

1 Laurence M. Rosen, Esq. (SBN 219683)
2 **THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.**
3 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2450
4 Los Angeles, CA 90071
5 Telephone: (213) 785-2610
6 Facsimile: (213) 226-4684
7 Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

8 Counsel for Plaintiff

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 ELVIS ALVIRA, Individually and on
11 behalf of all others similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 INTEL CORPORATION, BRIAN M.
15 KRZANICH, and ROBERT H. SWAN,

16 Defendants.
17
18

Case No:

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATIONS OF THE FEDERAL
SECURITIES LAWS**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

19
20 Plaintiff Elvis Alvira (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other
21 persons similarly situated, by Plaintiff’s undersigned attorneys, for Plaintiff’s
22 complaint against Defendants (defined below), alleges the following based upon
23 personal knowledge as to Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s own acts, and information and
24 belief as to all other matters, based upon, inter alia, the investigation conducted by
25 and through Plaintiff’s attorneys, which included, among other things, a review of
26 the defendants’ public documents, conference calls and announcements made by
27 defendants, United States Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) filings,
28 wire and press releases published by and regarding Intel Corporation (“Intel” or the

1 “Company”), analysts’ reports and advisories about the Company, and information
2 readily obtainable on the Internet. Plaintiff believes that substantial evidentiary
3 support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity
4 for discovery.

5 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

6 1. This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of
7 all persons and entities other than Defendants who purchased or otherwise acquired
8 the publicly traded securities of Intel between July 27, 2017 and January 4, 2018,
9 both dates inclusive (the “Class Period”). Plaintiff seeks to recover compensable
10 damages caused by Defendants’ violations of the federal securities laws and to pursue
11 remedies under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the
12 “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder.

13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 2. The claims asserted herein arise under and pursuant to §§10(b) and 20(a)
15 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §§78j(b) and §78t(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated
16 thereunder by the SEC (17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5).

17 3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under
18 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §27 of the Exchange Act.

19 4. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to §27 of the Exchange
20 Act (15 U.S.C. §78aa) and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) as Defendants conduct business in this
21 Judicial District.

22 5. In connection with the acts, conduct and other wrongs alleged in this
23 Complaint, Defendants, directly or indirectly, used the means and instrumentalities of
24 interstate commerce, including but not limited to, the United States mail, interstate
25 telephone communications and the facilities of the national securities exchange.
26
27
28

PARTIES

1
2 6. Plaintiff, as set forth in the accompanying Certification, purchased Intel
3 securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon
4 the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures.

5 7. Defendant Intel designs, manufactures, and sells computer, networking,
6 and communications platforms worldwide. The Company is incorporated in Delaware
7 and its principal executive offices are located at 2200 Mission College Blvd., Santa
8 Clara, California. Intel’s common stock is traded on the NASDAQ Global Select
9 Market (“NASDAQ”) under the ticker symbol “INTC.”

10 8. Defendant Brian M. Krzanich (“Krzanich”) has been the Chief
11 Executive Officer (“CEO”) of Intel since May 16, 2013.

12 9. Defendant Robert H. Swan (“Swan”) has been Chief Financial Officer
13 (“CFO”) and Executive Vice President of Intel since October 10, 2016.

14 10. Defendants Krzanich and Swan are sometimes referred to herein as the
15 “Individual Defendants.”

16 11. Each of the Individual Defendants:

- 17 (a) directly participated in the management of the Company;
- 18 (b) was directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the Company at the
19 highest levels;
- 20 (c) was privy to confidential proprietary information concerning the
21 Company and its business and operations;
- 22 (d) was directly or indirectly involved in drafting, producing, reviewing
23 and/or disseminating the false and misleading statements and
24 information alleged herein;
- 25 (e) was directly or indirectly involved in the oversight or implementation of
26 the Company’s internal controls;

1 (f) was aware of or recklessly disregarded the fact that the false and
2 misleading statements were being issued concerning the Company;
3 and/or

4 (g) approved or ratified these statements in violation of the federal securities
5 laws.

6 12. The Company is liable for the acts of the Individual Defendants and its
7 employees under the doctrine of *respondeat superior* and common law principles of
8 agency because all of the wrongful acts complained of herein were carried out within
9 the scope of their employment.

10 13. The scienter of the Individual Defendants and other employees and
11 agents of the Company is similarly imputed to the Company under *respondeat*
12 *superior* and agency principles.

13 14. The Company and the Individual Defendants are referred to herein,
14 collectively, as the “Defendants.”

15 **SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS**

16 **Materially False and Misleading Statements**

17 15. On July 27, 2017, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended
18 July 1, 2017 (the “2Q 2017 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s
19 second quarter 2017 financial results and position. The 2Q 2017 10-Q stated that the
20 Company’s disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of July 1, 2017, and
21 that “[t]here were no changes to our internal control over financial reporting (as
22 defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act) that occurred
23 during the quarter ended July 1, 2017 that have materially affected, or are reasonably
24 likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.” The 2Q
25 2017 10-Q was signed by Defendant Swan. The 2Q 2017 10-Q contained signed
26 certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) by Defendants
27 Krzanich and Swan attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of
28

1 any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting,
2 and the disclosure of all fraud.

3 16. The 2Q 2017 10-Q discussed Intel’s microprocessor and chipset, stating
4 in pertinent part:

5
6 We offer platforms that incorporate various components and
7 technologies, including a microprocessor and chipset, a stand-alone
8 System-on-Chip, or a multichip package.

9 17. On October 26, 2017, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter
10 ended September 30, 2017 (the “3Q 2017 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the
11 Company’s third quarter 2017 financial results and position. The 3Q 2017 10-Q
12 stated that the Company’s disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of
13 September 30, 2017, and that “[t]here were no changes to our internal control over
14 financial reporting (as defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange
15 Act) that occurred during the quarter ended September 30, 2017 that have materially
16 affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over
17 financial reporting.” The 3Q 2017 10-Q was signed by Defendant Swan. The 3Q
18 2017 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Krzanich and Swan
19 attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material
20 changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the
21 disclosure of all fraud.

22 18. The 3Q 2017 10-Q discussed Intel’s microprocessor and chipset, stating
23 in pertinent part:

24
25 We offer platforms that incorporate various components and
26 technologies, including a microprocessor and chipset, a stand-alone
27 System-on-Chip, or a multichip package.
28

1 19. The statements referenced in ¶¶15-18 above were materially false and/or
2 misleading because they misrepresented and failed to disclose the following adverse
3 facts pertaining to the Company’s business, operational and financial results, which
4 were known to Defendants or recklessly disregarded by them. Specifically,
5 Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1)
6 there is a fundamental design flaw in Intel’s processor chips as they contain a feature
7 that makes them vulnerable to hacking; (2) updates to fix the problems in Intel’s
8 processor chips could cause Intel chips to operate 5-30 percent more slowly; and (3)
9 as a result, Defendants’ public statements were materially false and misleading at all
10 relevant times.

11 **The Truth Emerges**

12 20. On January 2, 2018, during aftermarket hours, *The Register* published an
13 article titled, “Kernel-memory-leaking Intel processor design flaw forces Linux,
14 Windows redesign,” stating that there is a “fundamental design flaw in Intel’s
15 processor chips” and updates to fix the problems could cause Intel chips to operate 5-
16 30 percent more slowly, stating in pertinent part:

17 **Kernel-memory-leaking Intel processor design flaw forces Linux,**
18 **Windows redesign**

19 **Speed hits loom, other OSes need fixes**

20 By John Leyden and Chris Williams 2 Jan 2018 at 19:29

21 **Final update** A fundamental design flaw in Intel's processor chips has
22 forced a significant redesign of the Linux and Windows kernels to
23 defang the chip-level security bug.
24

25 Programmers are scrambling to overhaul the open-source Linux
26 kernel's virtual memory system. Meanwhile, Microsoft is expected to
27 publicly introduce the necessary changes to its Windows operating
28 system in an upcoming Patch Tuesday: these changes were seeded to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

beta testers running fast-ring Windows Insider builds in November and December.

Crucially, these updates to both Linux and Windows will incur a performance hit on Intel products. The effects are still being benchmarked, however we're looking at a ballpark figure of five to 30 per cent slow down, depending on the task and the processor model. More recent Intel chips have features – such as PCID – to reduce the performance hit. Your mileage may vary.

* * *

Impact

It is understood the bug is present in modern Intel processors produced in the past decade. It allows normal user programs – from database applications to JavaScript in web browsers – to discern to some extent the layout or contents of protected kernel memory areas.

* * *

These KPTI patches move the kernel into a completely separate address space, so it's not just invisible to a running process, it's not even there at all. Really, this shouldn't be needed, but clearly there is a flaw in Intel's silicon that allows kernel access protections to be bypassed in some way.

The downside to this separation is that it is relatively expensive, time wise, to keep switching between two separate address spaces for every system call and for every interrupt from the hardware. These context switches do not happen instantly, and they force the processor to dump cached data and reload information from memory. This increases the kernel's overhead, and slows down the computer.

Your Intel-powered machine will run slower as a result.

21. On January 3, 2018, Intel published an article on its website titled, “Intel Responds to Security Research Findings,” confirming that its chips contain a feature that makes them vulnerable to hacking, stating in pertinent part:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Intel Responds to Security Research Findings

January 3, 2018

Intel and other technology companies have been made aware of new security research describing software analysis methods that, when used for malicious purposes, have the potential to improperly gather sensitive data from computing devices that are operating as designed.

22. On January 3, 2018, *Reuters* published an article titled, “Security flaws put virtually all phones, computers at risk,” stating that Intel’s CEO, Defendant Krzanich, said “Google researchers told Intel of the flaws ‘a while ago,’” stating in pertinent part:

#CYBER RISK JANUARY 3, 2018 / 10:31 AM

Security flaws put virtually all phones, computers at risk

FRANKFURT/SAN FRANCISCO (Reuters) - Security researchers on Wednesday disclosed a set of security flaws that they said could let hackers steal sensitive information from nearly every modern computing device containing chips from Intel Corp, Advanced Micro Devices Inc and ARM Holdings.

One of the bugs is specific to Intel but another affects laptops, desktop computers, smartphones, tablets and internet servers alike. Intel and ARM insisted that the issue was not a design flaw, but it will require users to download a patch and update their operating system to fix.

“Phones, PCs, everything are going to have some impact, but it’ll vary from product to product,” Intel CEO Brian Krzanich said in an interview with CNBC Wednesday afternoon.

Researchers with Alphabet Inc’s Google Project Zero, in conjunction with academic and industry researchers from several countries, discovered two flaws.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

The first, called Meltdown, affects Intel chips and lets hackers bypass the hardware barrier between applications run by users and the computer’s memory, potentially letting hackers read a computer’s memory and steal passwords. The second, called Spectre, affects chips from Intel, AMD and ARM and lets hackers potentially trick otherwise error-free applications into giving up secret information.

* * *

Speaking on CNBC, Intel’s Krzanich said Google researchers told Intel of the flaws “a while ago” and that Intel had been testing fixes that device makers who use its chips will push out next week. Before the problems became public, Google on its blog said Intel and others planned to disclose the issues on Jan. 9. Google said it informed the affected companies about the “Spectre” flaw on June 1, 2017 and reported the “Meltdown” flaw after the first flaw but before July 28, 2017.

The flaws were first reported by tech publication The Register. It also reported that the updates to fix the problems could causes Intel chips to operate 5 percent to 30 percent more slowly. (bit.ly/2CsRxxkj)
[Emphasis added].

23. On this news, shares of Intel fell \$1.59 per share, or over 3.5%, from its previous closing price to close at \$45.26 per share on January 3, 2018, damaging investors.

24. Then, on January 4, 2018, news outlets reported that Intel’s CEO, Defendant Krzanich, sold millions of dollars worth of shares after Intel was informed of vulnerabilities in its semiconductors but before it was publicly disclosed. Defendant Krzanich sold about half his stock months after he learned about critical flaws in billions of Intel’s microchips, but before it was publicly disclosed, and now holds only the minimum number of shares he’s required to own.

25. On this news, shares of Intel fell \$0.83 per share from its previous closing price to close at \$44.43 per share on January 4, 2018, damaging investors.

1 26. As a result of Defendants' wrongful acts and omissions, and the
2 precipitous decline in the market value of the Company's securities, Plaintiff and
3 other Class members have suffered significant losses and damages.

4 **PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

5 27. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of
6 Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a Class, consisting of all those who
7 purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of Intel during the
8 Class Period (the "Class"); and were damaged upon the revelation of the alleged
9 corrective disclosures. Excluded from the Class are Defendants herein, the officers
10 and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate
11 families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in
12 which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

13 28. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is
14 impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, Intel securities were actively traded on
15 the NASDAQ. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at
16 this time and can be ascertained only through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believes
17 that there are hundreds or thousands of members in the proposed Class. Record
18 owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by
19 the Company or its transfer agent and may be notified of the pendency of this action
20 by mail, using the form of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class
21 actions.

22 29. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as
23 all members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in
24 violation of federal law that is complained of herein.

25 30. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members
26 of the Class and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class and
27 securities litigation. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to or in conflict with those
28 of the Class.

1 31. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class
2 and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class.
3 Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

- 4 • whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as
5 alleged herein;
- 6 • whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during
7 the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the financial
8 condition, business, operations, and management of the Company;
- 9 • whether Defendants' public statements to the investing public during the
10 Class Period omitted material facts necessary to make the statements
11 made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not
12 misleading;
- 13 • whether the Individual Defendants caused the Company to issue false
14 and misleading SEC filings and public statements during the Class
15 Period;
- 16 • whether Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and
17 misleading SEC filings and public statements during the Class Period;
- 18 • whether the prices of Intel securities during the Class Period were
19 artificially inflated because of the Defendants' conduct complained of
20 herein; and
- 21 • whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so,
22 what is the proper measure of damages.

23 32. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and
24 efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is
25 impracticable. Furthermore, as the damages suffered by individual Class members
26 may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it
27 impossible for members of the Class to individually redress the wrongs done to them.
28 There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

1 33. Plaintiff will rely, in part, upon the presumption of reliance established
2 by the fraud-on-the-market doctrine in that:

- 3 • Defendants made public misrepresentations or failed to disclose material
4 facts during the Class Period;
- 5 • the omissions and misrepresentations were material;
- 6 • Intel securities are traded in efficient markets;
- 7 • the Company's securities were liquid and traded with moderate to heavy
8 volume during the Class Period;
- 9 • the Company traded on the NASDAQ, and was covered by multiple
10 analysts;
- 11 • the misrepresentations and omissions alleged would tend to induce a
12 reasonable investor to misjudge the value of the Company's securities;
13 and
- 14 • Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased and/or sold Intel securities
15 between the time the Defendants failed to disclose or misrepresented
16 material facts and the time the true facts were disclosed, without
17 knowledge of the omitted or misrepresented facts.

18 34. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are
19 entitled to a presumption of reliance upon the integrity of the market.

20 35. Alternatively, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to the
21 presumption of reliance established by the Supreme Court in *Affiliated Ute Citizens of*
22 *the State of Utah v. United States*, 406 U.S. 128, 92 S. Ct. 2430 (1972), as Defendants
23 omitted material information in their Class Period statements in violation of a duty to
24 disclose such information, as detailed above.

25
26
27
28

COUNT I

Violation of Section 10(b) of The Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5

Against All Defendants

1
2
3
4 36. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above
5 as if fully set forth herein.

6 37. This Count is asserted against the Company and the Individual
7 Defendants and is based upon Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b),
8 and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the SEC.

9 38. During the Class Period, the Company and the Individual Defendants,
10 individually and in concert, directly or indirectly, disseminated or approved the false
11 statements specified above, which they knew or deliberately disregarded were
12 misleading in that they contained misrepresentations and failed to disclose material
13 facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances
14 under which they were made, not misleading.

15 39. The Company and the Individual Defendants violated §10(b) of the 1934
16 Act and Rule 10b-5 in that they:

- 17
- 18 • employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud;
 - 19 • made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material
20 facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the
21 circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or
 - 22 • engaged in acts, practices and a course of business that operated as a
23 fraud or deceit upon plaintiff and others similarly situated in connection
24 with their purchases of Intel securities during the Class Period.

25 40. The Company and the Individual Defendants acted with scienter in that
26 they knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the
27 name of the Company were materially false and misleading; knew that such
28 statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and
knowingly and substantially participated, or acquiesced in the issuance or

1 dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the securities
2 laws. These defendants by virtue of their receipt of information reflecting the true
3 facts of the Company, their control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of the
4 Company's allegedly materially misleading statements, and/or their associations with
5 the Company which made them privy to confidential proprietary information
6 concerning the Company, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

7 41. Individual Defendants, who are the senior officers and/or directors of
8 the Company, had actual knowledge of the material omissions and/or the falsity of
9 the material statements set forth above, and intended to deceive Plaintiff and the other
10 members of the Class, or, in the alternative, acted with reckless disregard for the truth
11 when they failed to ascertain and disclose the true facts in the statements made by
12 them or other personnel of the Company to members of the investing public,
13 including Plaintiff and the Class.

14 42. As a result of the foregoing, the market price of Intel securities was
15 artificially inflated during the Class Period. In ignorance of the falsity of the
16 Company's and the Individual Defendants' statements, Plaintiff and the other
17 members of the Class relied on the statements described above and/or the integrity of
18 the market price of Intel securities during the Class Period in purchasing Intel
19 securities at prices that were artificially inflated as a result of the Company's and the
20 Individual Defendants' false and misleading statements.

21 43. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class been aware that the
22 market price of Intel securities had been artificially and falsely inflated by the
23 Company's and the Individual Defendants' misleading statements and by the material
24 adverse information which the Company's and the Individual Defendants did not
25 disclose, they would not have purchased Intel securities at the artificially inflated
26 prices that they did, or at all.

27 44. As a result of the wrongful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff and other
28 members of the Class have suffered damages in an amount to be established at trial.

1 45. By reason of the foregoing, the Company and the Individual Defendants
2 have violated Section 10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder
3 and are liable to the Plaintiff and the other members of the Class for substantial
4 damages which they suffered in connection with their purchases of Intel securities
5 during the Class Period.

6 **COUNT II**

7 **Violation of Section 20(a) of The Exchange Act**
8 **Against The Individual Defendants**

9
10 46. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the
11 foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

12 47. During the Class Period, the Individual Defendants participated in the
13 operation and management of the Company, and conducted and participated, directly
14 and indirectly, in the conduct of the Company's business affairs. Because of their
15 senior positions, they knew the adverse non-public information regarding the
16 Company's business practices.

17 48. As officers and/or directors of a publicly owned company, the Individual
18 Defendants had a duty to disseminate accurate and truthful information with respect
19 to the Company's financial condition and results of operations, and to correct
20 promptly any public statements issued by the Company which had become materially
21 false or misleading.

22 49. Because of their positions of control and authority as senior officers, the
23 Individual Defendants were able to, and did, control the contents of the various
24 reports, press releases and public filings which the Company disseminated in the
25 marketplace during the Class Period. Throughout the Class Period, the Individual
26 Defendants exercised their power and authority to cause the Company to engage in
27 the wrongful acts complained of herein. The Individual Defendants therefore, were
28 "controlling persons" of the Company within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the

1 Exchange Act. In this capacity, they participated in the unlawful conduct alleged
2 which artificially inflated the market price of Intel securities.

3 50. Each of the Individual Defendants, therefore, acted as a controlling
4 person of the Company. By reason of their senior management positions and/or being
5 directors of the Company, each of the Individual Defendants had the power to direct
6 the actions of, and exercised the same to cause, the Company to engage in the
7 unlawful acts and conduct complained of herein. Each of the Individual Defendants
8 exercised control over the general operations of the Company and possessed the
9 power to control the specific activities which comprise the primary violations about
10 which Plaintiff and the other members of the Class complain.

11 51. By reason of the above conduct, the Individual Defendants are liable
12 pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act for the violations committed by the
13 Company.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

16 A. Determining that the instant action may be maintained as a class action
17 under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and certifying Plaintiff as the
18 Class representative;

19 B. Requiring Defendants to pay damages sustained by Plaintiff and the
20 Class by reason of the acts and transactions alleged herein;

21 C. Awarding Plaintiff and the other members of the Class prejudgment and
22 post-judgment interest, as well as their reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees and
23 other costs; and

24 D. Awarding such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and
25 proper.

26 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

27 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: January 10, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

By: /s/ Laurence M. Rosen
Laurence M. Rosen, Esq. (SBN 219683)
355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2450
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 785-2610
Facsimile: (213) 226-4684
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff