IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DARCY J. PATERSON, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. CHEMTURA CORPORATION, INC., CRAIG A. ROGERSON, JEFFREY D. BENJAMIN, TIMOTHY J. BERNLOHR, ANNA C. CATALANO, JAMES W. CROWNOVER, ROBERT A. DOVER, JONATHAN F. FOSTER, and JOHN K. WULFF, Defendants.	)	**CIVIL ACTION NO. _____** **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS**

Plaintiff Darcy J. Paterson ("Plaintiff"), by his attorneys, alleges upon information and belief, except for his own acts, which are alleged on knowledge, as follows:

NATURE AND SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of the public stockholders of Chemtura Corporation ("Chemtura" or the "Company") against the members of Chemtura's Board of Directors (the "Board" or the "Individual Defendants") or their violations of Section 14(a) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), 15.U.S.C. §§ 78n(a), 78t(a), and U.S. Securities and ExchangeJ. P Commission ("SEC") Rule 14a-9, 17 C.F.R. 240.14a-9 arising out of their attempt to sell the Company to Lanxess Deutschland GmbH ("Lanxess") for inadequate consideration.

2. On September 25, 2016, Lanxess and the Company announced they had entered into an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated September 25, 2016 ("Merger Agreement"), by which Lanxess, through its wholly owned, indirect subsidiary LANXESS Additives Inc.

("Merger Sub"), will acquire all of the outstanding shares of Chemtura in an all-cash transaction for $35.50 per share in cash (the "Proposed Transaction"). The Proposed Transaction is valued at approximately $2.1 billion and is expected to close in mid-2017.

3. On December 23, 2016, Chemtura filed a definitive proxy statement on a Schedule 14A (the "Proxy") with the SEC, which set the stockholder vote date on the Proposed Transaction for February 1, 2017. The Proxy is materially deficient and misleading because, *inter alia*, it fails to disclose material information regarding: (i) the background of the Proposed Transaction; (ii) the financial analyses performed by Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC ("Morgan Stanley"), the Company's financial advisor; and (iii) the projections prepare by Company management and relied upon by Morgan Stanley.

4. Without additional information the Proxy is materially misleading in violation of federal securities laws.

5. By unanimously approving the Proposed Transaction and authorizing the issuance of the Proxy, the Individual Defendants participated in the solicitation even though they knew, or should have known, that the Proxy was materially false and/or misleading. The Proxy is an essential link in accomplishing, and receiving shareholder approval for, the Proposed Transaction.

6. For these reasons and as set forth in detail herein, Plaintiff seeks to enjoin Defendants from conducting a stockholder vote on the Proposed Transaction unless and until the material information discussed below is disclosed to Chemtura's stockholders or, in the event the Proposed Transaction is consummated, to recover damages resulting from the Defendants' violations of the Exchange Act.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) and Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa) because Plaintiff alleges violations of Section 14(a) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act and SEC Rule 14a-9.

8. Personal jurisdiction exists over each defendant either because the defendant conducts business in or maintains operations in this District, or is an individual who is either present in this District for jurisdictional purposes or has sufficient minimum contacts with this District as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over defendant by this Court permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9. Venue is proper in this District under Section 27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa, as well as under 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because: (i) the conduct at issue took place and had an effect in this District; (ii) Chemtura maintains its primary place of business in this District; (iii) a substantial portion of the transactions and wrongs complained of herein, including Defendants' primary participation in the wrongful acts detailed herein, occurred in this District; and (iv) Defendants have received substantial compensation in this District by doing business here and engaging in numerous activities that had an effect in this District.

PARTIES AND RELEVANT NON-PARTIES

10. Plaintiff is, and has been at all relevant times, the owner of shares of common stock of Chemtura.

11. Relevant non-party Chemtura is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. It maintains principal executive offices at 1818 Market Street, Suite 3700, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 and 199 Benson Road, Middlebury, Connecticut 06762.

12. Defendant Craig A. Rogerson ("Rogerson") has been the President, Chief Executive Officer ("CEO"), and Chairman of the Board since December 2008.

13. Defendant Jeffrey D. Benjamin ("Benjamin") has been a director of the Company since 2010.

14. Defendant Timothy J. Bernlohr ("Bernlohr") has been a director of the Company since 2010.

15. Defendant Anna C. Catalano ("Catalano") has been a director of the Company since 2011.

16. Defendant James W. Crownover ("Crownover") has been a director of the Company since 2005.

17. Defendant Robert A. Dover ("Dover") has been a director of the Company since 2011.

18. Defendant Jonathan F. Foster ("Foster") has been a director of the Company since 2010.

19. Defendant John K. Wulff ("Wulff") has been a director of the Company since 2010.

20. Defendants referenced in ¶¶ 12 through 19 are collectively referred to as Individual Defendants and/or the Board.

21. Relevant non-party Lanxess is a limited liability company under the laws of Germany. Lanxess is a leading specialty chemicals company focused on the development, manufacturing, and marketing of chemical intermediates, specialty chemicals and plastics.

22. Relevant non-party Merger Sub is a Delaware corporation and an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Lanxess that was created for the purposes of effectuating the Proposed Transaction.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action on behalf of all persons and/or entities that own Chemtura common stock (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class are Defendants and their affiliates, immediate families, legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

24. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are thousands of members in the Class. The Proxy states that, as of October 28, 2016, there were 64,919,579 shares of common stock outstanding. All members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by Chemtura or its transfer agent and may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, using forms of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class actions.

25. Questions of law and fact are common to the Class, including (i) whether Defendants solicited stockholder approval of the Proposed Transaction through a materially false or misleading Proxy in violation of federal securities laws; (ii) whether Plaintiff and other Class members will suffer irreparable harm if securities laws violations are not remedied before the close of the tender offer; and (iii) whether the Class entitled is to injunctive relief as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

26. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Class. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class have sustained damages as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein.

27. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class, and has no interests contrary to or in conflict with those of the Class that Plaintiff seeks to represent.

28. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

FURTHER SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Company Background and its Poise for Growth

29. Chemtura is a leading global developer, manufacturer, and marketer of performance-driven engineered industrial specialty chemicals. The Company sells its products to industrial manufacturing customers for them to use as additives, ingredients, or intermediates that add value to their end products. The Company's two reporting segments are Industrial Performance Products and Industrial Engineered Products.

30. Chemtura had a successful start to the 2016 fiscal year. On April 28, 2016, the Company issued a press release announcing its financial results for the first quarter of 2016. Chemtura reported Adjusted EBITDA of $75 million compared to $51 million for the same period of the prior year. Rogerson stated that the Company's "first quarter performance delivered a strong start to 2016 and was our fifth consecutive quarter of year-over-year Adjusted EBITDA improvement for our Industrial business segments[.]"

31. The Company maintained its strong start to the year in the second quarter of 2016. In a July 28, 2016 press release, Chemtura announced $55 million in operating income, which

was a sharp 25% increase compared to the same metric in the second quarter of 2015. The $34 million of earnings from continuing operations was an 89% increase compared to same period from the previous year. Adjusted EBITDA for the second quarter of 2016 also increased 15% when compared to the second quarter of 2015. Rogerson stated that the Company's "performance in the second quarter continued our strong start to 2016" and the "second quarter results delivered meaningful improvement over prior year performance[.]"

The Inadequate Sale Process

32. In early 2015, Chemtura's representatives contacted several potential bidders. This initial outreach resulted in thirteen parties executing confidentiality agreements that included "customary 'standstill' provisions," which prohibited a potential counterparty from acquiring shares of Chemtura or taking certain other actions. The confidentiality agreements did not contain "don't ask to waive" provisions, nor did any of the confidentiality agreements executed during the rest of the sale process.

33. On February 4, 2015, the CEO of Party A contacted Defendant Rogerson a suggested preliminarily that Party A would be willing to pay $500 million for Chemtura's IEP segment and potentially $25 to $26 per share for the entire Company.

34. On June 17, 2015, Party J submitted a proposal to acquire certain assets of Chemtura's IPP segment for $1.5 billion.

35. Also, in June 2015, Party N executed a confidentiality agreement with Chemtura.

36. On August 12, 2015, Defendant Rogerson and Stephen Forsyth ("Forsyth"), Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Chemtura, met with representatives of Party F to suggest that Party F explore a partnership opportunity with Party J to acquire the

Company's IEP segment. On September 8, 2015, Chemtura and Party F executed a confidentiality agreement.

37. In November of 2015, Party P expressed preliminary interest in acquiring Chemtura's IPP segment, and the Company and Party P entered into a confidentiality agreement thereafter.

38. On January 13, 2016, Chemtura executed a confidentiality agreement with Party Q. Then, on March 2, 2016, Rogerson and the CEO of Party Q met, at which time Party Q's CEO indicated that "he envisioned a merger of equals transaction with an exchange ratio that would be set at the market price of each of the companies' common stock."

39. Subsequent to a meeting on March 29, 2016 between Defendant Rogerson and representatives from Parties G and H, Chemtura and Parties G and H entered into new confidentiality agreements.

40. On April 6, 2016, Rogerson met with representatives of Lanxess, at which time Lanxess express an interest in acquiring Chemtura in an all cash transaction. On April 11, 2016, Chemtura and Lanxess entered into a confidentiality agreement.

41. In May 2016, Chemtura and Party Q negotiated a term sheet, but failed to reach an agreement on "certain key terms," including corporate governance and executive leadership structures of the combined company.

42. On May 31, 2016, Matthias Zachert ("Zachert"), CEO of Lanxess, made a verbal proposal to acquire Chemtura for $32.50 per share.

43. In June 2016, Chemtura and Party O entered into a confidentiality agreement relating to Party O's auction process for the business that Chemtura had expressed interest in

participating as an acquiror. Ultimately, Chemtura did not submit a non-binding expression of interest to Party O.

44. On June 6, 2016, Rogerson informed Zachert that the Board would expect a price of $37 per share.

45. On August 2, 2016, Zachert submitted a revised proposal to Rogerson of $33.50 per share.

46. On August 8, 2016, the Board determined that Chemtura should continue to pursue a transaction with Lanxess at the proposed price of $33.50, despite Defendant Rogerson's overture that the Board "would expect a price of $37 per share."

47. On August 16, 2016, Forsyth met with representatives of an investment bank with whom Chemtura had a relationship who indicated that Party I may have an interest in an all-stock acquisition of Chemtura. Then, on August 24, 2016, Chemtura executed a confidentiality agreement with Party I.

48. On August 30, 2016, senior management of Chemtura and Party I met in person to discuss a potential transaction.

49. On September 13, 2016, Defendant Rogerson and Zachert spoke by telephone to discuss the potential transaction generally. Zachert informed Rogerson that Lanxess' management authority to enter into a definitive agreement with Chemtura would expire on September 30, 2016, after which time Lanxess' management would be required to seek approval of the Lanxess supervisory board to engage in continued discussions with Chemtura.

50. On September 21, 2016, the Board determined to continue to pursue a transaction with Lanxess.

51. On September 25, 2016, the Board approved the Proposed Transaction, and Chemtura and Lanxess executed the Merger Agreement.

The Proposed Transaction Provides Stockholders with Inadequate Consideration

52. On September 25, 2016, the Company announced that it had entered into the Merger Agreement to acquire all of the outstanding shares of the Company for $33.50 per share.

53. Given the Company's recent strong performance and its positioning for growth, the Proposed Transaction consideration is inadequate and significantly undervalues the Company.

54. Notably, the financial analyses performed by Morgan Stanley, the Company's financial advisor, indicate the inadequacy of the merger consideration. Morgan Stanley's *Discounted Cash Flow Analysis* yielded an implied per share value for the Company as high as $36.00, significantly higher than the $33.50 per share merger consideration.

55. Further, according to Yahoo Finance, at least one Wall Street analyst has set a price target of $35.00 per share for the Company.

56. In addition, the Proposed Transaction consideration fails to adequately compensate Chemtura's shareholders for the significant synergies created by the merger. Despite the significant synergies inherent in the transaction for Lanxess, however, the Board failed to secure a fair price for the Company, either for the intrinsic value of its assets or the value of the Company's assets to Lanxess.

57. Lanxess is seeking to acquire the Company at the most opportune time, at a time when the Company is performing very well and is positioned for tremendous growth.

58. Meanwhile, certain of the Company's officers and directors stand to receive substantial benefits as a result of the Proposed Transaction. Defendant Rogerson stands to

receive $20,353,216 is golden parachute compensation, Forsyth stands to receive $5,031,580, and the Company's other six executive officers stand to receive over $16.35 million.

The Materially Misleading and Incomplete Proxy

59. Defendants have failed to provide stockholders with material information necessary for an informed vote on the Proposed Transaction. The Proxy, which recommends that the Company's stockholders vote in favor of the Proposed Transaction on February 1, 2017, misrepresents and/or omits material information in violation of Sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act.

60. With respect to the background of the Proposed Transaction, the Proxy fails to disclose material information regarding potential conflicts of interest of the Company's officers and directors. Specifically, the Proxy fails to disclose the timing and nature of all communications concerning management retention and/or directorship of Chemtura's officers and directors following the Proposed Transaction, including who participated in all such communications.

61. Additionally, the Proxy stated that "Morgan Stanley or an affiliate thereof currently is a lender to Chemtura." However, the Proxy fails to disclose any details with respect to Morgan Stanley's role as a lender to the Company. Specifically, the Proxy fails to disclose: (i) how much Morgan Stanley lent to Chemtura; (ii) what impact the Proposed Transaction will have on those loans; and (iii) the amount of any fees or compensation received or to be received by Morgan Stanley in connection with serving as a lender to Chemtura.

62. With respect to Morgan Stanley's *Selected Comparable Trading Analysis*, the Proxy discloses that "Morgan Stanley reviewed certain financial information, valuation multiples and market trading data relating to Chemtura and selected publicly traded companies that

Morgan Stanley believed, based on its experience with companies in the specialty chemicals industry, to be similar to Chemtura's current operations for purposes of this analysis."

63. However, the Proxy fails to disclose any financial, operating or other metrics and ratios used by Morgan Stanley as part of its benchmarking process to compare Chemtura to the selected comparable companies and thus determine the appropriate EBITDA multiples to apply as a part of this analysis.

64. With respect to Morgan Stanley's *Discounted Equity Value Analysis*, the Proxy discloses the following:

> To calculate the theoretical future implied aggregate value range, Morgan Stanley applied Chemtura's NTM Pension Adjusted EBITDA multiple to the NTM Pension Adjusted EBITDA as of 2016 and 2017 year end, respectively. Morgan Stanley then adjusted the theoretical future implied aggregate value range by Chemtura's total debt (including underfunded pension and OPEB liability), non-controlling interest and cash and cash equivalents based on the estimated consolidated balance sheet of Chemtura as of December 31, 2016, and December 31, 2017, respectively, as reflected in the Risk Adjusted Long Range Forecast.

65. However, the Proxy fails to disclose the individual estimates of Chemtura's total debt (including underfunded pension and OPEB liability), non-controlling interest, and cash and cash equivalents, based on the estimated consolidated balance sheet of Chemtura as of December 31, 2016, and December 31, 2017.

66. With respect to Morgan Stanley's *Precedent Transactions Analysis*, the Proxy states that "Morgan Stanley performed a precedent transactions analysis, which is designed to imply a value of a company based on publicly available financial terms of selected transactions that involve companies in the chemicals sector. Selected comparable transactions were selected based on Morgan Stanley's professional judgment and knowledge of the sector."

67. However, the Proxy fails to disclose any financial, operating or other metrics and ratios used by Morgan Stanley as part of its benchmarking process to compare the Proposed Transaction to the selected comparable transactions and thus determine the appropriate multiples to apply. Additionally, the Proxy fails to disclose the reasons that AV/LTM EBITDA multiples were not selected and applied to Chemtura to derive a range of indicated per share values, despite the fact that they were observed as part of the underlying dataset, similar to the observed premiums.

68. With respect to Morgan Stanley's *Discounted Cash Flow Analysis*, the Proxy states the following:

> Morgan Stanley performed a discounted cash flow analysis of Chemtura using information contained in the Risk Adjusted Long Range Forecast and Street Case, as appropriate, and public filings to calculate ranges of the implied value of Chemtura assuming the merger closes on December 31, 2016. Morgan Stanley defined unlevered free cash flows as Pension Adjusted EBITDA, less depreciation and amortization, less stock based compensation, less taxes (impact of net operating losses not included), plus depreciation and amortization, less capital expenditures, and less increases in net working capital (in each case based on the Risk Adjusted Long Range Forecast and Street Case, as appropriate, and guidance on balance sheet data provided by Chemtura's management to Morgan Stanley).

69. However, the Proxy fails to disclose Morgan Stanley's basis for ignoring the effects of Chemtura's net operating losses in the calculation of the unlevered free cash flows, especially given that the Company had accumulated approximately $274 million of net operating loss carryforwards by the end of 2015.

70. With respect to the both sets of the Company's projections – *Pre-Risk Adjusted Long Range Forecast* and *Risk Adjusted Long Range Forecast* – the Proxy fails to disclose: (i) the reconciliation of GAAP operating income to non-GAAP unlevered free cash flows and non-GAAP EBITDA; and (ii) the reconciliation of EBITDA to pension-adjusted EBITDA.

71. Without this material information, stockholders cannot make an informed decision whether or not to vote in favor of the Proposed Transaction or seek appraisal for their shares, and have been harmed thereby.

72. Defendants failure to provide Chemtura's stockholders with the foregoing material information constitutes a violation of Sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act, and Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder. The Individual Defendants were aware of their duty to disclose this information. The material information described above that was omitted from the Proxy takes on actual significance in the minds of Chemtura's stockholders in reaching their decision whether to vote in favor of the Proposed Transaction. Absent disclosure of this material information prior to the vote on the Proposed Transaction, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class will be unable to make an informed decision about whether to vote in favor of the Proposed Transaction and are thus threatened with irreparable harm for which damages are not an adequate remedy.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Against All Defendants for Violations of Section 14(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 14a-9 Promulgated Thereunder

73. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

74. Defendants have issued the Proxy with the intention of soliciting stockholder support for the Proposed Transaction.

75. Rule 14a-9, promulgated by the SEC pursuant to Section 14(a) of the Exchange Act, provides that a proxy statement shall not contain "any statement which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it is made, is false or misleading with respect to any

material fact, or which omits to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements therein not false or misleading." 17 C.F.R. § 240.14a-9.

76. Specifically, the Proxy violates Section 14(a) and Rule 14a-9 because it is materially misleading in numerous respects and omits material facts, including those set forth above. Moreover, in the exercise of reasonable care, Defendants should have known that the Proxy is materially misleading and omitted material facts that are necessary to render the statements that are made non-misleading.

77. The Individual Defendants had actual knowledge of the misrepresentations and omissions of material facts set forth herein, or acted with reckless disregard for the truth.

78. The misrepresentations and omissions in the Proxy are material to Plaintiff and the Class, and Plaintiff and the Class will be deprived of their right to cast a fully informed vote on the Proposed Transaction.

79. Plaintiff and the Class have no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT II

Against the Individual Defendants for Violations of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act

80. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

81. The Individual Defendants acted as controlling persons of Chemtura within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act as alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as officers and/or directors of Chemtura, and participation in and/or awareness of the Company's operations and/or intimate knowledge of the incomplete and misleading statements contained in the Proxy filed with the SEC, they had the power to influence and control and did influence and control, directly or indirectly, the decision making of the Company, including the content and

dissemination of the various statements that Plaintiff contends are materially incomplete and misleading.

82. Each of the Individual Defendants was provided with or had unlimited access to copies of the Proxy and other statements alleged by Plaintiff to be misleading prior to and/or shortly after these statements were issued and had the ability to prevent the issuance of the statements or cause the statements to be corrected.

83. In particular, each of the Individual Defendants had direct and supervisory involvement in the day-to-day operations of the Company, and, therefore, is presumed to have had the power to control or influence the particular transactions giving rise to the Exchange Act violations alleged herein, and exercised the same. The omitted information identified above was reviewed by the Board prior to voting on the Proposed Transaction. The Proxy at issue contains the unanimous recommendation of each of the Individual Defendants to approve the Proposed Transaction. They were, thus, directly involved in the making of the Proxy.

84. In addition, as the Proxy sets forth at length, and as described herein, the Individual Defendants were involved in negotiating, reviewing, and approving the Merger Agreement. The Proxy purports to describe the various issues and information that the Individual Defendants reviewed and considered. The Individual Defendants participated in drafting and/or gave their input on the content of those descriptions.

85. By virtue of the foregoing, the Individual Defendants have violated Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act.

86. As set forth above, the Individual Defendants had the ability to exercise control over and did control a person or persons who have each violated Section 14(a) and Rule 14a-9, by their acts and omissions as alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as controlling persons,

these defendants are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. As a direct and proximate result of Individual Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff will be irreparably harmed.

87. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Only through the exercise of this Court's equitable powers can Plaintiff be fully protected from the immediate and irreparable injury that Defendants' actions threaten to inflict.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against defendants jointly and severally, as follows:

(A) declaring this action to be a class action and certifying Plaintiff as the Class representatives and his counsel as Class counsel;

(B) declaring that the Proxy is materially misleading and contains omissions of material fact in violation of Section 14(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder;

(C) preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendants and their counsel, agents, employees and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from proceeding with, consummating, or closing the Proposed Transaction, unless and until Defendants disclose the material information identified above which has been omitted from the Proxy;

(D) to the extent the Proposed Transaction is consummated prior to the Court's entry of a final judgment, awarding Plaintiff and the members of the Class rescissory damages against the Individual Defendants, including, but not limited to, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

(E) awarding Plaintiff the costs and disbursements of this action, including reasonable attorneys' and expert fees and expenses;

(F) awarding extraordinary, equitable and/or injunctive relief as permitted by law, equity and the federal statutory provisions sued hereunder, and any appropriate state law remedies; and

(G) granting Plaintiff and the other members of the Class such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

Dated: December 27, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

CHAMBERLAIN, HRDLICKA, WHITE, WILLIAMS & AUGHTRY
Kenneth I. Trujillo
Matthew S. Olesh
300 Conshohocken State Road, Suite 570
West Conshohocken, PA 19428
Tel: (610) 772-2300
Fax: (610) 772-2305
Email: molesh@chamberlainlaw.com

LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP
Donald E. Enright (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
1101 30th Street NW, Suite 115
Washington, DC 20007
Tel: (202) 524-4290
Fax: (202) 337-1567
Email: denright@zlk.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff