

disclosed reports and information about the defendants. Plaintiff believes that substantial evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

II.

DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

2.0 Discovery is intended to be conducted under **Level III** pursuant to Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 190.4.

III.

THE PARTIES

3.0 Plaintiff [REDACTED] purchased Kosmos common stock pursuant and/or traceable to the IPO and was damaged thereby. Plaintiff is a citizen of the United States and can

[REDACTED]

3.1 Defendant Kosmos Energy Ltd. (“Kosmos” or the “Company”) is a Bermuda based corporation with its U.S. headquarters at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500 in Dallas, Texas. Kosmos may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas. In addition and in the alternative, Defendant Kosmos Energy Ltd. is a nonresident of the State of Texas doing business in the State. Based upon information and belief this defendant committed or conspired to commit the securities violations alleged herein within the State of Texas with reasonably foreseeable consequences in the State of Texas. In addition, based upon information and belief this Defendant had sufficient minimum

ET

contact within the State of Texas and purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within Texas.

3.2 Defendant The Blackstone Group is a leading private equity company and venture capital firm. Funds advised by The Blackstone Group own a significant position in Kosmos. The Blackstone Group is a nonresident of the State of Texas doing business in the State. The Blackstone Group may be served through the Texas Secretary of State, its headquarters are located at 345 Park Ave # Lb4 New York, New York, 10154. Based upon information and belief this Defendant committed or conspired to commit the securities violations alleged herein within the State of Texas with reasonably foreseeable consequences in the State of Texas. In addition, based upon information and belief this Defendant had sufficient minimum contact within the State of Texas and purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within Texas.

SOS

3.3 Defendant Warburg Pincus is a leading private equity company and venture capital firm. Warburg Pincus is a nonresident of the State of Texas doing business in the State. It may be served through the Texas Secretary of State, its U.S. headquarters are located at 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017. Funds advised by Warburg Pincus own a significant position in Kosmos. Based upon information and belief this defendant committed or conspired to commit the securities violations alleged herein within the State of Texas with reasonably foreseeable consequences in the State of Texas. In addition, based upon information and belief this Defendant had sufficient minimum contact within the State of Texas and purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within Texas.

SOS

3.4 Defendant Brian F. Maxted is, and was at the time of the IPO, a director of Kosmos and the Chief Executive Officer of the Company. Defendant Maxted signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Maxted is also a founding partner of Kosmos. Upon information and belief, Maxted is a resident of Texas and may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CT

75231

3.5 Defendant W. Greg Dunlevy is, and was at the time of the IPO, the Chief Financial Officer and Executive Vice President of Kosmos. Defendant Dunlevy signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Dunlevy is also a founding partner of Kosmos. Upon information and belief, Dunlevy is a resident of Texas and may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas. 75231

CIT

3.6 Defendant Sylvia Manor was the Vice President and Controller of Kosmos at the time of the IPO. Defendant Manor signed the false and misleading registration statement. Upon information and belief, Manor is a resident of Texas and may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.7 Defendant John R. Kemp is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos as well as the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company. Defendant Kemp signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Kemp may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.8 Defendant David I. Foley is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Foley signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Foley may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.9 Defendant Jeffrey A. Harris is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Harris signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Harris may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.10 Defendant David B. Krieger is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Krieger signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Krieger may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas. 75231

CIT

3.11 Defendant Prakash A. Melwani is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Melwani signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Melwani may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.12 Defendant Adebayo O. Ogunlesi is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Ogunlesi signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Ogunlesi may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.13 Defendant Chris Tong is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Tong signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Tong may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.14 Defendant Christopher A. Wright is, and was at the time of the IPO, a Director of Kosmos. Defendant Wright signed the false and misleading Registration Statement. Wright may be served with process pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Section 17.033; Texas Business Orgs. Code Section 5.252 upon its agent for service of process at 8176 Park Lane, Suite 500, Dallas Texas.

CIT

3.15 Defendant Citigroup Global Markets Inc., ("Citi") was an underwriter of the company offering and served as a financial advisor and assisted in the preparation and

SOS

dissemination of Kosmos' false and misleading Registration Statement. Citi acted as representative for 10,546,250 of the 33,000,000 shares offered in the IPO. Citi is a nonresident of the State of Texas doing business in the State. It may be served through the Texas Secretary of State, its U.S. headquarters are located at 399 Park Avenue New York, NY 10043. Based upon information and belief this Defendant committed or conspired to commit the securities violations alleged herein within the State of Texas with reasonably foreseeable consequences in the State of Texas. In addition, based upon information and belief this Defendant had sufficient minimum contact within the State of Texas and purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within Texas.

3.16 Defendant Barclays Capital Inc., ("Barclays") was an underwriter of the Company's Offering, and served as a financial advisor and assisted in the preparation and dissemination of Kosmos's false and misleading Registration Statement. Barclays acted as representative for 7,438,750 of the 33,000,000 shares offered in the IPO. Barclays is a nonresident of the State of Texas doing business in the State. It may be served through the Texas Secretary of State, its U.S. headquarters are located at 200 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10166-0398. Based upon information and belief this Defendant committed or conspired to commit the securities violations alleged herein within the State of Texas with reasonably foreseeable consequences in the State of Texas. In addition, based upon information and belief this Defendant had sufficient minimum contact within the State of Texas and purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within Texas. SOS

3.17 Defendant Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, ("Credit Suisse") was an underwriter of the Company's Offering, and served as a financial advisor and assisted in the preparation and dissemination of Kosmos's false and misleading Registration Statement. Credit Suisse acted as representative for 6,063,750 of the 33,000,000 shares offered in the IPO. Credit Suisse is a nonresident of the State of Texas doing business in the State. It may served through the Texas Secretary of State, its U.S. headquarters are located at 11 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10010. Based upon information and belief this defendant committed or conspired to SOS

commit the securities violations alleged herein within the State of Texas with reasonably foreseeable consequences in the State of Texas. In addition, based upon information and belief this Defendant had sufficient minimum contact within the State of Texas and purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within Texas.

IV.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4.0 This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case because the Plaintiff and the Defendants are both residents of the State of Texas. Moreover, the claims alleged herein arise under §§11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§77k, 77l(a)(2) and 77o. Section 22 of the Securities Act explicitly states that “[e]xcept as provided in section 16(c), no case arising under this title and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court in the United States.” Section 16(c) refers to “covered class actions,” which are defined as lawsuits brought as class actions or brought on behalf of more than 50 persons asserting claims under state or common law. This is an action asserting federal law claims. Thus, it does not fall within the definition of “covered class action” under §16(b)-(c) and therefore is not removable to federal court.

4.1 The Court has personal jurisdiction over each of the Defendants named herein because they conducted business in, resided in and/or were citizens of Texas at the time of the IPO.

4.2 The Underwriter Defendants conduct business and maintain offices in this county. Some, if not all, of the underwriting documents pertaining to the IPO are located in this county.

4.3 Venue is proper in this Court because many of the acts complained of including the dissemination of materially false and misleading statements and reports prepared by or with

the participation, acquiescence, encouragement, cooperation, or assistance of Defendants, occurred, at least in part, in this county.

V.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

5.0 Plaintiff bring this action as a class action on behalf of a Class, consisting of all those who purchased Kosmos common stock pursuant or traceable to the Company's IPO and Registration Statement and who were damaged thereby (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class are Defendants, the officers and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors, assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

5.1 The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. While the exact number of Class members is unknown the Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believe that there are thousands of members in the proposed Class. The proposed class may be indentified from records maintained by Kosmos 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.

5.2 Plaintiff' 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.

5.3 Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class and hae retained counsel competent and experienced in class and securities litigation.

5.4 Common questions of law and fact exist 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:

5.5 Whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as alleged herein

5.6 Whether the Prospectus and Registration Statement contained materially false and misleading statements and omissions; and

5.7 To what extent Plaintiff and members of the Class have sustained damages and the proper measure of damages.

5.8 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.

VI.

FACTS

6.0 Kosmos is an oil and gas exploration company that focuses its exploration efforts almost entirely on the Jubilee oil field, which is an oil field that is located in deep water off the coast of the Republic of Ghana in West Africa. In 2007, Kosmos entered into a partnership with several other gas exploration companies to share the costs of developing the Jubilee oil field. After entering into the partnership, Kosmos and its partners agreed to spend over \$3.3 billion on a project that would produce 120,000 barrels of oil per day ("bopd") by the middle of 2011.

6.1 At the same time that Kosmos and its partners were developing the Jubilee field, Kosmos went public via an Initial Public Offering ("IPO"). The IPO occurred on May 16, 2011. Investors who purchased Kosmos stock in the IPO were very interested in knowing the progress the Company had made in developing the Jubilee oil field. Kosmos addressed this topic repeatedly in the Registration Statements and Prospectus (collectively, the "Offering Documents") that Kosmos filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

6.2 Specifically, Kosmos told investors in the Offering Documents for the IPO that: “Oil production from the Jubilee Field offshore Ghana commenced on November 29, 2010, and we anticipate receiving our first oil revenues in early 2011. **We expect gross oil production from the Jubilee Field to reach its design capacity of 120,000 barrels of oil per day (“BOPD”) in mid 2011.**”

6.3 Kosmos also told investors in the Offering Documents that: the J-01 and J-02 Jubilee oil wells were “producing”; the J-03 and J-05 Jubilee oil wells were listed as “completion pending” – meaning that production casing had been fully installed and the well would soon be producing; and the J-04 and J-07 wells were listed as “plugged back” – meaning that well had been set up for production from a sidetrack well.

6.4 Kosmos further stated in the Offering Documents: “The Jubilee Field Phase 1 development was designed to **provide suitable flexibility and expandability in order to minimize capital expenditures associated with subsequent phases of development.**”

6.5 In addition, Kosmos told investors in the Offering Documents that: “A phased development program allows us to develop the full Jubilee Field on a faster timeline and allowed us to achieve first oil production at an earlier date than traditional development techniques This condensed timeline reflects the lessons learned by members of our seasoned management.”

6.6 These statements were materially false because, at the time of the IPO, gross oil production from the Jubilee field was not on track to reach its design capacity of 120,000 BOPD by mid 2011. Rather, several of the Jubilee oil wells were not producing as expected due to design defects with the oil wells – defects which existed at the time of completion and pre-dated the IPO. These design defects would cost Kosmos hundreds of millions of dollars to remediate, and would keep the Jubilee oil wells from producing as expected for several years. None of this was disclosed to investors in the IPO.

6.7 Investors first began learning the truth about the Jubilee oil field on July 6, 2011, when one of Kosmos's partners, Tullow Oil, issued a press release announcing that production from the Jubilee Oil field was flowing at 80,000 BOPD, which was 40,000 barrels below the anticipated 120,000 BOPD. Tullow characterized this as a "minor delay" and attributed it to "extended blow-out preventer maintenance" and "extra work required to fully commission the FPSO's gas compression system to allow a re-injection rate of 80 million cubic feet per day." Interestingly, Kosmos said nothing about the fact that the Jubilee oil wells were only producing 80,000 BOPD, even though they repeatedly told investors in connection with the May 2011 IPO that the wells would be producing 120,000 BOPD by June 2011.

6.8 Investors received more bad news about the Jubilee oil wells in August 2011, when Tullow Oil announced that production from the Jubilee Field was flowing and was projected to remain at the 82,000-84,000 BOPD range, not the 120,000 BOPD range that Kosmos told investors in connection with the IPO. Then, on November 2, 2011, Tullow announced that it was lowering production forecasts from the field to the 79,000 to 81,000 BOPD range. Once again, Kosmos remained silent with respect to the news that the Jubilee oil wells would not be producing 120,000 BOPD.

6.9 It was not until November 10, 2011 that Kosmos addressed the problems with the Jubilee oil wells. In the Company's Third Quarter 2011 earnings release, Kosmos stated cryptically that it had "identified completion issues [that] required one of the producing wells to be sidetracked, as well as downhole remediation on certain other wells." Later that same day, Kosmos' CEO, Brian Maxted, provided investors with additional information about the problems with the oil wells during a conference call with analysts, telling them that: **"I'm assuming that there will be a sizable amount of cost in 2012 and beyond [to fix the problems with the Jubilee oil wells], not just a one-year spend. It will be spread over, more likely than not, one or two years."** He also told analysts that "it remains to be seen exactly when that [the remediation of the problems with the Jubilee oil wells] will happen."

6.10 Investors learned more about the problems from one of Kosmos' partners, Andarko Petroleum, when Andarko's CEO stated that "The problem [with the Jubilee wells] wasn't associated with early depletion of the reservoir, but rather with the way wells were completed." In other words, **Kosmos and its partners were dealing with a design problem with the wells that existed before the IPO – a design problem that Kosmos did not disclose to investors who purchased Kosmos stock in the IPO.**

6.11 Analysts reacted very negatively to the news that there were widespread design problems with the Jubilee wells. For instance, an analyst with Tudor Pickering Holt stated: **"The combination of completion failures, production issues, downhole remediation, and sidetracks being planned all point to a completion design issue.** We estimate that Kosmos will outspend case flow by \$180 million in 2H11 and \$420 million in 2012 [to remediate the issues]." The analysts concluded **"these productivity issues [with the Jubilee wells] seem to be continuing and may not be limited to only the J-1 and J-7 wells."**

6.12 Credit Suisse analysts wrote: **"[The] Jubilee sidetrack is important. Some of the Jubilee wells have not been producing as well as expected.** The well-bores have been plugged with fines. Tullow, the operator, will attempt a different wellbore completion in an upcoming sidetrack. After a few months of monitoring, Kosmos will know whether this new completion design has been successful. Filling the FPSO's 120k b/d of capacity (currently at 80k b/d) will require Phase 1A wells or sidetracks on existing Phase 1 wells or both. **We raise field capex \$500M."**

6.13 The problems with the Jubilee oil wells have had a significant, negative impact on investors who purchased in the IPO, costing them hundreds of millions of dollars in investment losses, as the price of Kosmos' stock has fallen over approximately 30% since the IPO -- from an IPO price of \$18 per share to its current price of over \$13 per share. This drop in the value of Kosmos' stock price has been due entirely to the false statements that Defendants made about the Jubilee oil wells in the Offering Documents for the IPO.

VII.

FIRST CLAIM

Violations of Section 11 of the Securities Act Against All Defendants

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

7.1 This claim is brought pursuant to Section 11 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77k, on behalf of the class, against each of the Defendants.

7.2 The Registration Statement was inaccurate and misleading, contained untrue statements of material facts, and omitted facts necessary to make the statements made therein not misleading and omitted to state materials facts required to be stated therein.

7.3 Defendant Kosmos is the issuer of the securities purchased by Plaintiff and the Class. As such, Kosmos is strictly liable for the materially inaccurate statements contained in the Registration Statement and the failure of the Registration Statement to be complete and accurate.

7.4 The Individual Defendants, the Blackstone Group and Warburg Pincus each signed the Registration Statement. The Individual Defendants, the Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus each had a duty to make a reasonable and diligent investigation of the truthfulness and accuracy of the statements contained in the Registration Statement. They had a duty to ensure that they were true and accurate, that there were no omissions of material facts that would make the Registration Statement misleading and that the documents contained all facts required to be stated therein. In the exercise of reasonable care, the Individual Defendants, the Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus should have known of the material misstatements and omissions contained in the Registration Statement and also should have known of the omissions of material fact necessary to make the statements made therein not misleading. As such, the

Individual Defendants, the Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus are liable to Plaintiff and the Class.

7.5 The Underwriter Defendants each served as underwriters in connection with the Offering. These defendants each had a duty to make a reasonable and diligent investigation of the truthfulness and accuracy of the statements contained in the Registration Statement. They had a duty to ensure that they were true and accurate, that there were no omissions of material facts that would make the Registration Statement misleading and that the documents contained all facts required to be stated therein. In the exercise of reasonable care, the Underwriter Defendants should have known of the material misstatements and omissions contained in the Registration Statement and should have known of the omission of material facts necessary to make the statements made therein not misleading. As such, the Underwriter Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Class.

7.6 By reasons of the conduct herein alleged, each Defendant violated Section 11 of the Securities Act.

7.8 Plaintiff acquired Kosmos common stock in reliance on the Registration Statement and without knowledge of the untruths and/or omissions alleged herein. Plaintiff sustained damages and the price of Kosmos's shares declined substantially due to material misstatements in the Registration Statement.

7.9 This action was brought within one year after the discovery of the untrue statements and omissions and within three years of the date of the IPO.

7.10 By virtue of the foregoing, Plaintiff and other members of the Class are entitled to damages under Section 11 as measured by the provisions of Section 11(e), from the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally.

VIII.

SECOND CLAIM

Violations of Section 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act Against All Defendants

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

8.1 Defendants were sellers and offerors and/or solicitors of purchasers of the Kosmos securities offered pursuant to the IPO. Defendants issued, caused to be issued, and signed the Registration Statement in connection with the Offering. The Registration Statement was used to induce investors, such as Plaintiff and other members of the Class, to purchase Kosmos securities.

8.2 The Registration Statement contained untrue statements of material facts, omitted to state other facts necessary to make the statements made not misleading, and omitted material facts required to be stated therein. Defendants' actions of solicitation included participation in the preparation of the false and misleading Registration Statement.

8.3 As set forth more specifically above, the Registration Statement contained untrue statements of material fact and omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements, in light of circumstances in which they were made, not misleading.

8.4 Plaintiff and other Class members did not know, nor could they have known, of the untruths or omissions contained in the Registration Statement.

8.5 The Defendants were obligated to make a reasonable and diligent investigation of the statements contained in the Registration Statement to ensure that such statements were true and that there was no omission of material fact required to be stated in order to make the statements contained therein not misleading. None of the Defendants made a reasonable investigation or possessed reasonable grounds for the belief that the statements contained in the Registration Statement were accurate and complete in all material respects. Had they done so, these Defendants could have known of the material misstatements and omissions alleged herein.

8.6 This claim was brought within one year after discovery of the untrue statements and omissions in the Registration Statement and within three years after Kosmos securities were sold to the Class in connection with the Offerings.

IX.

THIRD CLAIM

**For Violation of Section 15 of the Securities Act Against the Individual Defendants, the
Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus**

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

9.1 Individual Defendants, the Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus acted as controlling persons of Kosmos within the meaning of §15 of the Securities Act. By reason of their ownership, senior management positions and/or directorships at the Company, as alleged above, these defendants, individually and acting pursuant to a common plan, had the power to influence and exercise the same to cause Kosmos to engage in the conduct complained of herein. By reason of such conduct, the Individual Defendants, the Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus are liable pursuant to §15 of the Securities Act.

9.2 By reason of such wrongful conduct, the Individual Defendants, The Blackstone Group, and Warburg Pincus are liable pursuant to §15 of the Securities Act. As a direct and proximate result of the wrongful conduct, Class members suffered damages in connection with their purchases of the Company's securities.

X.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

10.0 Declaring this action to be a proper class action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representatives;

10.1 Awarding Plaintiff and other members of the Class compensatory damages;

10.2 Awarding Plaintiff and other members of the Class rescission on their Section 12(a)(2) claims;

10.3 Awarding Plaintiff and other members of the Class pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees, expert witness fees, and other costs and disbursements; and

10.4 Awarding Plaintiff and other members of the Class any other relief and the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury trial.

DATED: January 10, 2012

Respectfully submitted,