

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

Laurence M. Rosen, Esq. (LR 5733)
Phillip Kim, Esq. (PK 9384)
275 Madison Ave., 34th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 686-1060
Fax: (212) 202-3827
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com
pkim@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

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

-----X
PATRICK BELAND, INDIVIDUALLY AND
ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS
SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LIBERTY TAX, INC., EDWARD L.
BRUNOT, JOHN T. HEWITT, and
KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN,

Defendants.
-----X

Case No. 17-cv-7327

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

CLASS ACTION

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Patrick Beland (“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 Liberty Tax, Inc. (“Liberty Tax” 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 Liberty Tax securities from June 29, 2016 through December 11, 2017, 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 Company conducts business in this judicial 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 Liberty Tax securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures.

7. Defendant Liberty Tax provides tax preparation services and solutions in the United States and Canada. The Company operates 212 tax offices in New York and over (40) forty tax offices in this judicial district. Liberty Tax securities trade on NASDAQ under the symbol “TAX.”

8. Defendant Edward L. Brunot (“Brunot”) has been the Company’s President and Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) since September 8, 2017. He previously served as Chief Operating Officer since June 1, 2017.

9. Defendant John T. Hewitt (“Hewitt”) is the Company’s founder, and was its President and CEO from October 1996 until his termination on September 5, 2017. He has been the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company throughout the Class Period.

10. Defendant Kathleen E. Donovan (“Donovan”) has been the Company’s Chief Financial Officer (“CFO”) throughout the Class Period. On November 7, 2017, the Company announced Donovan’s resignation, effective at a future date.

11. Collectively, Defendants Brunot, Hewitt, and Donovan are herein referred to as “Individual Defendants.”

12. Collectively, Defendant Liberty Tax and Individual Defendants are herein referred to as “Defendants.”

13. 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.

14. Liberty Tax 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.

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

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Defendants' False and Misleading Class Period Statements

16. On June 29, 2016, Liberty Tax filed an annual report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2016 (the "2016 10-K") with the SEC, which provided the Company's

annual financial results and position. The 2016 10-K was signed by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan. The 2016 10-K contained signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan 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.

17. The 2016 10-K stated the following regarding Defendant Hewitt’s control over the Company:

We are controlled by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, whose interests in our business may be different from those of our stockholders.

John Hewitt, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, currently owns all outstanding shares of our Class B common stock. Our Class B common stock has the power to elect, voting as a separate class, the minimum number of directors that constitute a majority of the Board of Directors. As a result, Mr. Hewitt will, for the foreseeable future, have significant influence over our management and affairs, given the Board’s authority to appoint or replace our senior management, cause us to issue additional shares of our Class A common stock or repurchase Class A common stock, declare dividends, or take other actions. Upon Mr. Hewitt’s death, pending the effectiveness of a provision of our certificate of incorporation that will become effective only after we have conducted an initial public offering or certain other triggering events occur, Mr. Hewitt’s estate would succeed to these special voting rights. Mr. Hewitt may make decisions regarding our Company and business that are opposed to other stockholders’ interests or with which they disagree. Mr. Hewitt’s ability to elect a majority of the Board of Directors may also delay or prevent a change of control of us, even if that change of control would benefit our stockholders, which could deprive an investor of the opportunity to receive a premium for your Class A common stock. The power to elect a majority of the directors may adversely affect the value of our Class A common stock due to investors’ perception that conflicts of interest may exist or arise. To the extent that the interests of our other stockholders are harmed by the actions of Mr. Hewitt, the price of our Class A common stock may be harmed. For information regarding the ownership of our outstanding stock, please see the section titled “Item 12-Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters.”

18. The 2016 10-K stated the following regarding the Company’s controls and procedures:

Item 9A. Controls and Procedures.

The Company's disclosure controls and procedures are designed to provide reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed in the Company's reports filed under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms, including, without limitation, that such information is accumulated and communicated to Company management, including the Company's principal executive and financial officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosures.

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

The Company, under the supervision and with the participation of the Company's management, including the Company's Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer, has evaluated the effectiveness of the Company's disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Exchange Act) as of April 30, 2016. Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that, as of April 30, 2016, the Company's disclosure controls and procedures were effective in providing reasonable assurance that material information is recorded, processed, summarized, and reported by management of the Company on a timely basis in order to comply with the Company's disclosure obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Management of the Company is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Rule 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act). The Company's internal control over financial reporting is designed to provide reasonable assurance to the Company's management and Board of Directors regarding the reliability of financial reporting and preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with GAAP.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Therefore, even those systems determined to be effective can provide only reasonable assurance with respect to financial statement preparation and presentation.

Management assessed the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of April 30, 2016. In making this assessment, management used the criteria set forth by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission in Internal Control – Integrated Framework (2013). Based on this assessment, management believes that, as of April 30, 2016, the Company's internal control over financial reporting was effective based on those criteria.

Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

During the quarter ended April 30, 2016, there were no changes that materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

19. On September 2, 2016, Liberty Tax filed a quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended July 31, 2016 (the “Q1 2017 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s quarterly financial results and position. The Q1 2017 10-Q was signed by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan. The Q1 2017 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan 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.

20. The Q1 2017 10-Q stated the following regarding the Company’s controls and procedures:

ITEM 4

CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We, under the supervision and with the participation of our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, have evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”) as of July 31, 2016. Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that, as of July 31, 2016, our disclosure controls and procedures were effective in providing reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed by us in the reports that we file or submit under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported by our management on a timely basis in order to comply with our disclosure obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

21. On December 9, 2016, Liberty Tax filed a quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended October 31, 2016 (the “Q2 2017 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s quarterly financial results and position. The Q2 2017 10-Q was signed by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan. The Q2 2017 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan 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.

22. The Q2 2017 10-Q stated the following regarding the Company's controls and procedures:

ITEM 4

CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We, under the supervision and with the participation of our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, have evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"), as of October 31, 2016. Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that, as of October 31, 2016, our disclosure controls and procedures were effective in providing reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed by us in the reports that we file or submit under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported by our management on a timely basis in order to comply with our disclosure obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

23. On March 9, 2017, Liberty Tax filed a quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended January 31, 2017 (the "Q3 2017 10-Q") with the SEC, which provided the Company's quarterly financial results and position. The Q3 2017 10-Q was signed by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan. The Q3 2017 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan 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.

24. The Q3 2017 10-Q stated the following regarding the Company's controls and procedures:

ITEM 4

CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We, under the supervision and with the participation of our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, have evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in

Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”), as of January 31, 2017. Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that, as of January 31, 2017, our disclosure controls and procedures were effective in providing reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed by us in the reports that we file or submit under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported by our management on a timely basis in order to comply with our disclosure obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

25. On July 7, 2017, Liberty Tax filed an annual report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2017 (the “2017 10-K”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s annual financial results and position. The 2017 10-K was signed by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan. The 2017 10-K contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hewitt and Donovan 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.

26. The 2017 10-K stated the following regarding Defendant Hewitt’s control over the Company:

We are controlled by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, whose interests in our business may be different from those of our stockholders.

John Hewitt, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, currently owns all outstanding shares of our Class B common stock. Our Class B common stock has the power to elect, voting as a separate class, the minimum number of directors that constitute a majority of the Board of Directors. As a result, Mr. Hewitt will, for the foreseeable future, have significant influence over our management and affairs, given the Board’s authority to appoint or replace our senior management, cause us to issue additional shares of our Class A common stock or repurchase Class A common stock, declare dividends, or take other actions. Upon Mr. Hewitt’s death, pending the effectiveness of a provision of our certificate of incorporation that will become effective only after we have conducted an initial public offering or certain other triggering events occur, Mr. Hewitt’s estate would succeed to these special voting rights. Mr. Hewitt may make decisions regarding our Company and business that are opposed to other stockholders’ interests or with which they disagree. Mr. Hewitt’s ability to elect a majority of the Board of Directors may also delay or prevent a change of control of us, even if that change of control would benefit our stockholders, which could deprive an investor of the opportunity to receive a premium for your Class A common stock. The power to elect a majority of the directors may adversely affect the value of our Class A common stock due to investors’ perception that conflicts of interest may exist or

arise. To the extent that the interests of our other stockholders are harmed by the actions of Mr. Hewitt, the price of our Class A common stock may be harmed. For information regarding the ownership of our outstanding stock, please see the section titled “Item 12-Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters.”

27. The 2017 10-K stated the following regarding the Company’s controls and procedures:

Item 9A. Controls and Procedures.

The Company’s disclosure controls and procedures are designed to provide reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed in the Company’s reports filed under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC’s rules and forms, including, without limitation, that such information is accumulated and communicated to Company management, including the Company’s principal executive and financial officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosures.

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

The Company, under the supervision and with the participation of the Company’s management, including the Company’s Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer, has evaluated the effectiveness of the Company’s disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Exchange Act) as of April 30, 2017. Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that, as of April 30, 2017, the Company’s disclosure controls and procedures were effective in providing reasonable assurance that information required to be filed by the Company in the reports if files or submits under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized, and reported by management of the Company on a timely basis in order to comply with the Company’s disclosure obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Management’s Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Management of the Company is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act). The Company’s internal control over financial reporting is designed to provide reasonable assurance to the Company’s management and Board of Directors regarding the reliability of financial reporting and preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with GAAP.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Therefore, even those systems determined to be effective can provide only reasonable assurance with respect to financial statement preparation and presentation.

Management assessed the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of April 30, 2017. In making this assessment, management used the criteria set forth by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission in *Internal Control – Integrated Framework* (2013). Based on this assessment, management believes that, as of April 30, 2017, the Company's internal control over financial reporting was effective based on those criteria.

Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

During the quarter ended April 30, 2017, there were no changes that materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

28. On September 11, 2017, Liberty Tax filed a quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended July 31, 2017 (the "Q1 2018 10-Q") with the SEC, which provided the Company's quarterly financial results and position. The Q1 2018 10-Q was signed by Defendants Brunot and Donovan. The Q1 2018 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Brunot and Donovan 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.

29. The Q1 2018 10-Q stated the following regarding the Company's controls and procedures:

ITEM 4

CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We, under the supervision and with the participation of our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, have evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"), as of July 31, 2017. Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that, as of July 31, 2017, our disclosure controls and procedures were effective in providing reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed by us in the reports that we file or submit under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported by our management on a timely basis in order to comply with our disclosure obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

30. The statements referenced in ¶¶ 16-29 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) Liberty Tax's former CEO Defendant Hewitt created an inappropriate tone at the top; (2) the inappropriate tone at the top led to ineffective entity level controls over the organization; and (3) as a result, Defendants' statements about Liberty Tax's business, operations and prospects were materially false and misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis at all relevant times.

The Truth Emerges

31. On November 7, 2017, Liberty Tax filed a Form 8-K with the SEC during aftermarket hours announcing the abrupt resignation of Defendant Donovan as CFO.

32. On this news, shares of Liberty Tax fell \$2.25 per share or over 16% from its previous closing price to close at \$11.00 per share on November 8, 2017, damaging investors.

33. On December 11, 2017, Liberty Tax filed a Form 8-K with the SEC announcing the sudden resignation of KPMG LLP as its independent registered public accounting firm and the delay in the filing of its quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended October 31, 2017, stating in part:

Item 4.01. Changes in Registrants Certifying Accountant.

On December 8, 2017, KPMG LLP ("KPMG") resigned as the independent registered public accounting firm of Liberty Tax, Inc. (the "Company"), effective immediately, and KPMG's resignation was accepted and approved by the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors of the Company (the "Board").

* * *

KPMG expressed to the Audit Committee and Company management its concern that the actions of former Chief Executive Officer John T. Hewitt, who

remains the Chairman of the Board and controlling stockholder as the sole holder of the Company's outstanding Class B common stock, have created an inappropriate tone at the top which leads to ineffective entity level controls over the organization. Prior to the termination of Mr. Hewitt's employment as Chief Executive Officer of the Company on September 5, 2017, the Audit Committee oversaw an investigation of allegations of misconduct by Mr. Hewitt. In particular, KPMG noted that Mr. Hewitt took actions to replace two independent members of the Board around the time information relating to this investigation appeared in media reports. KPMG also noted that following the replacement by Mr. Hewitt of two Class B directors, the chair of the Audit Committee retired from the Board, the Company's Chief Financial Officer announced her intention to resign from the Company, and another independent member of the Board announced that he would not stand for reelection at the Company's next annual meeting. Further, KPMG was made aware that following his termination as Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Hewitt may have continued to interact with franchisees and area developers of the Company. *Although Mr. Hewitt stated to KPMG during a meeting on November 9, 2017 that he would not reinsert himself into the management of the Company, in light of Mr. Hewitt's actions and his ability to control the Board as the sole holder of the Class B common stock, KPMG informed the Audit Committee and management that it has concerns regarding the Company's internal control over financial reporting as related to integrity and tone at the top and such matters should be evaluated as potential material weaknesses.*

Specifically, KPMG informed the Audit Committee and management that Mr. Hewitt's past and continued involvement in the Company's business and operations, including his continued interactions with franchisees and area developers of the Company, has led it to no longer be able to rely on management's representations, and therefore has caused KPMG to be unwilling to be associated with the Company's consolidated financial statements. In notifying the Company of its resignation, KPMG advised the Audit Committee and management that it is not aware of any information that cause it to question the integrity of current management, but rather that the structural arrangement by which Mr. Hewitt controls the Company is the cause of KPMG's concerns. KPMG also noted that because certain information known to the Board regarding the reasons that the Board terminated Mr. Hewitt as Chief Executive Officer had not been disclosed to the current Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, KPMG was uncertain as to whether it could continue to rely on management's representations.

* * *

Item 8.01. Other Events.

On December 11, 2017, the Company issued a press release announcing the resignation of KPMG as the Company's independent registered public accounting firm and that the *Company will delay the filing of its Quarterly Report on Form*

10-Q for the quarter ended October 31, 2017. A copy of the press release is attached hereto as Exhibit 99.1 to this Current Report on Form 8-K and is incorporated herein by reference.

[Emphasis added].

34. On this news, shares of the Company fell \$0.80 per share or over 6% from its previous closing price to close at \$11.15 per share on December 11, 2017, further damaging investors.

35. 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.

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

36. 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 Liberty Tax 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.

37. 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.

38. 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.

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. 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.

42. 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.

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

44. 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

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

46. 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.

47. 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.

48. 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.

49. 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.

50. 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.

51. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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.

54. 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

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

56. 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.

57. 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.

58. 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.

59. 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.

60. 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: December 15, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

By: /s/Phillip Kim
Laurence M. Rosen, Esq. (LR 5733)
Phillip Kim, Esq. (PK 9384)
275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Telephone: (212) 686-1060
Fax: (212) 202-3827
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com
pkim@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

Certification and Authorization of Named Plaintiff Pursuant to Federal Securities Laws

The individual or institution listed below (the "Plaintiff") authorizes and, upon execution of the accompanying retainer agreement by The Rosen Law Firm P.A., retains The Rosen Law Firm P.A. to file an action under the federal securities laws to recover damages and to seek other relief against Liberty Tax, Inc.. The Rosen Law Firm P.A. will prosecute the action on a contingent fee basis and will advance all costs and expenses. The Liberty Tax, Inc.. Retention Agreement provided to the Plaintiff is incorporated by reference, upon execution by The Rosen Law Firm P.A.

First name: Patrick

Middle initial:

Last name: Beland

Address:

City:

Redacted

State:

Zip:

Country:

Facsimile:

Phone:

Email:

Plaintiff certifies that:

1. Plaintiff has reviewed the complaint and authorized its filing.
2. Plaintiff did not acquire the security that is the subject of this action at the direction of plaintiff's counsel or in order to participate in this private action or any other litigation under the federal securities laws.
3. Plaintiff is willing to serve as a representative party on behalf of a class, including providing testimony at deposition and trial, if necessary.
4. Plaintiff represents and warrants that he/she/it is fully authorized to enter into and execute this certification.
5. Plaintiff will not accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of the class beyond the Plaintiff's pro rata share of any recovery, except such reasonable costs and expenses (including lost wages) directly relating to the representation of the class as ordered or approved by the court.
6. Plaintiff has made no transaction(s) during the Class Period in the debt or equity securities that are the subject of this action except those set forth below:

Acquisitions:

Type of Security	Buy Date	# of Shares	Price per Share
Common Stock	02/01/17	50	13.40

7. I have not served as a representative party on behalf of a class under the federal securities laws during the last three years, except if detailed below. []

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States, that the information entered is accurate:

YES


Certification for Patrick Beland (cont.)

By clicking on the button below, I intend to sign and execute this agreement and retain the Rosen Law Firm, P.A. to proceed on Plaintiff's behalf, on a contingent fee basis.

YES

Signed pursuant to California Civil Code Section 1633.1, et seq. - and the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act as adopted by the various states and territories of the United States.

Date of signing: 12/15/2017



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick Beland", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

PATRICK BELAND, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Canada (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Phillip Kim, The Rosen Law Firm, P.A. 275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor, New York, NY 10016 (212) 686-1060

DEFENDANTS

LIBERTY TAX, INC., EDWARD L. BRUNOT, JOHN T. HEWITT, and KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN,

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District (specify), 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 U.S.C. 78i(b) and 78t(a), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (17 C.F.R. 240.10b-5) Brief description of cause: To recover compensable damages caused by Defendants' alleged violations of federal securities laws

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

12/15/2017 /s/Phillip Kim

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

I, Phillip Kim, counsel for Plaintiff Patrick Beland, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):

- monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
- the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
- the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1

Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stocks:

Not Applicable

RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)

Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court."

NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)

- 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No
- 2.) If you answered "no" above:
 - a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No
 - b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes No
 - c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, specify the County in which the offending communication was received:

If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No

(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).

BAR ADMISSION

I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court.

Yes No

Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?

Yes (If yes, please explain) No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: /s/Phillip Kim

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

PATRICK BELAND, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

LIBERTY TAX, INC., EDWARD L. BRUNOT, JOHN T. HEWITT, and KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 17-cv-7327

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) EDWARD L. BRUNOT 1716 Corporate Landing Parkway Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Phillip Kim The Rosen Law Firm, P.A. 275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor New York, NY 10016 (212) 686-1060

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____ , who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

PATRICK BELAND, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

LIBERTY TAX, INC., EDWARD L. BRUNOT, JOHN T. HEWITT, and KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 17-cv-7327

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN
1716 Corporate Landing Parkway
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Phillip Kim
The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.
275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10016
(212) 686-1060

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER
CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____ , who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I returned the summons to the court because _____ ; or

Other *(specify):* _____

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

PATRICK BELAND, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

LIBERTY TAX, INC., EDWARD L. BRUNOT, JOHN T. HEWITT, and KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 17-cv-7327

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) JOHN T. HEWITT
1716 Corporate Landing Parkway
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Phillip Kim
The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.
275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10016
(212) 686-1060

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER
CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or
1716 Corporate Landing Parkway
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454

Other *(specify)*: _____

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

PATRICK BELAND, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

LIBERTY TAX, INC., EDWARD L. BRUNOT, JOHN T. HEWITT, and KATHLEEN E. DONOVAN,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 17-cv-7327

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) LIBERTY TAX, INC. 1716 Corporate Landing Parkway Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Phillip Kim The Rosen Law Firm, P.A. 275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor New York, NY 10016 (212) 686-1060

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or

Other *(specify):* _____

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ 0.00.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Liberty Tax, Three Top Execs Pegged with Securities Class Action](#)
