

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

Laurence M. Rosen, Esq.
609 W. South Orange Avenue, Suite 2P
South Orange, NJ 07079
Tel: (973) 313-1887
Fax: (973) 833-0399
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

CREIGHTON TAKATA, Individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

RIOT BLOCKCHAIN, INC. F/K/A, BIOPTIX,
INC., JOHN O'ROURKE, and JEFFREY G.
MCGONEGAL,

Defendants.

Case No.

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

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Creighton Takata (“Plaintiff”) individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated, by Plaintiff’s undersigned attorneys, for Plaintiff’s complaint against Defendants (defined below), alleges the following based upon personal knowledge as to Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s own acts, and upon information and belief as to all other matters based on the investigation conducted by and through Plaintiff’s attorneys, which included, among other things, a review of Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) filings by Riot Blockchain, Inc. f/k/a Bioptix, Inc. (“Riot” or the “Company”), as well as media and analyst reports about the Company. Plaintiff believes that substantial evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of all persons and entities, other than Defendants and their affiliates, who purchased publicly traded Riot securities from November 13, 2017 through February 15, 2018, both dates inclusive (“Class Period”), seeking to recover compensable damages caused by Defendants’ violations of federal securities laws and pursue remedies under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) as the misleading statements entered into and the subsequent damages took place within this district.

5. In connection with the acts, conduct and other wrongs alleged herein, Defendants either directly or indirectly used the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, including but not limited to the United States mails, interstate telephone communications, and the facilities of the national securities exchange.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff, as set forth in the accompanying PSLRA Certification, acquired Riot securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures.

7. Defendant Riot builds and supports various blockchain technologies. The company invests primarily in Bitcoin and Ethereum blockchains. The Company is a Nevada corporation with its principal executive offices supposedly located at 834-F South Perry Street, Suite 443, Castle Rock, CO 80104. Riot securities trade on NASDAQ under the symbol “RIOT.”

8. Defendant John O’Rourke (“O’Rourke”) has been the Company’s Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) and Chairman of the Board since November 3, 2017.

9. Defendant Jeffrey G. McGonegal (“McGonegal”) has been the Company’s Chief Financial Officer (“CFO”) since June 30, 2017.

10. Defendants O’Rourke and McGonegal are herein referred to as “Individual Defendants.”

11. Collectively, Defendant Riot and Individual Defendants are herein referred to as “Defendants.”

12. Each of the Individual Defendants:

- a. directly participated in the management of the Company;
- b. was directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the Company at the highest levels;
- c. was privy to confidential proprietary information concerning the Company and its business and operations;

- d. was directly or indirectly involved in drafting, producing, reviewing and/or disseminating the false and misleading statements and information alleged herein;
- e. was directly or indirectly involved in the oversight or implementation of the Company's internal controls;
- f. was aware of or recklessly disregarded the fact that the false and misleading statements were being issued concerning the Company; and/or
- g. approved or ratified these statements in violation of the federal securities laws.

13. Riot is liable for the acts of the Individual Defendants and its employees under the doctrine of *respondeat superior* and common law principles of agency as all of the wrongful acts complained of herein were carried out within the scope of their employment with authorization.

14. The scienter of the Individual Defendants and other employees and agents of the Company is similarly imputed to Riot under *respondeat superior* and agency principles.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Background

15. On October 4, 2017, the Company announced it was changing its name from Bioptix, Inc. ("Bioptix") to Riot claiming this name change was in line with a shift in the Company's direction. As Bioptix the Company focused on animal healthcare and veterinary products. As Riot, however, the Company was now going to focus on being a strategic investor and operator in the blockchain ecosystem.

16. Blockchain protocols offer a secure way to store and relay information without the need for middlemen. It uses a decentralized and encrypted ledger that offers a secure, efficient, verifiable, and permanent way of storing records and other information. Blockchain

protocols are the backbone of numerous digital cryptocurrencies including Bitcoin, Ethereum and Litecoin.

Defendants' False and Misleading Class Period Statements

17. On November 13, 2017, Riot filed its quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the period ended September 30, 2017 (the "3Q17 10-Q") with the SEC, which provided the Company's quarterly financial results and position. The 3Q17 10-Q was signed by Defendants O'Rourke and McGonegal. The 3Q17 10-Q contained signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("SOX") by Defendants O'Rourke and McGonegal attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company's internal control over financial reporting and the disclosure of all fraud.

18. The 3Q17 10-Q stated that the Company's principle executive offices were located at 202 6th Street, Suite 401, Castle Rock, CO 80104.

19. On December 27, 2017, the Company issued a press release entitled "Riot Blockchain Announces Adjournment of Annual Meeting of Stockholders" which announced the cancelation of the annual meeting of stockholders scheduled for the following day. The press release stated in relevant part:

Annual Meeting to Resume on Thursday, February 1, 2018
CASTLE ROCK, Colo., Dec. 27, 2017 /PRNewswire/ -- Riot Blockchain, Inc. (Nasdaq: RIOT) (the "Company") today announced that its 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders scheduled for December 28, 2017 (the "Annual Meeting"), was adjourned to achieve a quorum on the proposals to be approved.

The Annual Meeting has been adjourned to 10:00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time on Thursday, February 1, 2018, at the Boca Raton Resort and Club, 501 East Camino Real, Boca Raton, FL 33422, to allow additional time for the Company's stockholders to vote on proposals to approve the following:

1. To elect as directors the nominees named in the proxy statement;
2. To ratify the appointment of EisnerAmper LLP as our independent public accountant for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2017;

3. To advise us as to whether you approve the compensation of our named executive officers (Say-on-Pay); and
4. To approve an amendment to the Company's 2017 Equity Incentive Plan to increase the reservation of common stock for issuance thereunder to 1,645,000 shares from 895,000 shares.

During the period of the adjournment, the Company will continue to solicit proxies from its stockholders with respect to the proposals set forth in the proxy statement. Only stockholders of record on the record date of December 11, 2017, are entitled to and are being requested to vote. If a stockholder has previously submitted its proxy card and does not wish to change its vote, no further action is required by such stockholder.

No changes have been made in the proposals to be voted on by stockholders at the Annual Meeting. The Company's proxy statement and any other materials filed by the Company with the SEC remain unchanged and can be obtained free of charge at the SEC's website at www.sec.gov.

The Company encourages all stockholders that have not yet voted to vote their shares by 11:59 p.m. on Wednesday, January 31, 2018, Eastern Standard Time. If you have not voted, or have mislaid your proxy materials or are uncertain if you have voted all the shares you are entitled to vote please see "How You Can Vote" in the proxy materials. Every single vote counts.

20. On January 31, 2018, the Company issued another press release entitled "Riot Blockchain Announces Adjournment of Annual Meeting of Stockholders" which again announced the cancelation of the annual meeting of stockholders scheduled for the following day. The press release stated in relevant part:

CASTLE ROCK, Colo., Jan. 31, 2018 /PRNewswire/ -- Riot Blockchain, Inc. (Nasdaq: RIOT) (the "Company") today announced that its 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the "Annual Meeting") was adjourned for a second time to achieve a quorum on the proposals to be approved. Under Nevada law, a new record date is required to be set.

The Company will file and mail a new proxy statement to its shareholders of record as soon as practical after its Board of Directors approves the new record date and schedules a new date and time for its Annual Meeting.

21. The statements referenced in ¶¶ 17-20 above were materially false and/or misleading because they misinterpreted and failed to disclose the following adverse facts

pertaining to the Company's business and operations which were known to Defendants or recklessly disregarded by them. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) Riot's principle executive offices were not in Colorado, but rather in Florida in the same location as a large, influential shareholder, Barry C. Honig who had a previous working relationship with Defendant O'Rourke; (2) Riot never intended to hold its Annual General Meetings scheduled for December 28, 2017 and February 1, 2018; and (3) as a result, Defendants' statements about Riot's business, operations and prospects were materially false and misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis at all relevant times.

The Truth Emerges

22. On February 16, 2017, CNBC published the article "CNBC investigates public company that changed its name to Riot Blockchain and saw its shares rocket" regarding questionable practices at Riot, stating in relevant part:

As bitcoin hit record highs in late December, a hot new stock was making news on a daily basis. Riot Blockchain's stock shot from \$8 a share to more than \$40, as investors wanted to cash in on the craze of all things crypto.

But Riot had not been in the cryptobusiness for long. Until October, its name was Bioptix, and it was known for having a veterinary products patent and developing new ways to test for disease.

That might sound somewhat like the type of newly minted blockchain company that has gained SEC attention.

"Nobody should think it is OK to change your name to something that involves blockchain when you have no real underlying blockchain business plan and try to sell securities based on the hype around blockchain," SEC Chairman Jay Clayton said, speaking in generalities in recent testimony to Congress. The SEC declined to comment to CNBC about Riot Blockchain.

The company did make an investment in a cryptocurrency exchange in September and two months later did purchase a company that has cryptocurrency mining equipment, but paying more than \$11 million for equipment worth only \$2 million, according to SEC filings.

That purchase and the company's name change aren't Riot's only questionable moves.

A number of red flags in the company's SEC filings also might make investors leery: annual meetings that are postponed at the last minute, insider selling soon after the name change, dilutive issuances on favorable terms to large investors, SEC filings that are often Byzantine and, just this week, evidence that a major shareholder was getting out while everyone else was getting in.

* * *

Despite Riot Blockchain's latest quarterly report showing a company in the red, its annual meeting was twice set to take place at the swanky Boca Raton Resort and Club in Florida. The resort is known as the "pink palace" and has luxury yachts lined up on its dock.

But with less than one day's notice, Riot twice "adjourned" its annual meeting, first scheduled for Dec. 28 and then for Feb. 1. It's not clear the company ever planned to have the meeting. Numerous employees at the hotel told CNBC it had no reservations for either date under the name of Riot Blockchain or any affiliated entity.

Riot's filings reveal that Barry Honig may be the man behind the Riot Blockchain curtain.

That would explain why a company formerly headquartered in Colorado might suddenly host its annual meeting in Boca Raton. That sunny location would certainly be convenient for Honig, once the company's largest shareholder, whose office is a short drive from the hotel. He once owned more than 11 percent of the outstanding common stock, according to SEC filings.

"My history of investing's pretty good. I invest in public companies," Honig told CNBC by phone. "It was an investment where I had a return. And I sold some shares. There's nothing wrong with doing that."

Honig became active in Riot in April 2016 when it was a veterinary testing company with a different name. He led an activist campaign to replace the board in September 2016 and won the fight in January 2017.

After his victory, attorneys say, red flags began to appear.

Until January, Honig had an extensive website filled with fawning descriptions of his investment acumen and what he does for companies when he gets involved.

"Barry Honig's investment portfolio includes a variety of exciting technology and biotech companies focused on innovation and progress," barryhonig.com stated

before it was taken down.

“Typically, Barry Honig invests his hard-earned money into a company, and he also provides strategic guidance to the company pertaining [sic] a variety of aspects, including who should lead the company (he helps put the right people in the right places in most of his investments), what goals and timelines that company should work towards, and a plan for the best way to achieve those goals,” the website said.

A visit to the site now only reveals the text: “Under construction.”

From the outside, Honig’s office is nondescript. There does not appear to be any evidence of his company’s existence on the building’s directory or on the door of his office.

When CNBC crew members walked into the office, they didn’t find Honig, they found O’Rourke. That’s the same O’Rourke who made headlines when — less than three months after the company changed names and business plans — he sold about \$869,000 worth of shares, according to an SEC filing. He told the crew he was there for a meeting with Honig and that we had just missed him.

O’Rourke initially agreed to a formal interview with CNBC and emailed later to say the interview was “confirmed,” adding “I think you’ll be impressed.” Then, late the night before, he backed out via email and said he needed to go to the Midwest to close an acquisition.

He agreed to answer questions via email instead. One of CNBC’s first questions was whether he worked in the same office as Honig, which could raise eyebrows.

“I have my own office in a separate location,” O’Rourke said in an email sent by his lawyer, Nick Morgan, a partner with Paul Hastings. “I do have a good relationship with Mr. Honig and we speak often.”

“John O’Rourke does not work out of my office,” Honig said. “John O’Rourke has his own office ... at one time John O’Rourke had space in my office ... we speak often.”

Securities attorneys told CNBC that if a CEO were using the office of a major investor, it might raise concerns about the exchange of information.

“You just can’t imagine that the CEO and the investor are going to have an appropriate wall between them where they’re not engaging in discussions or dialogue about what’s appropriate for the company on a day to day basis or in the future,” said Richard Birns, a corporate partner at Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP.

Despite Honig's website saying he gives advice on who should lead a company, Honig said he had nothing to do with O'Rourke becoming CEO.

"The board and Michael Beeghley [the CEO before O'Rourke] are the ones that made the decision in regards to John O'Rourke becoming the CEO, okay? John O'Rourke doesn't work for me, okay?" he said.

Birns analyzed Riot Blockchain's SEC filings for CNBC and found additional concerns.

"I see a company that has had a change of control of the board. I see a company that has had a change in business. I see a company that has had several dilutive issuances immediately following the change of the board and change of the business. And I see a stock that has gone zoom," he said. "And what I understand a significant amount of insider selling. So yes, these are red flags."

Jacob Zamansky, founder of Zamansky LLC, which specializes in securities fraud, also expressed caution.

"With the absence of revenue on the company's current financial statements, I would think investors need to be very cautious of a highly speculative stock with a lot of red flags," he said.

Since Honig's board shake-up, the company has increased its common stock share count from 4.5 million to more than 11.6 million. On Oct. 2, 2017, two days before announcing the name change to Riot Blockchain, the board approved a dividend payout of more than \$9.5 million, according to SEC filings.

Investors who own more than 5 percent of a company's outstanding common stock are required to file a form known as a 13D, which outlines their holdings. Subsequent changes in holdings require a "timely" filing of any changes.

SEC records spanning 14 months show that Honig filed two 13Ds, including one in January 2017 that shows he owned 11.19 percent. After Riot's name change sent the company's shares soaring, Honig cashed out and filed the second 13D in February showing he owned less than 2 percent of outstanding common stock along with a small number of warrants. His purchase price ranged from \$2.77 to \$5.32 per share, according to the list of trades he provided to the SEC in 2017. Honig's investment dropped below 5 percent, the threshold for SEC filing, on Nov. 28. At that point, the stock had already climbed above \$20.

Honig did not disclose his dramatically reduced position in the stock until this week.

But that may not be the true extent of Honig's selling. Buried deep in the footnotes of Riot filings, it's clear Honig also accumulated more than 700,000 new warrants that he could convert to stock at \$3.56 per share and more than 700,000 promissory notes that he could convert to stock at \$2.50 a share.

What about those warrants and promissory notes? It's not clear, as he never mentioned them in either 13D. But in another footnote from a recent Riot filing, there is no longer a mention of them.

He declined to further clarify what happened to them.

"It's all disclosed in the public filings. And those are all the obligations I have," he said. "I'm very comfortable with what I had to do and what I was obligated to do. ... I'm not going to talk about my personal trading history or my bank account."

Birns questioned how Honig made his filings. "It's clear that Mr. Honig, through himself and through the entities that he controls, owns at least a significant amount of stock. Or has the potential to own significant amount of stock in excess of what is reported on the 13D," he said.

This is not the first time Honig has faced questions over his actions. In 2000, he was alleged to have committed stock manipulation. Honig was fined \$25,000 and suspended for 10 days, according to the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority. In 2003, he let his broker's license lapse.

"The answer's no," Honig said when asked if he still manipulates stocks.

SEC filings suggest that when Honig began his charge to take over the board, he was represented by lawyer Harvey Kesner of Sichenzia Ross Ference Kesner LLP. A few months later, Kesner's law firm appears on Riot Blockchain's SEC filings.

Kesner's company, Paradox Capital Partners LLC, owns Riot stock, according to SEC filings.

When reached by phone, Kesner said he didn't know anything about Riot Blockchain and Barry Honig and hung up.

Honig said Kesner was Riot's attorney, but "his law firm has represented me in other issues in the past."

Since its name change, Riot has been a very active company, issuing 23 press releases about acquisitions and new divisions.

One of those acquisitions was Kairos Global Technology Inc., which had been

founded less than two weeks before the purchase. Kairos' main asset was \$2 million of mining equipment. Riot purchased Kairos for \$11.9 million worth of preferred convertible stock, according to SEC filings.

O'Rourke told CNBC the company paid a premium for the equipment due to a shortage of mining equipment and difficulties getting it directly from the manufacturer.

Kairos appears to have many links to Riot. The company was incorporated by Joe Laxague of Laxague Law Inc., the same lawyer who, SEC filings suggest, represented another major investor in Riot who has owned more than 7.49 percent of the company.

Laxague told CNBC he could not comment when reached by phone and hung up.

Kairos' president was Michael Ho, Nevada records show, a poker player who played at a tournament with two other professional poker players, both of whom are on Riot's advisory board, according to records reviewed by CNBC.

O'Rourke said Riot is using the equipment to mine and that the company is currently mining in Norway and Canada. Despite the many press releases, there has been no formal mining announcement.

"We have launched our own Bitcoin mining operation and it will be a focal point for Riot's expansion plans moving forward," is all Riot says on its webpage dedicated to mining. SEC filings are silent on mining activity.

As for professional poker players advising Riot? O'Rourke told CNBC the players are investors in the cryptocurrency space with more than 50,000 social media followers. He called them "thought leaders."

Riot is not O'Rourke and Honig's first cryptocurrency investment.

In 2013, they were owners in BTX Trader, a cryptocurrency company, which was acquired by WPCS, a publicly traded company in which Honig had invested, according to court records.

WPCS bought BTX on Dec. 17, 2013, just 13 days after it was incorporated in Delaware, according to SEC filings.

At the time, WPCS was a communications, infrastructure and contracting company. The stock went up to \$435.60 on a split-adjusted basis. It's now trading around \$2 after selling off BTX Trader in 2015, according to SEC filings.

Just last month, the company changed its name to DropCar after a merger and is now a cloud-services-for-cars company.

O'Rourke, through his lawyer, told CNBC in an email that he made several investments with Honig as co-investor. "BTX Trader was one of our first investments together in the blockchain sector in 2013," he said. "I have a good relationship with Mr. Honig, and he has been a supportive shareholder of Riot."

Honig acknowledges the investment.

The questions continue for Riot Blockchain.

On Tuesday, Riot filed to withdraw prior SEC filings.

"It is not the result of any government inquiry," O'Rourke said in an email. "It was just corporate clean up from our securities counsel."

As for the annual shareholders' meeting, "We did not have a quorum of shareholders required for a vote," O'Rourke said in the email from his lawyer. "We are also working on other corporate action items that would require shareholder approval and a shareholder meeting as well. We did not want to waste the time and expense of potentially having two shareholder meetings within a short period of time. Thus we adjourned the meetings, which is not an uncommon practice."

There is no new date for the shareholders' meeting.

"You see companies adjourn meetings in a context of a contested election and the like," Birns said. "I just don't think in this instance, there's any reason to adjourn their annual meeting."

And as to O'Rourke selling stock in December?

He told CNBC in the email: "I sold less than 10 percent of my overall position to assist with covering tax obligations as a result of so-called phantom income tax from the vesting of restricted stock awards. It is common for Executives to sell stock to cover such tax obligations. I could have sold more stock in that window but chose to sell just 30,383 shares."

O'Rourke welcomes increased regulation and transparency for the cryptocurrency industry. "Unfortunately, as with many new hot sectors, it [blockchain] has attracted some bad actors trying to capitalize on the hype," he said. "Riot is all for increased transparency and properly imposed regulation."

Honig would not disclose how much he made on his investment in Riot, "I wasn't fortunate enough to do as well as you might think and people might speculate. ... I don't regret anything." (Emphasis added).

23. On this news, shares of Riot fell \$5.74 per share or over 33.37% to close at \$11.46 per share on February 16, 2018, damaging investors.

24. As a result of Defendants' wrongful acts and omissions, and the precipitous decline in the market value of the Company's common shares, Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered significant losses and damages.

ADDITIONAL SCIENTER ALLEGATIONS

25. As alleged herein, Defendants acted with scienter since they knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of the Company were materially false and/or misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance or dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the federal securities laws. As set forth elsewhere herein in detail, Defendants, by virtue of their receipt of information reflecting the true facts regarding Riot, his control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of Riot's allegedly materially misleading misstatements and/or their associations with the Company which made them privy to confidential proprietary information concerning Concordia, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

26. On December 29, 2017, Defendant O'Rourke sold 30,383 shares of Riot stock for proceeds of \$869,256.35. O'Rourke wanted to sell his stock quietly and curiously timed his sales on the Friday before a holiday weekend.

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

27. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a Class, consisting of all those who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of Riot during the Class Period (the "Class");

and were damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosure. Excluded from the Class are Defendants herein, the officers and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

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

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

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

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

- (a) whether Defendants' acts as alleged violated the federal securities laws;

- (b) whether Defendants' statements to the investing public during the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the financial condition, business, operations, and management of the Company;
- (c) whether Defendants' statements to the investing public during the Class Period omitted material facts necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading;
- (d) whether the Individual Defendants caused the Company to issue false and misleading SEC filings and public statements during the Class Period;
- (e) whether Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and misleading SEC filings and public statements during the Class Period;
- (f) whether the prices of the Company's securities during the Class Period were artificially inflated because of the Defendants' conduct complained of herein; and
- (g) whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, what is the proper measure of damages.

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

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

- (a) Defendants made public misrepresentations or failed to disclose material facts during the Class Period;
- (b) the omissions and misrepresentations were material;
- (c) the Company's securities are traded in efficient markets;
- (d) the Company's securities were liquid and traded with moderate to heavy volume during the Class Period;
- (e) the Company traded on the NASDAQ, and was covered by multiple analysts;
- (f) the misrepresentations and omissions alleged would tend to induce a reasonable investor to misjudge the value of the Company's securities; Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased and/or sold the Company's securities between the time the Defendants failed to disclose or misrepresented material facts and the time the true facts were disclosed, without knowledge of the omitted or misrepresented facts; and
- (g) Unexpected material news about the Company was rapidly reflected in and incorporated into the Company's stock price during the Class Period.

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

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

COUNT I

**Violation of Section 10(b) of The Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5
Against All Defendants**

36. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

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

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

39. The Company and the Individual Defendants violated §10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule 10b-5 in that they: employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud; made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and/or engaged in acts, practices and a course of business that operated as a fraud or deceit upon plaintiff and others similarly situated in connection with their purchases of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

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

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

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

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

43. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class been aware that the market price of the Company's securities had been artificially and falsely inflated by the Company's and the Individual Defendants' misleading statements and by the material adverse information which the

Company's and the Individual Defendants did not disclose, they would not have purchased the Company's securities at the artificially inflated prices that they did, or at all.

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

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

COUNT II

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

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

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

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

49. Because of their positions of control and authority as senior officers, the Individual Defendants were able to, and did, control the contents of the various reports, press releases and public filings which the Company disseminated in the marketplace during the Class

Period. Throughout the Class Period, the Individual Defendants exercised their power and authority to cause the Company to engage in the wrongful acts complained of herein. The Individual Defendants therefore, were “controlling persons” of the Company within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. In this capacity, they participated in the unlawful conduct alleged which artificially inflated the market price of the Company’s securities.

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

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

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

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

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

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: February 17, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

By: /s/Laurence M. Rosen

Laurence M. Rosen

609 W. South Orange Avenue, Suite 2P

South Orange, NJ 07079

Tel: (973) 313-1887

Fax: (973) 833-0399

Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff