

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

TED SHARPENTER, On Behalf of Himself and)
All Others Similarly Situated,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

LANDAUER, INC., WILLIAM G. DEMPSEY,)
MICHAEL P. KAMINSKI, DAVID E.)
MEADOR, THOMAS M. WHITE, STEPHEN)
C. MITCHELL, JEFFREY A. STRONG,)
MICHAEL T. LEATHERMAN, JEFFREY)
ALLEN BAILEY, TERI G. FONTENOT,)
FRANK B. MODRUSON, FORTIVE)
CORPORATION, and FERN MERGER SUB)
INC.,)

Defendants.)

Case No. _____

CLASS ACTION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Plaintiff, by his undersigned attorneys, for this complaint against defendants, alleges upon personal knowledge with respect to himself, and upon information and belief based upon, *inter alia*, the investigation of counsel as to all other allegations herein, as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This action stems from a proposed transaction announced on September 6, 2017 (the “Proposed Transaction”), pursuant to which Landauer, Inc. (“Landauer” or the “Company”) will be acquired by Fortive Corporation (“Parent”) and its indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary, Fern Merger Sub Inc. (“Merger Sub,” and together with Parent, “Fortive”).

2. On September 6, 2017, Landauer’s Board of Directors (the “Board” or “Individual Defendants”) caused the Company to enter into an agreement and plan of merger (the “Merger Agreement”) with Fortive. Pursuant to the terms of the Merger Agreement, Merger

Sub launched a tender offer (the “Tender Offer”) to acquire all of the Company’s common stock for \$67.25 per share in cash. The Tender Offer is scheduled to expire on October 18, 2017. Following the consummation of the Tender Offer and the satisfaction or waiver of certain conditions, Merger Sub will be merged with and into the Company (the “Merger”), and the Company will be the surviving corporation.

3. On September 20, 2017, defendants filed a Solicitation/Recommendation Statement (the “Solicitation Statement”) with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) in connection with the Proposed Transaction.

4. The Solicitation Statement omits material information with respect to the Proposed Transaction, which renders the Solicitation Statement false and misleading. Accordingly, plaintiff alleges herein that defendants violated Sections 14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “1934 Act”) in connection with the Solicitation Statement.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has jurisdiction over all claims asserted herein pursuant to Section 27 of the 1934 Act because the claims asserted herein arise under Sections 14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the 1934 Act and Rule 14a-9.

6. This Court has jurisdiction over defendants because each defendant is either a corporation that conducts business in and maintains operations within this District, or is an individual with sufficient minimum contacts with this District so as to make the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

7. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial portion of the transactions and wrongs complained of herein occurred in this District.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff is, and has been continuously throughout all times relevant hereto, the owner of Landauer common stock.

9. Defendant Landauer is a Delaware corporation and maintains its principal executive offices at 2 Sciences Road, Glenwood, Illinois 60425. Landauer's common stock is traded on the NYSE under the ticker symbol "LDR."

10. Defendant Michael P. Kaminski ("Kaminski") is a director, President, and Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of Landauer.

11. Defendant William G. Dempsey ("Dempsey") is a director of Landauer.

12. Defendant David E. Meador ("Meador") is a director of Landauer.

13. Defendant Thomas M. White ("White") is a director of Landauer.

14. Defendant Stephen C. Mitchell ("Mitchell") is a director of Landauer.

15. Defendant Jeffrey A. Strong ("Strong") is a director of Landauer.

16. Defendant Michael T. Leatherman ("Leatherman") is a director of Landauer.

17. Defendant Jeffrey Allen Bailey ("Bailey") is a director of Landauer.

18. Defendant Teri G. Fontenot ("Fontenot") is a director of Landauer.

19. Defendant Frank B. Modruson ("Modruson") is a director of Landauer.

20. The defendants identified in paragraphs 10 through 19 are collectively referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants."

21. Defendant Parent is a Delaware corporation and a party to the Merger Agreement.

22. Defendant Merger Sub is a Delaware corporation, an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of Parent, and a party to the Merger Agreement.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action on behalf of himself and the other public stockholders of Landauer (the “Class”). Excluded from the Class are defendants herein and any person, firm, trust, corporation, or other entity related to or affiliated with any defendant.

24. This action is properly maintainable as a class action.

25. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. As of September 1, 2017, there were 9,810,109 shares Landauer common stock issued and outstanding, held by hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals and entities scattered throughout the country.

26. Questions of law and fact are common to the Class, including, among others: (i) whether defendants violated the 1934 Act; and (ii) whether defendants will irreparably harm plaintiff and the other members of the Class if defendants’ conduct complained of herein continues.

27. Plaintiff is committed to prosecuting this action and has retained competent counsel experienced in litigation of this nature. Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Class and plaintiff has the same interests as the other members of the Class. Accordingly, plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.

28. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for defendants, or adjudications that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of individual members of the Class who are not parties to the adjudications or would substantially impair or impede those non-party Class members’ ability to protect their interests.

29. Defendants have acted, or refused to act, on grounds generally applicable to the Class as a whole, and are causing injury to the entire Class. Therefore, final injunctive relief on behalf of the Class is appropriate.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Background of the Company

30. Landauer is a leading global provider of technical and analytical services to determine occupational and environmental radiation exposure and the leading domestic provider of outsourced medical physics services. The Company is organized into three reportable business segments: Radiation Measurement, Medical Physics, and Medical Products, which the Company divested in May 2016.

31. Landauer's Radiation Measurement segment has been the Company's core business for over 60 years. The Company has provided complete radiation dosimetry services to hospitals, medical and dental offices, universities, national laboratories, nuclear facilities, and other industries in which radiation poses a potential threat to employees. Landauer's services include the manufacture of various types of radiation detection monitors, the distribution and collection of the monitors to and from customers, and the analysis and reporting of exposure findings. These services are provided to approximately 1.8 million individuals globally. In addition to providing analytical services, the Company may sell dosimetry detectors and reading equipment to large customers that want to manage their own dosimetry programs, or into smaller international markets in which it is not economical to establish a direct service.

32. The Company's Medical Physics services are provided through its Landauer Medical Physics ("LMP") division. The Company uses LMP as a platform to expand into the medical physics services market, serving domestic hospitals, radiation therapy centers and

imaging centers. LMP is the leading nationwide service provider of clinical physics support, equipment commissioning and accreditation support and imaging equipment testing. Clinical physics support is provided by medical physicists, who individually focus on either imaging or therapeutic medical physics. Imaging physicists are concerned primarily with the radiation delivered by imaging equipment, image quality and compliance with safe practices in nuclear pharmacies.

33. The Company's Medical Products business, which was divested in May 2016, was a provider of high quality medical consumable accessories used in radiology, radiation therapy, and image guided surgical procedures. Medical products ranged from consumables used with magnetic resonance imaging, computed tomography, and mammography technologies to highly engineered passive reflective markers used during image guided surgical procedures.

The Solicitation Statement Omits Material Information, Rendering It False and Misleading

34. Defendants filed the Solicitation Statement with the SEC in connection with the Proposed Transaction.

35. The Solicitation Statement omits material information regarding the Proposed Transaction, which renders the Solicitation Statement false and misleading.

36. First, the Solicitation Statement omits material information regarding the analyses performed by the Company's financial advisor, Lazard Frères & Co. LLC ("Lazard"). When a banker's endorsement of the fairness of a transaction is touted to shareholders, the valuation methods used to arrive at that opinion as well as the key inputs and range of ultimate values generated by those analyses must also be fairly disclosed.

37. With respect to Lazard's Precedent Transactions Analysis, the Solicitation Statement fails to, but must, disclose the individual last twelve months ("LTM")

EBITDA multiples for each of the transactions observed by Lazard in its analysis.

38. With respect to Lazard's Discounted Cash Flow Analysis, the Solicitation Statement fails to, but must, disclose the specific inputs and assumptions underlying the discount rate range of 8.75% to 9.75% used by Lazard in its analysis.

39. The omission of this material information renders the "Opinion of Lazard Frères & Co. LLC" section of the Solicitation Statement false and misleading.

40. Second, the Solicitation Statement fails to disclose material information relating to potential conflicts of interest of Lazard. Full disclosure of investment banker compensation and all potential conflicts is required due to the central role played by investment banks in the evaluation, exploration, selection, and implementation of strategic alternatives.

41. Specifically, the Solicitation Statement fails to disclose whether Lazard has provided Fortive or its affiliates any services within the past three years, and if so, the Solicitation Statement must disclose the nature and timing of those services, as well as the amount of compensation Lazard earned for those services.

42. The omission of this material information renders the "Background and Reasons for the Board's Recommendation" section of the Solicitation Statement false and misleading.

43. The above-referenced omitted information, if disclosed, would significantly alter the total mix of information available to Landauer's stockholders.

COUNT I

(Claim for Violation of Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act Against Defendants)

44. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

45. Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act states, in relevant part, that:

It shall be unlawful for any person to make any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements made,

in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading . . . in connection with any tender offer or request or invitation for tenders[.]

46. Defendants disseminated the misleading Solicitation Statement, which contained statements that, in violation of Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, omitted to state material facts necessary to make the statements therein not misleading.

47. The Solicitation Statement was prepared, reviewed, and/or disseminated by defendants.

48. The Solicitation Statement misrepresented and/or omitted material facts in connection with the Proposed Transaction as set forth above.

49. By virtue of their positions within the Company and/or roles in the process and the preparation of the Solicitation Statement, defendants were aware of this information and their duty to disclose this information in the Solicitation Statement.

50. The omissions in the Solicitation Statement are material in that a reasonable shareholder will consider them important in deciding whether to tender their shares in connection with the Proposed Transaction. In addition, a reasonable investor will view a full and accurate disclosure as significantly altering the total mix of information made available.

51. Defendants knowingly or with deliberate recklessness omitted the material information identified above in the Solicitation Statement, causing statements therein to be materially incomplete and misleading.

52. By reason of the foregoing, defendants violated Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act.

53. Because of the false and misleading statements in the Solicitation Statement, plaintiff and the Class are threatened with irreparable harm.

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

COUNT II

(Claim for Violation of 14(d) of the 1934 Act Against Defendants)

55. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

56. Section 14(d)(4) of the 1934 Act states:

Any solicitation or recommendation to the holders of such a security to accept or reject a tender offer or request or invitation for tenders shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

57. Rule 14d-9(d) states, in relevant part:

Any solicitation or recommendation to holders of a class of securities referred to in section 14(d)(1) of the Act with respect to a tender offer for such securities shall include the name of the person making such solicitation or recommendation and the information required by Items 1 through 8 of Schedule 14D-9 (§ 240.14d-101) or a fair and adequate summary thereof[.]

Item 8 requires that directors must “furnish such additional information, if any, as may be necessary to make the required statements, in light of the circumstances under which they are made, not materially misleading.”

58. The Solicitation Statement violates Section 14(d)(4) and Rule 14d-9 because it omits the material facts set forth above, which renders the Solicitation Statement false and/or misleading.

59. Defendants knowingly or with deliberate recklessness omitted the material information set forth above, causing statements therein to be materially incomplete and misleading.

60. The omissions in the Solicitation Statement are material to plaintiff and the Class, and they will be deprived of their entitlement to make a fully informed decision with respect to the Proposed Transaction if such misrepresentations and omissions are not corrected prior to the expiration of the tender offer.

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

COUNT III

**(Claim for Violation of Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act
Against the Individual Defendants, Parent, and Merger Sub)**

62. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

63. The Individual Defendants, Parent, and Merger Sub acted as controlling persons of Landauer within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act as alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as officers and/or directors of Landauer and participation in and/or awareness of the Company's operations and/or intimate knowledge of the false statements contained in the Solicitation Statement filed with the SEC, they had the power to influence and control and did influence and control, directly or indirectly, the decision making of the Company, including the content and dissemination of the various statements that plaintiff contends are false and misleading.

64. Each of the Individual Defendants, Parent, and Merger Sub was provided with or had unlimited access to copies of the Solicitation Statement alleged by plaintiff to be misleading prior to and/or shortly after these statements were issued and had the ability to prevent the issuance of the statements or cause them to be corrected.

65. In particular, each of the Individual Defendants had direct and supervisory involvement in the day-to-day operations of the Company, and, therefore, is presumed to have had the power to control and influence the particular transactions giving rise to the violations as alleged herein, and exercised the same. The Solicitation Statement contains the unanimous recommendation of the Individual Defendants to approve the Proposed Transaction. They were thus directly connected with and involved in the making of the Solicitation Statement.

66. Parent and Merger Sub also had direct supervisory control over the composition

of the Solicitation Statement and the information disclosed therein, as well as the information that was omitted and/or misrepresented in the Solicitation Statement.

67. By virtue of the foregoing, the Individual Defendants, Parent, and Merger Sub violated Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act.

68. As set forth above, the Individual Defendants, Parent, and Merger Sub had the ability to exercise control over and did control a person or persons who have each violated Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act and Rule 14a-9, by their acts and omissions as alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as controlling persons, these defendants are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act.

69. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff and the Class are threatened with irreparable harm.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment and relief as follows:

A. Enjoining defendants and all persons acting in concert with them from proceeding with, consummating, or closing the Proposed Transaction;

B. In the event defendants consummate the Proposed Transaction, rescinding it and setting it aside or awarding rescissory damages;

C. Directing the Individual Defendants to file a Solicitation Statement that does not contain any untrue statements of material fact and that states all material facts required in it or necessary to make the statements contained therein not misleading;

D. Declaring that defendants violated Sections 14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the 1934 Act, as well as Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder;

E. Awarding plaintiff the costs of this action, including reasonable allowance for plaintiff's attorneys' and experts' fees; and

F. Granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: September 25, 2017

RIGRODSKY & LONG, P.A.

By: /s/ Brian D. Long

Brian D. Long (#4347)
Gina M. Serra (#5387)
2 Righter Parkway, Suite 120
Wilmington, DE 19803
Telephone: (302) 295-5310
Facsimile: (302) 654-7530
Email: bdl@rl-legal.com
Email: gms@rl-legal.com

OF COUNSEL:

RM LAW, P.C.

Richard A. Maniskas
1055 Westlakes Drive, Suite 300
Berwyn, PA 19312
Telephone: (484) 324-6800

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATION OF PLAINTIFF

I, Ted Sharpenter (“Plaintiff”), hereby declare as to the claims asserted under the federal securities laws that:

1. Plaintiff has reviewed the complaint and authorizes its filing.
2. Plaintiff did not purchase the security that is the subject of this action at the direction of Plaintiff’s counsel or in order to participate in any private action.
3. Plaintiff is willing to serve as a representative party on behalf of the class, either individually or as part of a group, and I will testify at deposition or trial, if necessary. I understand that this is not a claim form and that I do not need to execute this Certification to share in any recovery as a member of the class.
4. Plaintiff’s purchase and sale transactions in the Landauer, Inc. (NYSE: LDR) security that is the subject of this action during the class period is/are as follows:

PURCHASES

Buy Date	Shares	Price per Share
6/16/17	50	\$53.00

SALES

Sell Date	Shares	Price per Share

Please list additional transactions on separate sheet of paper, if necessary.

5. Plaintiff has complete authority to bring a suit to recover for investment losses on behalf of purchasers of the subject securities described herein (including Plaintiff, any co-owners, any corporations or other entities, and/or any beneficial owners).

6. During the three years prior to the date of this Certification, Plaintiff has not moved to serve as a representative party for a class in an action filed under the federal securities laws.

7. Plaintiff will not accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of the class beyond 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.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 22nd day of September, 2017.



Ted Sharpenter

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

Ted Sharpenter

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Brian D. Long
RIGRODSKY & LONG, P.A.
2 Righter Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19803; (302) 295-5310

DEFENDANTS

Landauer, Inc., William G. Dempsey, Michael P. Kaminski, David E. Meador, Thomas M. White, Stephen C. Mitchell, Jeffrey A. Strong, Michael T. Leatherman, Jeffrey Allen Bailey, Teri G. Fontenot, et al.

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. Each category contains a list of legal codes with checkboxes.

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. §§ 78n(d), 78n(e), 78t(a), and 17 C.F.R. 240.14d-9

Brief description of cause:

14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

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: X Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

09/25/2017

Brian D. Long

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

Print

Save As...

Reset

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
- United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 - United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 - Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 - Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
- Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 - Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 - Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
- PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
- Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 - Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Landauer, Others Accused of Omitting Info in Merger Registration Statement](#)
