement shall be held to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable, the validity, legality and enforceability of the remaining provisions shall not in any way be affected or impaired thereby.

(c) Unless the application of this subsection will cause a provision required by Law to be excluded from this Agreement, in the event of an actual conflict between the terms and conditions set forth above the signature page to this Agreement and those contained in any schedule, exhibit, appendix, or attachment to this Agreement, the terms and conditions set forth above the signature page shall control. To the extent possible, all the terms of this Agreement should be read together as not conflicting.

(d) Each party has cooperated in the negotiation and preparation of this Agreement. Therefore, in the event that construction of this Agreement occurs, it shall not be construed against either party as drafter.

20. Section and Other Headings. The section and other headings contained in this Agreement are for reference purposes only and shall not affect the meaning or interpretation of this Agreement.

21. Administrative Service Charge. Counsel agrees to pay the County an administrative service charge of Five Hundred Thirty-three Dollars ($533.00) for the processing of this Agreement pursuant to Ordinance Number 74-1979, as amended by Ordinance Numbers 201-2001, 128-2006, and 153-2018. The administrative service charge shall be due and payable to the County by Counsel upon signing this Agreement.

22. Executory Clause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement:

(a) Approval and Execution. The County shall have no liability under this Agreement (including any extension or other modification of this Agreement) to any Person unless (i) all requisite County and other governmental approvals have been obtained, including, if required, approval by the County Legislature and (ii) this Agreement has been executed by the County Executive (as defined in this Agreement).

(b) Availability of Funds. The County shall have no liability under this Agreement (including any extension or other modification of this Agreement) to any Person beyond funds appropriated or otherwise lawfully available for this Agreement, and, if any portion of the funds for this Agreement are from the state and/or federal governments, then beyond funds available to the County from the state and/or federal governments.

(c) NIFA Approval. County contracts with a Maximum Amount equal to or greater than Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00) require the approval of the Nassau County Interim Finance Authority ("NIFA") during the control period declared by NIFA on January 26, 2011, with limited exceptions. NIFA also requires that when the aggregate of contracts issued to a particular vendor for the provision of similar services is equal to or greater than $50,000 in any 12-month period they be subject to NIFA approval even if each individual contract is less than $50,000. NIFA has advised the County that NIFA's approval is subject, among other things, to the following limitation: payment to Counsel under this Agreement for Services, including related expenses and disbursements, rendered prior to the later of (i) the date of NIFA approval or (ii) full execution of the Agreement (such date, the "Approval Date") shall not exceed the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00). Counsel therefore acknowledges that charges incurred over Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00) prior to the Approval Date shall not be approved by NIFA, and shall not be paid by the County, unless NIFA makes an exception to its policy. Accordingly, to mitigate against exposure, Counsel shall provide the following notice to the Department:

(A) If Counsel anticipates incurring costs in excess of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00) prior to the Approval Date, Counsel shall provide written notice to the Department at least Forty-five (45) days prior to the date on which Counsel anticipates reaching the Fifty Thousand Dollar ($50,000.00) cap.

(B) If Counsel has reached or anticipates reaching the Fifty Thousand Dollar ($50,000.00) cap prior to the Approval Date, and in less than Forty-five (45) days, Counsel shall provide the Department with immediate written notice.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Department will review and advise Counsel of the Department's intended course of action, which, in appropriate cases as determined by the Department, may include seeking a waiver from NIFA.

23. Entire Agreement. This Agreement represents the full and entire understanding and agreement between the parties with regard to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior agreements (whether written or oral) of the parties relating to the subject matter of this Agreement.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank.]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement of the dates appearing below their respective signatures.

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP

By: _____

Name: Mark C. Rifkin

Title: Partner

Date: June 29, 2020

NASSAU COUNTY

By: _____

Name: Joey Kaltchas

Title: County Attorney

Date: 7/6/20

NASSAU COUNTY

By: _____

Name: Helena Williams

Title: County Executive

☐ Deputy County Executive

Date: 3/15/21

PLEASE EXECUTE IN BLUE INK

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF NASSAU)

On the 30th day of June in the year 2020 before me personally came Mark C. Rifkin to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he or she resides in the County of New York; that he or she is the Partner of Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz, the corporation described herein and which executed the above instrument; and that he or she signed his or her name thereto by authority of the board of directors of said corporation.

NOTARY PUBLIC

GREGG M. WEISS
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 4783335
Qualified in Nassau County
Certificate Filed in New York County
Commission Expires Sept. 30, 20 21

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF NASSAU)

On the 6th day of July in the year 2020 before me personally came **Jared A. Kasschau** to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he or she resides in the County of Nassau; that he or she is the **Nassau County Attorney**, the municipal corporation described herein and which executed the above instrument; and that he or she signed his or her name thereto pursuant to Law, including Nassau County Charter Section 1101.

NOTARY PUBLIC

MARY J. NORI
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF NEW YORK
Registration No. 02NO6266941
Qualified in Nassau County
Commission Expires August 6, ~~2016~~ 2020

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF NASSAU)

On the 15 day of March in the year 2021 before me personally came Helena Williams to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he or she resides in the County of Nassau; that he or she is a **County Executive of the County of Nassau**, the municipal corporation described herein and which executed the above instrument; and that he or she signed his or her name thereto pursuant to Section 205 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

NOTARY PUBLIC

LAURA J VIGLIOTTI
NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF NEW YORK
LIC. #01VI6190782
COMM. EXP. 08/04/2021
COMMISSIONED IN NASS COUNTY

Appendix EE
Equal Employment Opportunities for Minorities and Women

The provisions of this Appendix EE are hereby made a part of the document to which it is attached.

The Contractor shall comply with all federal, State and local statutory and constitutional anti-discrimination provisions. In addition, Local Law No. 14-2002, entitled "Participation by Minority Group Members and Women in Nassau County Contracts," governs all County Contracts as defined herein and solicitations for bids or proposals for County Contracts. In accordance with Local Law 14-2002:

(a) The Contractor shall not discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, age, disability or marital status in recruitment, employment, job assignments, promotions, upgradings, demotions, transfers, layoffs, terminations, and rates of pay or other forms of compensation. The Contractor will undertake or continue existing programs related to recruitment, employment, job assignments, promotions, upgradings, transfers, and rates of pay or other forms of compensation to ensure that minority group members and women are afforded equal employment opportunities without discrimination.

(b) At the request of the County contracting agency, the Contractor shall request each employment agency, labor union, or authorized representative of workers with which it has a collective bargaining or other agreement or understanding, to furnish a written statement that such employment agency, union, or representative will not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, or marital status and that such employment agency, labor union, or representative will affirmatively cooperate in the implementation of the Contractor's obligations herein.

(c) The Contractor shall state, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees, that, in the performance of the County Contract, all qualified applicants will be afforded equal employment opportunities without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, age, disability or marital status.

(d) The Contractor shall make best efforts to solicit active participation by certified minority or women-owned business enterprises ("Certified M/WBEs") as defined in Section 101 of Local Law No. 14-2002, for the purpose of granting of Subcontracts.

(e) The Contractor shall, in its advertisements and solicitations for Subcontractors, indicate its interest in receiving bids from Certified M/WBEs and the requirement that Subcontractors must be equal opportunity employers.

(f) Contractors must notify and receive approval from the respective Department Head prior to issuing any Subcontracts and, at the time of requesting such authorization, must submit a signed Best Efforts Checklist.

(g) Contractors for projects under the supervision of the County's Department of Public Works shall also submit a utilization plan listing all proposed Subcontractors so that, to the greatest extent feasible, all Subcontractors will be approved prior to commencement of work. Any additions or changes to the list of subcontractors under the utilization plan shall be approved by the Commissioner of the Department of Public Works when made. A copy of the utilization plan any additions or changes thereto shall be submitted by the Contractor to the Office of Minority Affairs simultaneously with the submission to the Department of Public Works.

(h) At any time after Subcontractor approval has been requested and prior to being granted, the contracting agency may require the Contractor to submit Documentation Demonstrating Best Efforts to Obtain Certified Minority or Women-owned Business Enterprises. In addition, the contracting agency may require the Contractor to submit such documentation at any time after Subcontractor approval when the contracting agency has reasonable cause to believe that the existing Best Efforts Checklist may be inaccurate. Within ten working days (10) of any such request by the contracting agency, the Contractor must submit Documentation.

(i) In the case where a request is made by the contracting agency or a Deputy County Executive acting on behalf of the contracting agency, the Contractor must, within two (2) working days of such request, submit evidence to demonstrate that it employed Best Efforts to obtain Certified M/WBE participation through proper documentation.

(j) Award of a County Contract alone shall not be deemed or interpreted as approval of all Contractor's Subcontracts and Contractor's fulfillment of Best Efforts to obtain participation by Certified M/WBEs.

(k) A Contractor shall maintain Documentation Demonstrating Best Efforts to Obtain Certified Minority or Women-owned Business Enterprises for a period of six (6) years. Failure to maintain such records shall be deemed failure to make Best Efforts to comply with this Appendix EE, evidence of false certification as M/WBE compliant or considered breach of the County Contract.

(l) The Contractor shall be bound by the provisions of Section 109 of Local Law No. 14-2002 providing for enforcement of violations as follows:

a. Upon receipt by the Executive Director of a complaint from a contracting agency

that a County Contractor has failed to comply with the provisions of Local Law No. 14-2002, this Appendix EE or any other contractual provisions included in furtherance of Local Law No. 14-2002, the Executive Director will try to resolve the matter.

b. If efforts to resolve such matter to the satisfaction of all parties are unsuccessful, the Executive Director shall refer the matter, within thirty days (30) of receipt of the complaint, to the American Arbitration Association for proceeding thereon.

c. Upon conclusion of the arbitration proceedings, the arbitrator shall submit to the Executive Director his recommendations regarding the imposition of sanctions, fines or penalties. The Executive Director shall either (i) adopt the recommendation of the arbitrator (ii) determine that no sanctions, fines or penalties should be imposed or (iii) modify the recommendation of the arbitrator, provided that such modification shall not expand upon any sanction recommended or impose any new sanction, or increase the amount of any recommended fine or penalty. The Executive Director, within ten days (10) of receipt of the arbitrators award and recommendations, shall file a determination of such matter and shall cause a copy of such determination to be served upon the respondent by personal service or by certified mail return receipt requested. The award of the arbitrator, and the fines and penalties imposed by the Executive Director, shall be final determinations and may only be vacated or modified as provided in the civil practice law and rules ("CPLR").

(m) The contractor shall provide contracting agency with information regarding all subcontracts awarded under any County Contract, including the amount of compensation paid to each Subcontractor and shall complete all forms provided by the Executive Director or the Department Head relating to subcontractor utilization and efforts to obtain M/WBE participation.

Failure to comply with provisions (a) through (m) above, as ultimately determined by the Executive Director, shall be a material breach of the contract constituting grounds for immediate termination. Once a final determination of failure to comply has been reached by the Executive Director, the determination of whether to terminate a contract shall rest with the Deputy County Executive with oversight responsibility for the contracting agency.

Provisions (a), (b) and (c) shall not be binding upon Contractors or Subcontractors in the performance of work or the provision of services or any other activity that are unrelated, separate, or distinct from the County Contract as expressed by its terms.

The requirements of the provisions (a), (b) and (c) shall not apply to any employment or application for employment outside of this County or solicitations or advertisements therefor or any existing programs of affirmative action regarding employment outside of this County and the effect of contract provisions required by these provisions (a), (b) and (c) shall be so limited.

The Contractor shall include provisions (a), (b) and (c) in every Subcontract in such a manner that these provisions shall be binding upon each Subcontractor as to work in connection with the County Contract.

As used in this Appendix EE the term "Best Efforts Checklist" shall mean a list signed by the Contractor, listing the procedures it has undertaken to procure Subcontractors in accordance with this Appendix EE.

As used in this Appendix EE the term "County Contract" shall mean (i) a written agreement or purchase order instrument, providing for a total expenditure in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000), whereby a County contracting agency is committed to expend or does expend funds in return for labor, services, supplies, equipment, materials or any combination of the foregoing, to be performed for, or rendered or furnished to the County; or (ii) a written agreement in excess of one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000), whereby a County contracting agency is committed to expend or does expend funds for the acquisition, construction, demolition, replacement, major repair or renovation of real property and improvements thereon. However, the term "County Contract" does not include agreements or orders for the following services: banking services, insurance policies or contracts, or contracts with a County contracting agency for the sale of bonds, notes or other securities.

As used in this Appendix EE the term "County Contractor" means an individual, business enterprise, including sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, not-for-profit corporation, or any other person or entity other than the County, whether a contractor, licensor, licensee or any other party, that is (i) a party to a County Contract, (ii) a bidder in connection with the award of a County Contract, or (iii) a proposed party to a County Contract, but shall not include any Subcontractor.

As used in this Appendix EE the term "County Contractor" shall mean a person or firm who will manage and be responsible for an entire contracted project.

As used in this Appendix EE "Documentation Demonstrating Best Efforts to Obtain Certified Minority or Women-owned Business Enterprises" shall include, but is not limited to the following:

a. Proof of having advertised for bids, where appropriate, in minority publications, trade newspapers/notices and magazines, trade and union publications, and publications of general circulation in Nassau County and surrounding areas or having verbally solicited M/WBEs whom the County Contractor reasonably believed might have the qualifications to do the work. A copy of the advertisement, if used, shall be included to demonstrate that it contained language indicating that the County Contractor welcomed bids and quotes from M/WBE Subcontractors. In addition, proof of the date(s) any such advertisements appeared must be included in the Best Effort Documentation. If verbal solicitation is used, a County Contractor's affidavit with a notary's signature and stamp shall be required as part of the documentation.

b. Proof of having provided reasonable time for M/WBE Subcontractors to respond to bid opportunities according to industry norms and standards. A chart outlining

the schedule/time frame used to obtain bids from M/WBEs is suggested to be included with the Best Effort Documentation

c. Proof or affidavit of follow-up of telephone calls with potential M/WBE subcontractors encouraging their participation. Telephone logs indicating such action can be included with the Best Effort Documentation

d. Proof or affidavit that M/WBE Subcontractors were allowed to review bid specifications, blue prints and all other bid/RFP related items at no charge to the M/WBEs, other than reasonable documentation costs incurred by the County Contractor that are passed onto the M/WBE.

e. Proof or affidavit that sufficient time prior to making award was allowed for M/WBEs to participate effectively, to the extent practicable given the timeframe of the County Contract.

f. Proof or affidavit that negotiations were held in good faith with interested M/WBEs, and that M/WBEs were not rejected as unqualified or unacceptable without sound business reasons based on (1) a thorough investigation of M/WBE qualifications and capabilities reviewed against industry custom and standards and (2) cost of performance The basis for rejecting any M/WBE deemed unqualified by the County Contractor shall be included in the Best Effort Documentation

g. If an M/WBE is rejected based on cost, the County Contractor must submit a list of all sub-bidders for each item of work solicited and their bid prices for the work.

h. The conditions of performance expected of Subcontractors by the County Contractor must also be included with the Best Effort Documentation

i. County Contractors may include any other type of documentation they feel necessary to further demonstrate their Best Efforts regarding their bid documents.

As used in this Appendix EE the term "Executive Director" shall mean the Executive Director of the Nassau County Office of Minority Affairs; provided, however, that Executive Director shall include a designee of the Executive Director except in the case of final determinations issued pursuant to Section (a) through (l) of these rules.

As used in this Appendix EE the term "Subcontract" shall mean an agreement consisting of part or parts of the contracted work of the County Contractor.

As used in this Appendix EE, the term "Subcontractor" shall mean a person or firm who performs part or parts of the contracted work of a prime contractor providing services, including construction services, to the County pursuant to a county contract. Subcontractor shall include a

person or firm that provides labor, professional or other services, materials or supplies to a prime contractor that are necessary for the prime contractor to fulfill its obligations to provide services to the County pursuant to a county contract. Subcontractor shall not include a supplier of materials to a contractor who has contracted to provide goods but no services to the County, nor a supplier of incidental materials to a contractor, such as office supplies, tools and other items of nominal cost that are utilized in the performance of a service contract.

Provisions requiring contractors to retain or submit documentation of best efforts to utilize certified subcontractors and requiring Department head approval prior to subcontracting shall not apply to inter-governmental agreements. In addition, the tracking of expenditures of County dollars by not-for-profit corporations, other municipalities, States, or the federal government is not required.

Appendix L

Certificate of Compliance

In compliance with Local Law 1-2006, as amended (the "Law"), Counsel hereby certifies the following:

1. The chief executive officer of Contractor is:

   Mark C. Rifkin (Name)

   270 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016 (Address)

   212-545-4600 (Telephone Number)

2. The Contractor agrees to either (1) comply with the requirements of the Nassau County Living Wage Law or (2) as applicable, obtain a waiver of the requirements of the Law pursuant to section 9 of the Law. In the event that the Contractor does not comply with the requirements of the Law or obtain a waiver of the requirements of the Law, and such Contractor establishes to the satisfaction of the Department that at the time of execution of this Agreement, it had a reasonable certainty that it would receive such waiver based on the Law and Rules pertaining to waivers, the County will agree to terminate the contract without imposing costs or seeking damages against the Contractor

3. In the past five years, Contractor _____ has _X_ has not been found by a court or a government agency to have violated federal, state, or local laws regulating payment of wages or benefits, labor relations, or occupational safety and health. If a violation has been assessed against the Contractor, describe below:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. In the past five years, an administrative proceeding, investigation, or government body-

initiated judicial action _____ has __X__ has not been commenced against or relating to the Contractor in connection with federal, state, or local laws regulating payment of wages or benefits, labor relations, or occupational safety and health. If such a proceeding, action, or investigation has been commenced, describe below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Contractor agrees to permit access to work sites and relevant payroll records by authorized County representatives for the purpose of monitoring compliance with the Living Wage Law and investigating employee complaints of noncompliance.

I hereby certify that I have read the foregoing statement and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct and complete. Any statement or representation made herein shall be accurate and true as of the date stated below.

July 6, 2020
Dated

Signature of Chief Executive Officer

Mark C. Rifkin
Name of Chief Executive Officer

Sworn to before me this
6 day of August, 2020

Notary Public

GREGG M. WEISS
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 4783335
Qualified in Nassau County
Certificate Filed in New York County
Commission Expires Sept. 30, 2024