

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

RAVISHANKER NARAYANAN, Individually
and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MAREX GROUP PLC, IAN LOWITT, and
ROBERT IRVIN,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-08393-RA-SDA

[rel. 1:25-cv-08368-RA-SDA]

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM M. BRODY IN SUPPORT OF LEAD PLAINTIFFS'
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

I, William M. Brody, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner of Schall Brown & Schwartz LLP (“Lead Counsel”), Court-appointed Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs Ali Shahsavanpour and Jaimin Patel (“Lead Plaintiffs”) and the proposed Settlement Class. I am admitted pro hac vice. I submit this Declaration in support of Lead Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Proposed Class Action Settlement (the “Motion”). I have personal knowledge of my own acts and of the acts taken by my firm under my direction in this Action. As to all other matters, my statements are based on my review of the files and records of this Action and of publicly available materials, and I believe them to be true. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the matters stated herein. Capitalized terms not defined herein have the meanings given in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated August 20, 2026 (the “Stipulation”).

2. A true and correct copy of the Stipulation, together with its exhibits, is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Lead Counsel conferred with counsel for Defendants, Latham & Watkins LLP, regarding the relief requested in the Motion, and the relief requested in the Motion is unopposed. The facts concerning the conduct and sequence of the settlement negotiations are set forth in the accompanying Declaration of David J. Schwartz, who conducted those negotiations for Lead Plaintiffs, and are not repeated here.

I. LEAD COUNSEL’S INVESTIGATION

3. Lead Plaintiffs filed the First Amended Complaint (the “FAC”) on April 20, 2026. ECF No. 44. The FAC asserts claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 on behalf of investors who purchased or otherwise acquired Marex ordinary shares from November 7, 2024 through August 5, 2025, inclusive (the “Class Period”).

4. The Parties reached an agreement in principle to settle before Defendants' response to the FAC was due. They advised the Court of the settlement on June 5, 2026. ECF No. 45.

5. Before agreeing to any settlement figure, Lead Counsel conducted an extensive investigation regarding liability, loss causation, and, among other things, damages. This investigation included, without limitation: (a) review and consideration of the allegations in the original complaint filed in this action and the August 5, 2025 report published by short seller NINGI Research (the "NINGI Report"); (b) research and analysis into the available and potentially relevant United States and United Kingdom public record for the relevant periods, including Marex's registration statements and prospectuses, its Forms 20-F and 6-K, its U.S. and U.K. annual reports, its U.K. corporate and regulatory filings, investor presentations (including the April 2, 2025 Investor Day materials), earnings releases, earnings-call and conference-call transcripts, other public statements, and market and trading data, including materials that turned out not to be relevant; (c) analysis of documents concerning Marex's alleged counterparties and related parties in order to investigate the NINGI Report's allegations; (d) analysis of the NINGI Report's allegations and efforts to corroborate them, as well as analysis of Marex's responses to the NINGI Report; (e) attempts to speak with NINGI Research; (f) engagement of a paid investigative firm to conduct an extensive search for former Marex employees in the United States and the United Kingdom and to contact and interview the witnesses it identified; (g) conducting follow-up interviews with potential witnesses identified and contacted by the investigators; (h) comparison of Marex's reported Market Making "Securities" revenue with the published volume metric in each period in which both appeared; (i) calculation and analysis of

potential damages; and, among other things, (j) extensive research and analysis regarding liability, loss causation and damages.

6. The NINGI Report accused Marex of nine categories of financial misconduct. Based on the information available to it, Lead Counsel decided to plead only one theory in the FAC: that Marex presented revenue from the “Securities” line of its Market Making business beside a published volume metric that measured only the exchange-traded portion of that business, making the paired presentation materially misleading, as reflected in the FAC. Lead Counsel evaluated each of the NINGI Report's allegations against the results of its investigation. In the exercise of its professional judgment and based on its investigation and analysis, Lead Counsel determined that the theory pleaded in the FAC was a strong and supportable basis for recovery on behalf of the class, and that the Report's remaining categories of alleged misconduct did not warrant inclusion as part of the claims in the FAC.

II. THE SETTLEMENT AND THE STIPULATION

7. Following the negotiations described in the concurrently filed Declaration of David J. Schwartz, the Parties executed a confidential Term Sheet. They advised the Court of their agreement in principle on June 5, 2026. ECF No. 45. The Parties then negotiated and drafted the Stipulation and the documents needed to seek preliminary and final approval of the Settlement.

8. The executed Stipulation and its exhibits, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1, comprise: Exhibit A (the proposed Preliminary Approval Order); Exhibit A-1 (the long-form Notice, including the Plan of Allocation as its Appendix); Exhibit A-2 (the Proof of Claim and Release); Exhibit A-3 (the Summary Notice); Exhibit A-4 (the Postcard Notice); and Exhibit B (the proposed Judgment). The proposed Preliminary Approval

Order would authorize notice to the Settlement Class, provide for administration of the Settlement, and set the schedule of settlement-related events. The Notice and the Proof of Claim and Release explain Settlement Class Members' rights and collect the transaction information needed to process Claims. The proposed Judgment would finally approve the Settlement, enter the releases, and dismiss the Action with prejudice. Stipulation ¶¶ 3.2–3.3.

9. The Settlement provides for payment of \$950,000.00 in cash (the “Settlement Amount”) into an interest-bearing escrow account maintained by The Huntington National Bank, the independent Escrow Agent, to be held as a qualified settlement fund (the “Settlement Fund”). As set forth in the Stipulation, payment is due within the later of sixty calendar days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order or receipt of complete payment information. Stipulation ¶¶ 1.16–1.18, 2.1, 2.4–2.7.

III. DAMAGES-RELATED ISSUES REFERENCED IN THE MEMORANDUM

10. Lead Counsel estimated the number of damaged shares and potential aggregate damages using a standard damages model for claims under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, with per-share inflation measured by the August 5, 2025 decline and with the 90-day limitation of 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(e) applied. The damaged-share estimate was derived from Marex's reported trading volume using customary adjustments. The figures were computed by my firm from publicly available data: Nasdaq official daily closing prices for Marex ordinary shares, Marex's reported daily trading volume, and the share-count information disclosed in Marex's SEC filings, including its 2025 Annual Report on Form 20-F.

11. The PSLRA caps damages on any transaction at the difference between the purchase price and the mean trading price of the security during the 90-day period beginning with the corrective disclosure. 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(e)(1), (3). Based on my firm's review of

publicly available Nasdaq daily price data, the mean here was calculated to be \$33.20 per share, the average of the daily closing prices of Marex ordinary shares over the 63 trading days from August 5, 2025 through October 31, 2025, the last trading day within the statutory 90-day period. As set forth in the Stipulation, a day-by-day schedule of closing prices and running average closing prices (Table B to the Plan of Allocation) will be posted on the settlement website. According to the information available to counsel in its work calculating damages, of the 184 trading days in the Class Period, 51 closed below \$33.20, the last of them on March 18, 2025. Shares purchased on those days and held through the end of the 90-day period therefore have a recognized loss amount of zero under the Plan of Allocation.

12. On that model, an estimated 36.17 million Marex ordinary shares were purchased during the Class Period and held through the August 5, 2025 disclosure. As an arithmetic step, assuming that the pleaded misrepresentations caused the entire \$2.33 per-share decline in the Nasdaq closing price of Marex ordinary shares on August 5, 2025, and applying the full \$2.33 to every estimated damaged share before the transaction-specific limitations of 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(e), aggregate damages would be approximately \$84.3 million. Assuming the entire August 5, 2025 decline could be recovered and applying the § 78u-4(e) limitations, with damaged shares assumed held through the 90-day statutory period, aggregate damages would be approximately \$80.2 million. The \$950,000 Settlement Amount is approximately 1.18% of that \$80.2 million scenario. Both figures are plaintiff-favorable, complete-victory benchmarks, not estimates of likely trial recovery. Apportioned equally among the NINGI Report's nine allegations, the aggregate damages number would be approximately \$8.9 million instead of 80.2 million, and the Settlement would equal approximately 10.7% of it.

13. Lead Counsel engaged an independent consulting expert to confirm the reasonableness of its damages estimates and related calculations. That expert performed his own analysis and calculations and independently confirmed the reasonableness and appropriateness of Lead Counsel's methodology, the inputs underlying Lead Counsel's calculations, and Lead Counsel's overall damages estimates.

14. If the maximum amounts disclosed in the Notice are requested and approved, deductions from the Settlement Fund would be attorneys' fees of \$316,666.67 (one-third of the Settlement Fund), Litigation Expenses of \$75,000.00, and Notice and Administration Costs, including Taxes, estimated by the proposed Claims Administrator, Strategic Claims Services ("SCS"), at \$78,000. The projected Net Settlement Fund would therefore be approximately \$480,333.33, or approximately 50.6% of the Settlement Amount. Because that projection applies maximum requested amounts and a cost estimate, it is a conservative projection, not a guaranteed minimum. On those figures, the counsel-to-class ratio is approximately 0.66 to 1, comparing the \$316,666.67 maximum fee with the \$480,333.33 projected for the Settlement Class, and approximately 0.82 to 1 if all requested Litigation Expenses are attributed to counsel. The estimated average recovery is approximately \$0.03 per allegedly damaged share before deduction of Court-approved fees, expenses, and costs. If the Court approves the fee and expense application in full, the estimated average cost would be approximately \$0.01 per allegedly damaged share. Notice ¶¶ 3, 5.

15. Based on my firm's review of publicly available Nasdaq daily trading and price data and Marex's SEC filings, aggregate reported trading volume in Marex ordinary shares during the Class Period was approximately 148.1 million shares over the 184 trading days in the

Class Period, an average daily volume of approximately 805,000 shares, against approximately 72.2 million ordinary shares outstanding as of December 31, 2024.

IV. LEAD COUNSEL'S EXPERIENCE

16. Schall Brown & Schwartz LLP and its attorneys have substantial experience prosecuting securities class actions in this District and in federal courts nationwide. A true and correct copy of the firm's resume is attached hereto as Exhibit 2. That experience, together with the factual investigation, legal analysis, market work, and damages analysis described above, permitted Lead Counsel to make an informed assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, and settlement value of the claims, notwithstanding that the Action settled before formal discovery.

V. IDENTIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS (FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e)(3))

17. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(3), Lead Plaintiffs identify the following agreements made in connection with the Settlement: (a) the confidential Term Sheet executed by counsel for the Parties on or about June 2, 2026, which memorialized the agreement in principle and which the Stipulation supersedes, Stipulation ¶ 13.9; (b) the Stipulation and its exhibits, attached hereto as Exhibit 1; (c) the confidential Supplemental Agreement executed with the Stipulation, referenced in Stipulation ¶ 9.3, which Lead Plaintiffs will submit to the Court for in camera review upon request; and (d) the Escrow Agreement between Lead Counsel and The Huntington National Bank referenced in Stipulation ¶ 1.18, governing custody and disbursement of the Settlement Fund. There are no other agreements made in connection with the Settlement.

VI. EXHIBITS

18. Attached hereto are true and correct copies of the following:

- Exhibit 1: the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated August 20, 2026 and executed by the parties, together with its Exhibits A, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4 and Exhibit B;
- Exhibit 2: the firm resume of Schall Brown & Schwartz LLP.

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

Executed on August 20, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ William M. Brody
William M. Brody

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of August, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by CM/ECF to the parties registered to the Court's CM/ECF system.

s/ William M. Brody
William M. Brody

EXHIBIT 2

SBS SCHALL, BROWN & SCHWARTZ LLP

FIRM RESUMÉ

Schall, Brown & Schwartz LLP

2049 Century Park East, Suite 2460 Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 301-3335
Email: info@schallfirm.com

ABOUT THE FIRM

Since 2017, Schall, Brown & Schwartz LLP (“SBS” or the “Firm”) has recovered nearly half a billion dollars for investors worldwide who have been harmed by securities fraud and corporate malfeasance. The Firm has been and is co-lead or co-counsel on some of the largest securities fraud class action cases in the U.S.

Notably, SBS was co-counsel and played an integral role in *Erickson, et al. v. Snap, Inc., et al.*, No. 17-CV-03679 (C.D. Cal.), securing the second largest securities class action settlement recovery in the U.S. in 2021. In every case in which the Firm is involved, its attorneys actively work to ensure that investors obtain the maximum possible recovery and that all its clients’ questions and concerns are addressed promptly and fully.

CLASS ACTION EXPERIENCE

SBS’s attorneys have represented both plaintiffs and defendants in class action and complex civil cases in federal and state courts nationwide. That broad experience encompasses securities fraud, common law fraud, employment, and consumer claims across multiple industries.

In addition, the Firm’s attorneys have previously worked for judges in federal court as well as national class action and complex civil litigation firms on cases involving hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars in damages. Drawing on that experience, the Firm’s clients receive the gold standard in client development and legal representation. This gold standard encompasses SBS’s added value in its participation in mediations for all matters that have reached that significant phase. SBS is active in all phases of securities litigation, with special emphasis and expertise in the deposition and mediation stages.

SECURITIES FRAUD EXPERIENCE

SBS has the expertise and experience to zealously litigate securities fraud cases of any size, scope, or level of complexity. The Firm's attorneys have prosecuted securities fraud class actions on behalf of all types of investors and amassed the expertise necessary to navigate every challenge that may be raised in litigating cases under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Currently, SBS is lead or co-lead counsel in:

In re The Hain Celestial Sec. Lit., No. 16-cv-04581 (E.D.N.Y.);

Bergman v. Caribou Biosciences, Inc., No. 23-cv-01742 (N.D. Cal.)(As of Feb. 18, 2025, SBS secured \$3.9 million acting as Co-Lead Counsel);

In re SentinelOne, Inc. Sec. Lit., No. 23-cv-02786-HSG (N.D. Cal.)

O'Meara v. Shift4 Payments, Inc. et al, No. 23-CV-03206 (E.D. Pa.)

Frouws v. Edgio, Inc., et al., No. 23-CV-00691 (D. Ariz)

Moreno v. Marathon Digital, et al., No. 23-CV-00470 (D. Nev.)

Marselis v. Fox Factory, et al., No. 24-CV-00747 (N.D. Ga.);

White v. Brooge Energy, et al., No. 24-CV-00959 (C.D. Cal.)

Kula v. Fastly, et al., No. 24-CV-03170 (N.D. Cal.)

Gray v. Biogen, et al., No. 24-CV-01444 (D. Co.)

Shahsavanpour et al. v. Marex Group PLC et al., No. 1:25-cv-08393 (S.D.N.Y.)

Maglione v. Fluor Corporation et al., No. 25-cv-02496 (N.D. Tex.)

In re Sarepta Therapeutics Sec. Lit., No. 25-cv-13530 (D. Mass.)

Potter v. monday.com, Ltd., et al., No. 26-cv-01956 (S.D.N.Y.)

SBS is also on the executive committee in *Tan v. Goldman Sachs Group Inc et al*, No. 21-CV-08413 (S.D.N.Y.).

RECENT SECURITIES FRAUD RECOVERIES

By SBS as Co-Counsel:

Erickson, et al. v. Snap, Inc., et al., No. 17-CV-03679 (C.D. Cal.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Snap's growth statements).

➤ \$187.5M settlement in 2021

In re Pattern Energy Group Inc., No. 2020-0357 (Del. Ch.) (alleging breaches of fiduciary duty).

➤ \$100M settlement in 2024

Klein, et al. v. Altria Group., et al., No. 20-cv-00075-DJN (E.D. V.A.) (alleging claims based on Altria and Juul Labs Inc. failure to disclose).

- \$90M settlement in 2022

St. Clair County Employees' Retirement System, et al. v. Resideo Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 19-CV-02863 (D. Minn.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Resideo's statements about competing with former parent Honeywell International Inc.)

- \$55M settlement in 2022

He et al. v. Uniti Group Inc., et al., No. 19-cv-00756 (E.D. Ark.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Uniti's concealment of a prohibited sale-leaseback transaction with its parent company relating to a 2015 spinoff).

- \$39M settlement in 2022

In re Talis Biomedical, No. 22-cv-00105 (N.D. Cal.) (alleging that the Registration Statement was false and misleading and omitted material adverse facts).

- \$32.5M settlement in 2024

Perdomo v. ADT Inc., et al., No. 18-cv-80668 (S.D. Fla.) (alleging 1933 Act claims based on ADT's IPO Registration Statement)

- \$30M settlement in 2020

Bilinsky v. Gatos Silver, Inc., et al., No. 22-cv-00453 (D. Col.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on statements regarding Gatos' silver mine located in Mexico).

- \$21M settlement in 2023

Bond. Clover Health Investments Corp., et al., No. 21-cv-00096 (M.D. Tenn.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on statements about Clover's de-SPAC transaction).

- \$22M settlement in 2023

Zwick Partners, LP, et al. v. Quorum Health, et al., No. 16-CV-02475 (M.D. Tenn.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on impairment indicators that existed when Quorum spun off from CHS).

- \$18M settlement in 2020

Bernstein, et al. v. Ginkgo Bioworks, No. 21-CV-08943 (N.D. Cal.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Ginkgo misclassifying and underreporting related party revenue in order to conceal their near total-dependence on related parties).

- \$17.75M settlement in 2024

In re Douyu, No. 0651703/2020 (Supreme Court, New York County) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Douyu's concealment of major shareholder Tencent Holdings funding a competitor at the time of Douyu's U.S. IPO).

- \$15M settlement in 2022

In re Avon Products, Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 19-CV-01420 (S.D.N.Y) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Avon's disclosure of credit terms).

- \$14.5M settlement in 2020

In re Toronto-Dominion Bank Securities Litigation, No. 17-CV-01665 (D.N.J.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Toronto-Dominion's policies which led its employees to break the law at customers' expense to meet sales targets).

- \$13.2M settlement in 2019

Ortiz v. Canopy Growth Corp. et al., No. 19-cv-20543 (D.N.J.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on Canopy's concealment of an inventory oversupply problem).

- \$13M settlement in 2022

Abadilla v. Precigen Inc. et al., No. 20-cv-06936, (N.D. Cal.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on statements about the progress or viability about Precigen's methane bioconversion platform program)

- \$13M settlement in 2023

Sonny St. John v. Cloopen Group Holding Limited et al., No. 652617/2021 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cnty.) (alleging Section 11 claims based on omissions in Cloopen's registration documents).

- \$12M settlement in 2023

In re CPI Card Group Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 16-CV-04531 (S.D.N.Y.) (alleging 1933 Act claims based on omissions in CPI's Registration Statement).

- \$11M settlement in 2019

Lowry et al. v. RTI Surgical Holdings, Inc. et al., No. 20 C 01939 (N.D. Ill.) (alleging 1934 Act claims based on alleged manipulative accounting practices)

- \$10.5M settlement in 2021

OUR TEAM

BRIAN J. SCHALL

Founding Partner

Brian founded SBS with the vision of a client-centered approach to achieving the maximum recovery possible for all class members. To that end, SBS has helped recover nearly half a billion dollars for investors since 2017, including some of the largest recoveries of all time in securities fraud cases.

Committed to his vision, Brian looks forward to continuing to empower investors to take a more active role in the litigation than they traditionally have, thereby shaping the securities class action sector to better represent the interests of clients.

Brian began his legal career at a multi-billion-dollar fund manager where he focused on Dodd-Frank compliance, with a special emphasis on complex derivatives. He then worked at a prominent securities fraud class action firm, and subsequently co-founded Goldberg Law PC where he vigorously fought for shareholder rights in some of the largest class action cases in recent years.

DAVID J. SCHWARTZ

Founding Partner

David focuses on event-driven and special situation litigation using legal strategies to enhance clients' investment returns. Over the last several years, he has helped secure leadership roles on behalf of his clients in some of the largest securities and Delaware class actions in the country, including cases against *Lordstown*, *Nikola*, *Alta Mesa*, and *PayPal*.

David's extensive experience includes prosecuting, as well as defending against, securities and corporate governance actions for an array of domestic and international clients, including hedge funds, merger arbitrageurs, retail investors, pension funds, mutual funds, and asset management companies. He has played a pivotal role in numerous large securities class action and corporate governance cases in recent years, achieving over \$170 million in settlements in 2022 alone:

In re CannTrust, Inc. Securities Litigation (CA\$129.5M settlement)

In re Resideo Securities Litigation (\$55M settlement, one of the three largest in the Eighth Circuit)

Makris, et al. v. Ionis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al. (\$12.5M settlement)

David has also done substantial work in mergers and acquisitions appraisal litigation and direct action/opt-out litigation, including over a dozen appraisals in domestic and foreign jurisdictions. He is currently prosecuting *In re Lordstown Securities Litigation* and several international appraisal actions.

In recognition of David as one of the nation's most accomplished attorneys, Benchmark Litigation named him a "Future Star" and selected him, three years in a row, to its "40 & Under Hot List." In addition, Lawdragon has recognized him as one of the country's "500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers" and featured him in its Lawyer Limelight series.

ANDREW J. BROWN

Founding Partner & Head of Litigation

Andrew Brown has extensive experience in class action litigation, having spent 18 years at the largest plaintiffs' firm in the country, representing institutional investors and individuals in hundreds of securities class actions and shareholder derivative cases. A trial lawyer since starting his career as a Deputy Public Defender in 1992, Mr. Brown and his litigation teams have recovered billions of dollars and achieved ground-breaking corporate governance reforms on behalf of his clients and class members.

Mr. Brown left the firm in 2018 to get back to his roots -- representing individuals against large and powerful corporations with seemingly unlimited resources. Mr. Brown's success has garnered national attention in various media. Several of his cases have been reported in national news publications such as the Wall Street Journal, and he has appeared on various television programs such as Fox Business News. His investigations have led to SEC enforcement actions for securities fraud, and he is one of the few lawyers in class action litigation to take a case to trial and prevail, recovering hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of tens of thousands of class members.

WILLIAM M. BRODY

Partner & General Counsel

Will Brody has over 20 years of experience as a civil litigator and trial attorney in complex and high stakes lawsuits. Mr. Brody has a client-driven approach focusing on strategies to maximize value and results. After graduating from Northwestern School of Law, Mr. Brody worked at top-tier litigation firms in Los Angeles including most recently as a litigation partner at Loeb & Loeb LLP. He has experience leading the representations of local, national and international clients in a broad range of matters including disputes involving fraud, securities investments, accounting malfeasance, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract and real estate matters among many other issues.

RINA RESTAINO

Partner

Rina started with SBS in 2019 and shares Brian's vision of a client-centric approach. She is committed to understanding clients' needs and providing them clear and fulsome counsel from the inception of a class action through final approval of any settlement.

On behalf of the Firm's clients, Rina has participated in over 20 mediations, resulting in millions of dollars recovered for shareholders. She also has extensive experience in all phases of litigation, particularly in securities fraud and employment class actions involving over 1,000 plaintiffs. Her expertise arises from cases involving multifaceted data management and damage analysis.

Rina has made significant contributions to SBS, namely securing the client and ensuring an optimal recovery for the shareholders in the \$90 million settlement in *Klein, et al. v. Altria Group., et al.*

In addition, Rina has worked for Fortune 500 companies in different legal and business capacities. She has

handled single plaintiff and class action litigation for employees and employers, including cases alleging wrongful termination, discrimination, wage claims, and unfair labor practices.

BRIAN O'MARA

Partner

Brian is a litigation partner at Schall, Brown & Schwartz. Mr. O'Mara's practice focuses on investigating and prosecuting complex securities, antitrust, and consumer protection litigation in state and federal courts across the United States. Over the past 20 years, Brian has served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous shareholder, consumer protection, and antitrust actions involving companies in the financial services, technology, pharmaceutical, entertainment and gaming, and telecommunications industries, which have yielded billions of dollars in recoveries. Mr. O'Mara has helped institutional and individual claimants protect their investments by securing leadership positions in dozens of securities and antitrust actions and has been responsible for a number of significant trial and appellate court rulings in the securities and antitrust space.

Brian has been twice recognized by the American Antitrust Institute's Antitrust Enforcement Awards for the category of Outstanding Antitrust Litigation Achievement in Private Law Practice for his work in the ISDAfix price-fixing litigation and the EpiPen class action alleging antitrust and RICO violations. He has also been named a Super Lawyer by Super Lawyers Magazine for the past six consecutive years and recognized as a Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyer by Lawdragon.

Brian graduated from the University of Kansas with a degree in economics, and he received his law degree from DePaul University College of Law, where he was the recipient of a CALI Excellence for the Future Award in securities regulation. Following graduation, Brian began his legal career serving as the law clerk to the Honorable Jerome M. Polaha in the Second Judicial District Court for the State of Nevada.

CHRIS MOONEY

Senior Counsel

Prior to joining Schall, Brown & Schwartz, Chris concentrated on plaintiff representation in complex litigation matters, including securities fraud, commodity manipulation, price-fixing, and exchange-related antitrust claims. Chris has also worked as a financial associate at one of the world's largest banks, where he helped manage an \$8B portfolio of private equity investments and is a licensed C.P.A. (currently unregistered) with experience in the audit and review of S.E.C. registered entities.

Chris earned his J.D. in 2013 from Fordham University School of Law, where he served as a member of the Dispute Resolution Society and interned for the Honorable George B. Daniels (S.D.N.Y.) as well as the S.D.N.Y. U.S. Attorney's Office. He received his B.B.A., cum laude, in accounting and finance from Baruch College.

SHERIN MAHDAVIAN

Senior Associate

Sherin, a transactional and litigation attorney with experience in business and regulatory law, focuses her

While in law school, Sherin worked as a federal agency liaison for Congressman Brad Sherman's office at one of the top lobbying firms in Los Angeles. After graduating, she worked at a mid-sized law firm in Downtown LA, where she specialized in regulatory, business, and environmental law and focused her efforts on transactional work and client relations.

EDWARD E. JOHNSON

Of Counsel

Edward specializes in handling the most complex civil litigation matters, in a wide variety of areas including trade secret, licensing, patent infringement, M&A- related, derivative, employment, commercial, and contract disputes.

Edward's clients have included businesses in numerous industries, including semiconductors, medical devices, financial services, and real estate development. He has litigated in state and federal courts throughout the United States. He practiced at Sullivan & Cromwell LLP for ten years and at Theodora Oringer P.C. for seven years.

Edward is a 2005 magna cum laude graduate of Harvard Law School. He received his B.A. in mathematics from Williams College in 1998.

DAVID ZIMMER

Of Counsel

David is Of Counsel at Schall Brown & Schwartz, where he works on the firm's active litigation matters. David previously spent eleven years at Goodwin Procter in Boston, where he was a partner in Goodwin's Supreme Court and Appellate practice. David is also a Lecturer at Harvard Law School, where he teaches the Federal Courts Clinic and Clinical Seminar.

David has extensive experience representing clients in appeals and complex civil litigation. David has argued or second-chaired seven merits cases at the U.S. Supreme Court and dozens of appeals in federal and state appellate courts across the country. He also regularly assists with dispositive motions in federal and state trial courts. David is ranked in Chambers USA in the Nationwide Appellate Rankings and was one of Law360's Appellate Rising Stars in 2021. David's work has also been recognized by Benchmark Litigation, the American Lawyer, the Financial Times, and the Legal Aid Society, among others.

David dedicates a significant portion of his time to pro bono work and public service, with a particular focus on immigration law. He successfully argued two of the most important immigration cases the Supreme Court has decided in the last decade and is one of the few two-time winners of the American Immigration Lawyers' Association's Jack Wasserman Memorial Award for Excellence in Litigation. David is also the Chair of the AILA Amicus Committee; a member and the former co-Chair of the Boston Bar Association's Amicus Committee; a member of the Legal Services Corporation's Leadership Council; and a member of the Board of Directors for the ACLU of Massachusetts and Lawyers for Civil Rights.

BRIAN ENGLAND

Of Counsel

Brian England joined Schall, Brown, & Schwartz LLP in 2024 and has already helped secure a \$15 million settlement in *Peter Frouws, et al. v. Edgio*.

Brian began his legal career in the Los Angeles office of Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi LLP. He then joined the leading international law firm Sullivan & Cromwell LLP as an associate and was later promoted to special counsel. During that time, Brian represented large, publicly-traded companies in high-stakes, complex litigation and regulatory matters.

Brian is admitted to practice before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth, Ninth and Federal Circuits, the U.S. District Courts for the Central, Eastern, Northern and Southern Districts of California, and the District Courts of Arizona and the District of Columbia.

Brian has in the past worked extensively with Public Counsel's Adoptions Project, finalizing numerous adoptions. He also represented a family in an administrative hearing against Los Angeles County regarding the County's failure to properly pay adoption assistance, resulting in a substantial increase in the monthly payments and significant lump sum payment for past deficiencies. Brian was honored as the Adoptions Project's Advocate of the Year for 2003. He has also participated, on a pro bono basis, in other family law and parental rights issues. Finally, Brian was part of a team that litigated a significant prisoner's rights litigation that resulted in a favorable outcome for deaf prisoners in the federal prison system.

Represented a Fortune 100 company in a coordinated proceeding involving more than 25 nationwide and state class actions involving claims of fraud, violations of consumer protection statutes, and breaches of express and implied warranties arising out of the sale of polycarbonate baby bottles and products.

Represented major investment banks in the Enron Securities class actions and University of California Regents, et al. v. AOL Time Warner Inc., et al, participating in all aspects of the defense of these actions..

ADAM L. ROSEN

Associate

Dedicated to securing maximum recovery for class members while understanding each clients' individual needs, Adam Rosen approaches each case with commitment and personalized attention.

Adam graduated summa cum laude from Tufts University in 2020 and earned his J.D. from the UCLA School of Law in 2023, where he worked as a teaching assistant in UCLA's Anderson School of Business. Prior to joining SBS in 2025, Adam honed his investor relations skills with prominent Los Angeles-based hedge funds. Following his foray into finance, Adam went on to prosecute complex consumer and employment class actions.