

## In re NVIDIA Corporation Securities Litigation

**COURT:** United States District Court for the Northern District of California  
**CASE NUMBER:** 18-cv-07669-HSG  
**CLASS PERIOD:** 05/10/2017 - 11/14/2018  
**CASE CONTACTS:** John C. Browne, Jeroen van Kwawegen, Jonathan D. Uslander, Michael Mathai, Lauren M. Cruz

This is a securities class action lawsuit filed against NVIDIA Corporation (“NVIDIA” or the “Company”), and certain of its executives (collectively, “Defendants”). The action asserts claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (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, on behalf of investors who purchased NVIDIA’s stock between May 10, 2017 and November 14, 2018, inclusive (the “Class Period”).

The Complaint alleges that, during the Class Period, Defendants violated provisions of the Exchange Act by issuing false and misleading press releases, filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”), and statements during investor and analyst conference calls.

NVIDIA designs, develops, and markets graphics processing units (“GPUs”) and related software. Although traditionally used in connection with computer gaming, demand for the Company’s GPUs surged as NVIDIA’s GPUs became widely used in connection with cryptocurrencies. Given the volatility in the cryptocurrency market, the Company’s ability to adapt to the ever-changing cryptocurrency landscape was critical to investors.

Throughout the Class Period, Defendants assured investors that the Company followed the market closely and could adjust to rapid changes in the cryptocurrency markets. Even as analysts increasingly began to question the Company’s ability to manage inventory in the face of an uncertain cryptocurrency market, Defendants touted that NVIDIA and its executives are “masters at managing our channel, and we understand the channel very well.” NVIDIA also repeatedly assured investors that surging demand for GPUs among cryptocurrency miners would not have a negative impact on the Company because of strong demand for GPUs by NVIDIA’s core customer base of computer gamers. As a result of these misrepresentations, NVIDIA shares traded at artificially inflated prices throughout the Class Period.

The truth began to be disclosed on August 16, 2018, when NVIDIA lowered its revenue guidance for the third quarter of 2018 and reported that it no longer expected a meaningful contribution from cryptocurrency miners for the remainder of the year. NVIDIA also reported that its GPU inventory had ballooned by over 30% from the prior quarter, which investors feared could be a sign of slowing demand for NVIDIA’s GPUs. Then, on November 15, 2018, NVIDIA significantly cut its revenue guidance for the fiscal fourth quarter, revealing that revenue would decline by over 7% in the quarter. NVIDIA attributed its poor financial results to surging inventory of midrange GPUs that built up in the channel before the rapid fade of cryptocurrency mining. As a result of these disclosures, the price of the Company’s stock declined significantly.

On May 2, 2019, the Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. of the Northern District of California, appointed E. Öhman J:or Fonder AB (“Öhman Fonder”) and Stichting Pensioenfonds PGB (“PGB”) as Co-Lead Plaintiffs, and Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP as Co-Lead Counsel, in the action. Lead Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on June 21, 2019. Defendants moved to dismiss the Amended Complaint, and Plaintiffs opposed their motion. On March 16, 2020, the Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam granted in part and denied in part Defendants’ motion to dismiss Lead Plaintiffs’ amended complaint.

Lead Plaintiffs filed the second amended complaint on May 13, 2020. Defendants moved to dismiss the second amended complaint on June 29, 2020. Lead Plaintiffs opposed Defendants’ motion on August 13, 2020. Defendants

replied in support of their motion on September 14, 2020. The Court held argument on Defendants' motion on November 19, 2020. The Court has not yet ruled on the motion to dismiss the second amended complaint.