

acquired publicly traded securities of Kraft from May 4, 2017 through February 21, 2019, inclusive (the “Class Period”), seeking to recover compensable damages caused by Defendants’ violations of federal securities laws (the “Class”).

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. § 8 240.10b-5).

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

4. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to §27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §78aa and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b), as the Company conducts business and is headquartered in this District.

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

PARTIES

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

7. Defendant Kraft manufactures and markets food and beverage products in the United States, Canada, Europe, and internationally. Kraft is a Delaware corporation maintaining

its co-headquarters at 200 E. Randolph Street, Suite 7600, Chicago, Illinois 60045. Kraft's securities trade on the NASDAQ under the ticker symbol "KHC."

8. Defendant Bernardo Hees ("Hees") has served as the Company's Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") since July 2015.

9. Defendant Paulo Basilio ("Basilio") served as the Company's Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") and Executive Vice President from June 2015 until October 1, 2017

10. Defendant David A. Knopf ("Knopf") has been the Company's Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") and Executive Vice President since October 1, 2017.

11. Defendants Hees, Basilio, and Knopf are sometimes referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants."

12. Each of the Individual Defendants:

- a. directly participated in the management of the Company;
- b. was directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the Company at the highest levels;
- c. was privy to confidential proprietary information concerning the Company and its business and operations;
- d. was directly or indirectly involved in drafting, producing, reviewing and/or disseminating the false and misleading statements and information alleged herein;
- e. was directly or indirectly involved in the oversight or implementation of the Company's internal controls;
- f. was aware of or recklessly disregarded the fact that the false and misleading statements were being issued concerning the Company; and/or

g. approved or ratified these statements in violation of the federal securities laws.

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

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

15. Defendant Kraft and the Individual Defendants are referred to herein, collectively, as the “Defendants.”

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Materially False and Misleading Statements Issued During the Class Period

16. On May 4, 2017, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended April 1, 2017 (the “1Q 2017 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s first quarter 2017 financial results and position. The 1Q 2017 10-Q contained signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) by Defendant Hees and Basilio attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

17. The 1Q 2017 10-Q stated that the Company had adequate internal controls and complied with SEC regulations, stating in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. ***Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures as of the period covered by this report, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Exchange***

Act is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended April 1, 2017. *We determined that there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended April 1, 2017 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.*

(Emphasis added.)

18. On August 4, 2017, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended July 1, 2017 (the "2Q 2017 10-Q") with the SEC, which provided the Company's second quarter 2017 financial results and position. The 2Q 2017 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hees and Basilio attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company's internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

19. The 2Q 2017 10-Q stated that the Company had adequate internal controls and complied with SEC regulations, stating in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. *Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures as of the period covered by this report, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Exchange Act is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.*

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended July 1, 2017. *We determined that there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended July 1, 2017 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.*

(Emphasis added.)

20. On November 7, 2017, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2017 (the “3Q 2017 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s third quarter 2017 financial results and position. The 3Q 2017 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hees and Basilio attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

21. The 3Q 2017 10-Q stated that the Company’s internal controls were not effective as of September 30, 2017 because of a misapplication of Accounting Standards Update 2016-15, an accounting standard which relates to Statement of Cash Flows, but failed to note any issues with its procurement area stating, in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report to determine if our disclosure controls and procedures as of the period covered by this report, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC’s rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.

Based on this evaluation, we concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures were *not effective as of September 30, 2017 due to the material*

weakness in internal control over financial reporting related to the misapplication of ASU 2016-15, as described below.

Material Weakness in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the Company's annual or interim financial statements will not be prevented or detected on a timely basis. We did not maintain effective controls over the adoption of new accounting standards. Specifically, we did not maintain effective controls to evaluate and document the impact of new accounting standards, including communication with the appropriate individuals in coming to our conclusions on the application of new standards.

This control deficiency resulted in the misstatement of our operating and investing cash flows and related financial disclosures, and in the restatement of our consolidated financial statements for the quarters ended April 1, 2017 and July 1, 2017, including the comparable prior periods. Additionally, this control deficiency could result in a misstatement of the aforementioned account balances or disclosures that would result in a material misstatement to the annual or interim consolidated financial statements that would not be prevented or detected. Accordingly, our management has determined that this control deficiency constitutes a material weakness.

Remediation of Material Weakness

The remediation of this material weakness will primarily include steps to improve the evaluation and documentation of new accounting standards' impacts and communication with the appropriate individuals. We plan to have these remediation steps in place during our 2017 fiscal year but will allow for testing to determine operating effectiveness before concluding on remediation.

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended September 30, 2017. *We determined that there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended September 30, 2017 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.*

(Emphasis added.)

22. On February 2, 2018, the Company filed a Form 10-K for the year ended December 30, 2017 (the "2017 10-K") with the SEC, which provided the Company's 2017 financial results and position. The 2017 10-K contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants

Hees and Knopf attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company's internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

23. The 2017 10-K stated that the Company had adequate internal controls and complied with SEC regulations, stating in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. *Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures as of the period covered by this report, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Exchange Act is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.*

Remediation of Previously Disclosed Material Weakness

A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the Company's annual or interim financial statements will not be prevented or detected on a timely basis. As previously disclosed concurrently with the filing of our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2017, we concluded that we had a material weakness in internal control over financial reporting related to the misapplication of Accounting Standards Update 2016-15. Specifically, we did not maintain effective controls over the adoption of new accounting standards, including communication with the appropriate individuals in coming to our conclusions on the application of new standards. Our management determined that the control deficiency constituted a material weakness.

During the fourth quarter of 2017, management implemented steps to improve the evaluation and documentation of new accounting standards' impacts and communication with the appropriate individuals.

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended December 30, 2017. During the three months ended December 30, 2017, management implemented steps to

improve the evaluation and documentation of new accounting standards' impacts and communication with the appropriate individuals. These changes have been designed to ensure enhanced subject matter expert input in relation to new accounting standard pronouncements.

We determined that, except for the remediation activities described above, there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended December 30, 2017 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting as defined in Rule 13a-15(f) under the Exchange Act. Our internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external reporting purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Our internal control over financial reporting includes those written policies and procedures that:

- pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of assets;
- provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;
- provide reasonable assurance that receipts and expenditures are being made only in accordance with management and director authorization; and
- provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of assets that could have a material effect on the consolidated financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

Management assessed the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting as of December 30, 2017. Management based this assessment on criteria described in *Internal Control - Integrated Framework* (2013) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

Based on this assessment, management determined that as of December 30, 2017, we maintained effective internal control over financial reporting.

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, an independent registered public accounting firm, who audited the consolidated financial statements included in this Annual Report on Form 10-K, has also audited the effectiveness of our

internal control over financial reporting as of December 30, 2017, as stated in their report which appears herein under Item 8.

(Emphasis added.)

24. On May 3, 2018, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 2018 (the “1Q 2018 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s first quarter 2018 financial results and position. The 1Q 2018 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hees and Knopf attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

25. The 1Q 2018 10-Q stated that the Company had adequate internal controls and complied with SEC regulations, stating in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. *Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures, as of March 31, 2018, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC’s rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.*

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended March 31, 2018. *We determined that there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended March 31, 2018 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.*

(Emphasis added.)

26. The 1Q 2018 10-Q stated that its goodwill and intangible assets numbered \$44,843 million and \$53,757 million respectively, stating, in pertinent part, the following:

We test goodwill for impairment at least annually in the second quarter or when a triggering event occurs. We performed our 2017 annual impairment test as of April 2, 2017. As a result of our 2017 annual impairment test, there was no impairment of goodwill. Each of our goodwill reporting units had excess fair value over its carrying value of at least 10% as of April 2, 2017.

Our goodwill balance consists of 20 reporting units and had an aggregate carrying value of \$44.8 billion as of March 31, 2018. As a majority of our goodwill was recently recorded in connection with business combinations that occurred in 2015 and 2013, representing fair values as of the respective transaction dates, there was not a significant excess of fair values over carrying values as of April 2, 2017. We have a risk of future impairment to the extent that individual reporting unit performance does not meet our projections. Additionally, if our current assumptions and estimates, including projected revenues and income growth rates, terminal growth rates, competitive and consumer trends, market-based discount rates, and other market factors, are not met, or if valuation factors outside of our control change unfavorably, the estimated fair value of our goodwill could be adversely affected, leading to a potential impairment in the future. No events occurred during the period ended March 31, 2018 that indicated it was more likely than not that our goodwill was impaired. There were no accumulated impairment losses to goodwill as of March 31, 2018.

* * *

We test indefinite-lived intangible assets for impairment at least annually in the second quarter or when a triggering event occurs. We performed our 2017 annual impairment test as of April 2, 2017. As a result of our 2017 annual impairment test, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$49 million in SG&A in the second quarter of 2017. This loss was due to continued declines in nutritional beverages in India. The loss was recorded in our EMEA segment as the related trademark is owned by our Italian subsidiary. Each of our other brands had excess fair value over its carrying value of at least 10% as of April 2, 2017.

Our indefinite-lived intangible assets primarily consist of a large number of individual brands and had an aggregate carrying value of \$53.8 billion as of March 31, 2018. As a majority of our indefinite-lived intangible assets were recently recorded in connection with business combinations that occurred in 2015 and 2013, representing fair values as of the respective transaction dates, there was not a significant excess of fair values over carrying values as of April 2, 2017. We have a risk of future impairment to the extent individual brand performance does not meet our projections. Additionally, if our current assumptions and estimates, including projected revenues and income growth rates, terminal growth rates, competitive and consumer trends, market-based discount rates, and other market factors, are not met, or if valuation factors outside of our control change unfavorably, the estimated fair values of our indefinite-lived intangible assets could be adversely affected, leading to potential impairments in the future. No

events occurred during the period ended March 31, 2018 that indicated it was more likely than not that our indefinite-lived intangible assets were impaired.

27. On August 3, 2018, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended June 30, 2018 (the “2Q 2018 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s second quarter 2018 financial results and position. The 2Q 2018 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hees and Knopf attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

28. The 2Q 2018 10-Q stated that the Company had adequate internal controls and complied with SEC regulations, stating in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. *Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures, as of June 30, 2018, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC’s rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.*

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended June 30, 2018. *We determined that there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended June 30, 2018 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.*

(Emphasis added.)

29. The 2Q 2018 10-Q stated that its goodwill and intangible assets numbered \$44,270 million and \$53,379 million respectively, stating, in pertinent part, the following:

Our goodwill balance consists of 20 reporting units and had an aggregate carrying value of \$44.3 billion as of June 30, 2018. We test goodwill for impairment at least annually in the second quarter or when a triggering event occurs. We performed our 2018 annual impairment test as of April 1, 2018. As a result of our 2018 annual impairment test, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$164 million in SG&A related to our Australia and New Zealand reporting unit. This impairment loss was primarily due to margin declines in the region. The goodwill carrying value of this reporting unit was \$509 million prior to its impairment. Additionally, we noted that four of our 20 reporting units each had excess fair value over its carrying value of less than 10%. As of the impairment test date, the goodwill carrying values associated with these reporting units were \$4.7 billion for Canada Retail, \$424 million for Latin America Exports, \$407 million for Northeast Asia, and \$326 million for Southeast Asia.

We generally utilize the discounted cash flow method under the income approach to estimate the fair value of our reporting units. Some of the more significant assumptions inherent in estimating the fair values include the estimated future annual net cash flows for each reporting unit (including net sales, cost of products sold, SG&A, working capital, and capital expenditures), income tax rates, and a discount rate that appropriately reflects the risk inherent in each future cash flow stream. We selected the assumptions used in the financial forecasts using historical data, supplemented by current and anticipated market conditions, estimated product category growth rates, management plans, and guideline companies.

Fair value determinations require considerable judgment and are sensitive to changes in underlying assumptions, estimates, and market factors. Estimating the fair value of individual reporting units requires us to make assumptions and estimates regarding our future plans, as well as industry and economic conditions. If our current assumptions and estimates, including future annual net cash flows, income tax rates, and discount rates, are not met, or if valuation factors outside of our control change unfavorably, the estimated fair value of our goodwill could be adversely affected, leading to a potential impairment in the future. Additionally, as a majority of our goodwill was recorded in connection with business combinations that occurred in 2015 and 2013, representing fair values as of the respective transaction dates, those amounts are more susceptible to an impairment risk if business operating results or macroeconomic conditions deteriorate.

Accumulated impairment losses to goodwill were \$164 million at June 30, 2018. There were no accumulated impairment losses to goodwill at December 30, 2017.

* * *

Our indefinite-lived intangible assets primarily consist of a large number of individual brands and had an aggregate carrying value of \$53.4 billion as of June 30, 2018. We test indefinite-lived intangible assets for impairment at least

annually in the second quarter or when a triggering event occurs. We performed our 2018 annual impairment test as of April 1, 2018. As a result of our 2018 annual impairment test, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$101 million in SG&A in the second quarter of 2018. This impairment loss was due to net sales and margin declines related to the *Quero* brand in Brazil. Additionally, as of April 1, 2018, two brands (*ABC* and *Smart Ones*) each had excess fair value over its carrying value of less than 10%. These brands had an aggregate carrying value of \$665 million as of April 1, 2018.

As a result of our 2017 annual impairment testing, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$48 million in SG&A in the second quarter of 2017. This loss was due to continued declines in nutritional beverages in India. The loss was recorded in our EMEA segment as the related trademark is owned by our Italian subsidiary.

We generally utilize the excess earnings method under the income approach to estimate the fair value of certain of our largest brands. Some of the more significant assumptions inherent in estimating the fair values include the estimated future annual net cash flows for each brand (including net sales, cost of products sold, and SG&A), contributory asset charges, income tax considerations, a discount rate that reflects the level of risk associated with the future earnings attributable to the brand, and management's intent to invest in the brand indefinitely. We selected the assumptions used in the financial forecasts using historical data, supplemented by current and anticipated market conditions, estimated product category growth rates, management plans, and guideline companies.

We generally utilize the relief from royalty method under the income approach to estimate the fair value of our remaining brands. Some of the more significant assumptions inherent in estimating the fair values include the estimated future annual net sales for each brand, royalty rates (as a percentage of revenue that would hypothetically be charged by a licensor of the brand to an unrelated licensee), income tax considerations, a discount rate that reflects the level of risk associated with the future cost savings attributable to the brand, and management's intent to invest in the brand indefinitely. We selected the assumptions used in the financial forecasts using historical data, supplemented by current and anticipated market conditions, estimated product category growth rates, management plans, and guideline companies.

Fair value determinations require considerable judgment and are sensitive to changes in underlying assumptions, estimates, and market factors. Estimating the fair value of individual indefinite-lived intangible assets requires us to make assumptions and estimates regarding our future plans, as well as industry and economic conditions. If our current assumptions and estimates, including future annual net cash flows, royalty rates, contributory asset charges, income tax considerations, and discount rates, are not met, or if valuation factors outside of our control change unfavorably, the estimated fair values of our indefinite-lived intangible assets could be adversely affected, leading to potential impairments in the future. Additionally, as a majority of our indefinite-lived intangible assets were recorded in connection with business combinations that occurred in 2015

and 2013, representing fair values as of the respective transaction dates, those amounts are more susceptible to an impairment risk if business operating results or macroeconomic conditions deteriorate.

30. On November 2, 2018, the Company filed a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 29, 2018 (the “3Q 2018 10-Q”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s third quarter 2018 financial results and position. The 3Q 2018 10-Q contained signed SOX certifications by Defendants Hees and Knopf attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

31. The 3Q 2018 10-Q stated that the Company had adequate internal controls and complied with SEC regulations, stating in pertinent part:

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. *Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures, as of September 29, 2018, were effective and provided reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed or submitted under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is (i) recorded, processed, summarized, and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC’s rules and forms, and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.*

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with other members of management, evaluated the changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended September 29, 2018. *We determined that there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the three months ended September 29, 2018 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.*

(Emphasis added.)

32. The 3Q 2018 10-Q stated that its goodwill and intangible assets numbered \$44,308 million and \$53,038 million respectively, stating, in pertinent part, the following:

Our goodwill balance consists of 20 reporting units and had an aggregate carrying value of \$44.3 billion as of September 29, 2018. We test goodwill for impairment at least annually in the second quarter or when a triggering event occurs. We performed our 2018 annual impairment test as of April 1, 2018. As a result of our 2018 annual impairment test, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$164 million in SG&A related to our Australia and New Zealand reporting unit. This impairment loss was primarily due to margin declines in the region. The goodwill carrying value of this reporting unit was \$509 million prior to its impairment. Additionally, five of our 20 reporting units each had excess fair value over its carrying value of less than 10%. As of the impairment test date, the goodwill carrying values associated with these reporting units were \$4.7 billion for Canada Retail, \$424 million for Latin America Exports, \$407 million for Northeast Asia, \$326 million for Southeast Asia, and \$232 million for Other Latin America.

We generally utilize the discounted cash flow method under the income approach to estimate the fair value of our reporting units. Some of the more significant assumptions inherent in estimating the fair values include the estimated future annual net cash flows for each reporting unit (including net sales, cost of products sold, SG&A, working capital, and capital expenditures), income tax rates, and a discount rate that appropriately reflects the risk inherent in each future cash flow stream. We selected the assumptions used in the financial forecasts using historical data, supplemented by current and anticipated market conditions, estimated product category growth rates, management plans, and guideline companies.

Fair value determinations require considerable judgment and are sensitive to changes in underlying assumptions, estimates, and market factors. Estimating the fair value of individual reporting units requires us to make assumptions and estimates regarding our future plans, as well as industry and economic conditions. If our current assumptions and estimates, including future annual net cash flows, income tax rates, and discount rates, are not met, or if valuation factors outside of our control change unfavorably, the estimated fair value of our goodwill could be adversely affected, leading to a potential impairment in the future. Additionally, as a majority of our goodwill was recorded in connection with business combinations that occurred in 2015 and 2013, representing fair values as of the respective transaction dates, those amounts are more susceptible to an impairment risk if business operating results or macroeconomic conditions deteriorate. No events occurred during the period ended September 29, 2018 that indicated it was more likely than not that our goodwill was impaired.

Accumulated impairment losses to goodwill were \$164 million at September 29, 2018. There were no accumulated impairment losses to goodwill at December 30, 2017.

* * *

Our indefinite-lived intangible assets primarily consist of a large number of individual brands and had an aggregate carrying value of \$53.0 billion as of September 29, 2018. We test indefinite-lived intangible assets for impairment at least annually in the second quarter or when a triggering event occurs. We performed our 2018 annual impairment test as of April 1, 2018. As a result of our 2018 annual impairment test, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$101 million in SG&A in the second quarter of 2018. This impairment loss was due to net sales and margin declines related to the *Quero* brand in Brazil. Additionally, as of April 1, 2018, two brands (*ABC* and *Smart Ones*) each had excess fair value over its carrying value of less than 10%. These brands had an aggregate carrying value of \$665 million as of April 1, 2018.

In the third quarter of 2018, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$215 million in SG&A related to the *Smart Ones* brand. This impairment loss was primarily due to reduced future investment expectations and continued sales declines in the third quarter of 2018. We transferred the remaining carrying value of *Smart Ones* to definite-lived intangible assets. No events occurred during the period ended September 29, 2018 that indicated it was more likely than not that our other indefinite-lived intangible assets were impaired.

As a result of our 2017 annual impairment testing, we recognized a non-cash impairment loss of \$48 million in SG&A in the second quarter of 2017. This loss was due to continued declines in nutritional beverages in India. The loss was recorded in our EMEA segment as the related trademark is owned by an Italian subsidiary.

We generally utilize the excess earnings method under the income approach to estimate the fair value of certain of our largest brands. Some of the more significant assumptions inherent in estimating the fair values include the estimated future annual net cash flows for each brand (including net sales, cost of products sold, and SG&A), contributory asset charges, income tax considerations, a discount rate that reflects the level of risk associated with the future earnings attributable to the brand, and management's intent to invest in the brand indefinitely. We selected the assumptions used in the financial forecasts using historical data, supplemented by current and anticipated market conditions, estimated product category growth rates, management plans, and guideline companies.

We generally utilize the relief from royalty method under the income approach to estimate the fair value of our remaining brands. Some of the more significant assumptions inherent in estimating the fair values include the estimated future annual net sales for each brand, royalty rates (as a percentage of revenue that would hypothetically be charged by a licensor of the brand to an unrelated licensee), income tax considerations, a discount rate that reflects the level of risk associated with the future cost savings attributable to the brand, and management's intent to invest in the brand indefinitely. We selected the assumptions used in the financial forecasts using historical data, supplemented by current and anticipated market conditions, estimated product category growth rates, management plans, and guideline companies.

Fair value determinations require considerable judgment and are sensitive to changes in underlying assumptions, estimates, and market factors. Estimating the fair value of individual indefinite-lived intangible assets requires us to make assumptions and estimates regarding our future plans, as well as industry and economic conditions. If our current assumptions and estimates, including future annual net cash flows, royalty rates, contributory asset charges, income tax considerations, and discount rates, are not met, or if valuation factors outside of our control change unfavorably, the estimated fair values of our indefinite-lived intangible assets could be adversely affected, leading to potential impairments in the future. Additionally, as a majority of our indefinite-lived intangible assets were recorded in connection with business combinations that occurred in 2015 and 2013, representing fair values as of the respective transaction dates, those amounts are more susceptible to an impairment risk if business operating results or macroeconomic conditions deteriorate.

33. The statements referenced in ¶¶16-32 above were materially false and/or misleading because they misrepresented and failed to disclose the following adverse facts pertaining to the Company's business, operations, and prospects, 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) Kraft's internal controls, specifically with respect to its procurement area, were inadequate; (2) Kraft would be forced to write down a significant amount of goodwill and certain intangible assets in its Kraft natural cheese business, its Oscar Mayer cold cuts business, and its Canada retail business due to supply chain issues; (3) Kraft failed to advise investors of the foregoing issues; and (4) as a result, Kraft's public statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times.

The Truth Emerges

34. On February 21, 2019, after the market closed, Kraft announced its earnings for the fourth quarter of 2018. The Company announced an impairment charge of \$15.4 billion, stating, in relevant part:

During the fourth quarter, as part of the Company's normal quarterly reporting procedures and planning processes, the Company concluded that, based on several

factors that developed during the fourth quarter, the fair values of certain goodwill and intangible assets were below their carrying amounts. *As a result, the Company recorded non-cash impairment charges of \$15.4 billion to lower the carrying amount of goodwill in certain reporting units, primarily U.S. Refrigerated and Canada Retail, and certain intangible assets, primarily the Kraft and Oscar Mayer trademarks.* These charges resulted in a net loss attributable to common shareholders of \$12.6 billion and diluted loss per share of \$10.34.

(Emphasis added.)

35. That same day, Kraft disclosed that it had received a subpoena from the Securities and Exchange Commission in October 2018 in connection with the Company's procurement function, stating, in relevant part:

The Company received a subpoena in October 2018 from the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") associated with an investigation into the Company's procurement area, more specifically the Company's accounting policies, procedures, and internal controls related to its procurement function, including, but not limited to, agreements, side agreements, and changes or modifications to its agreements with its vendors.

Following this initial SEC document request, the Company together with external counsel launched an investigation into the procurement area. In the fourth quarter of 2018, as a result of findings from the investigation, the Company recorded a \$25 million increase to costs of products sold as an out of period correction as the Company determined the amounts were immaterial to the fourth quarter of 2018 and its previously reported 2018 and 2017 interim and year to date periods. Additionally, the Company is in the process of implementing certain improvements to its internal controls to mitigate the likelihood of this occurring in the future and has taken other remedial measures. The Company continues to cooperate fully with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

(Emphasis Added.)

36. That same day, the Company hosted a conference call to discuss its quarterly results. During the call, Defendant Knopf provided additional details on the impairment, stating, in part:

Thanks, Bernardo. So, in terms of the impairment, the writedown was primarily reflected -- it reflected revised margin expectations and this was for really three businesses of ours; first, the Kraft natural cheese business; second, our Oscar Mayer cold cuts business where we talked about issue that we had in the first part

of the year; and then third, our Canada retail business. And really the fundamental driver behind the reduction in expectations was driven by our second half performance, OK, which was primarily driven by supply chain issues that we had in the cost side as you know.

And then just to provide a little more context, since the merger, we've also seen significant pressure on valuations from a higher discount rate come into play, which was partially offset (technical difficulty) taxes, but that's really the context around the impairment.

* * *

Just to be clear, by far and away, the majority of the impairment, which was really concentrated in these three businesses that I mentioned, it was by far and away driven by the second half performance and the new level of margin and profitability that we're talking about versus what it was before. So the margin profile and what we established in the second half was really the key driver behind the impairment.

37. On this news, Kraft's shares fell \$13.23 per share or over 27% to close at \$34.95 per share on February 22, 2019, damaging investors.

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

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

39. 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 Kraft securities publicly traded on NASDAQ during the Class Period (the "Class"); and were damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures. 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.

40. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, Kraft 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 Kraft 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.

41. 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.

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

43. 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 the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as alleged herein;
- b. whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the business, operations and management of Kraft;

- c. whether the Individual Defendants caused Kraft to issue false and misleading financial statements during the Class Period;
- d. whether Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and misleading financial statements;
- e. whether the prices of Kraft securities during the Class Period were artificially inflated because of the Defendants' conduct complained of herein; and
- f. whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, what is the proper measure of damages.

44. 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.

45. 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. Kraft securities are traded in an efficient market;
- d. the Company's shares 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; and
- g. Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased, acquired and/or sold Kraft 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.

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

47. 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
Violations of Section 10(b) of The Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5
Against All Defendants

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

49. This Count is asserted against Defendants 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.

50. During the Class Period, 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.

51. Defendants violated §10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule 10b-5 in that they:
- a. employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud;
 - b. 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; or
 - c. 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 Kraft securities during the Class Period.

52. Defendants acted with scienter in that they knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of Kraft 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 Kraft, their control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of Kraft's allegedly materially misleading statements, and/or their associations with the Company which made them privy to confidential proprietary information concerning Kraft, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

53. 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 Kraft personnel to members of the investing public, including Plaintiff and the Class.

54. As a result of the foregoing, the market price of Kraft securities was artificially inflated during the Class Period. In ignorance of the falsity of 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 Kraft securities during the Class Period in purchasing Kraft securities at prices that were artificially inflated as a result of Defendants' false and misleading statements.

55. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class been aware that the market price of Kraft securities had been artificially and falsely inflated by Defendants' misleading statements and by the material adverse information which Defendants did not disclose, they would not have purchased Kraft securities at the artificially inflated prices that they did, or at all.

56. 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.

57. By reason of the foregoing, 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 purchase of Kraft securities during the Class Period.

COUNT II
Violations of Section 20(a) of The Exchange Act
Against The Individual Defendants

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

59. During the Class Period, the Individual Defendants participated in the operation and management of Kraft, and conducted and participated, directly and indirectly, in the conduct of Kraft's business affairs. Because of their senior positions, they knew the adverse non-public information about Kraft's current financial position and future business prospects.

60. 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 Kraft's business practices, and to correct promptly any public statements issued by Kraft which had become materially false or misleading.

61. 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 Kraft disseminated in the marketplace during the Class Period concerning the Company's business, operational and accounting policies. Throughout the Class Period, the Individual Defendants exercised their power and authority to cause Kraft to engage in the wrongful acts complained of herein. The Individual Defendants therefore, were "controlling persons" of Kraft 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 Kraft securities.

62. Each of the Individual Defendants, therefore, acted as a controlling person of Kraft. By reason of their senior management positions and/or being directors of Kraft, each of the Individual Defendants had the power to direct the actions of, and exercised the same to cause, Kraft to engage in the unlawful acts and conduct complained of herein. Each of the Individual Defendants exercised control over the general operations of Kraft 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.

63. 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 Kraft.

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 her reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees and other costs; and

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

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: February 24, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Steven F. Molo

MOLOLAMKEN LLP

Steven F. Molo

Megan C. Church

Gerald P. Meyer

300 North LaSalle Street, Suite 5350

Chicago, Illinois 60654

Telephone: (312) 450-6700

Facsimile: (312) 450-6701

Email: smolo@mololamken.com

Email: mchurch@mololamken.com

Email: gmeyer@mololamken.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

Phillip Kim (*pro hac vice* to be filed)

Laurence M. Rosen (*pro hac vice* to be filed)

275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor

New York, NY 10016

Telephone: (212) 686-1060

Fax: (212) 202-3827

Email: pkim@rosenlegal.com

Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff