

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ROBERT F. COCKERILL, CHRISTOPHER
WILLIAM NEWTON, OLIVER MAJOR, and
DARRELL D. BENSON, SR., individually and
as representatives on behalf of a class of
similarly situated persons,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CORTEVA, INC.; DUPONT SPECIALTY
PRODUCTS USA, LLC; DUPONT DE
NEMOURS, INC.; E.I. DU PONT DE
NEMOURS AND COMPANY; THE PENSION
AND RETIREMENT PLAN; THE BENEFIT
PLANS ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Defendants.

Case No.: Case No. 2:21-cv-03966-MMB

Complaint – Class Action

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF
ERISA AND STATE LAW**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED AS TO
STATE LAW CLAIMS**

Plaintiffs, Robert F. Cockerill, Christopher Newton, Oliver Major and Darrell D. Benson, Sr. (“Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through their undersigned attorneys, allege the following:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Plaintiffs are participants in The Pension and Retirement Plan, formerly titled the U.S. DuPont Pension and Retirement Plan (the “Plan”), a “defined benefit pension plan” within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(35). Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all similarly situated participants, their beneficiaries and estates, pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 1001, *et seq.* (“ERISA”) and seek, for themselves and on behalf of one or more classes of Plan participants and their

beneficiaries, declaratory, permanent injunctive and other appropriate equitable and remedial plan-wide relief as follows.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' federal claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and under the specific jurisdictional statute for claims brought under ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e), (f). The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because the state law claims form part of the same case or controversy. Additionally, the Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the case involves citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000.

3. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(2), venue is proper in this District, in that the Defendants may be found in this District and/or because one of the Plaintiffs and other participants in the Plan earned and accrued pension benefits while residents within this district, and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

III. PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

4. Plaintiff Robert F. Cockerill is a participant in the Plan, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7). He resides in Landenberg, Pennsylvania.

5. Plaintiff Christopher William Newton is a participant in the Plan, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7). He resides in Richmond, Virginia.

6. Plaintiff Oliver F. Major is a participant in the Plan, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7). He resides in Middletown, Delaware.

7. Plaintiff Darrell D. Benson, Sr. is a participant in the Plan, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7). He resides in Buffalo, New York.

B. Defendants

8. Defendant Corteva, Inc. (“Corteva”), is a Delaware corporation with its corporate headquarters located at 974 Centre Road, Building 735, Wilmington, DE 19805. As of June 1, 2019, Corteva is the parent company of the historical E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company (“historical DuPont”) and is the entity with responsibility for the administration of the Plan. Since that time, Corteva has been responsible to appoint the members of the Administrative Committee that is the named Plan Administrator. In these roles, Corteva is a fiduciary under ERISA with respect to the Plan.

9. Defendant DuPont Specialty Products USA, LLC (“Specialty Products”), is a Delaware corporation and now a subsidiary of DuPont de Nemours, Inc. Prior to June 1, 2019, Specialty Products was a subsidiary of DowDuPont Inc. (“DowDuPont”). Prior to the merger of Dow and DuPont on August 31, 2017, Specialty Products was a subsidiary of historical DuPont. Specialty Products was, at all relevant times, the company for which Mr. Newton worked and for which Mr. Cockerill worked and continues to work. In this capacity, Specialty Products made numerous misrepresentations to Mr. Newton, Mr. Cockerill, Mr. Major and members of the Class over many years leading up to the merger of Dow and DuPont and continuing after the merge of Dow and DuPont, about their eligibility for early retirement benefits if they fulfilled certain conditions.

10. Defendant E.I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company is a Delaware company founded more the 200 years ago and, as such, was one of the oldest companies in the United States. For over 110 years, E.I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company sponsored the Plan, one of the oldest pension plans in this country. Historical DuPont also acted as a fiduciary under ERISA with respect to its appointment of the members of the Committee that is the named Plan Administrator.

Historical DuPont, through its former subsidiary Specialty Products, also employed Mr. Cockerill, Mr. Newton, Mr. Major and many other Class members and Plan participants and communicated with these employees about the Plan. As of June 1, 2019, Historical DuPont has ostensibly ceased to exist except as a paper subsidiary of Corteva, although most of its businesses continue to operate under the similarly named DuPont de Nemours, Inc. (“new DuPont”).

11. Defendant DuPont de Nemours, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its corporate headquarters located at 974 Centre Road, Building 730, Wilmington, Delaware 19805.

12. The Pension and Retirement Plan, previously named the U.S. DuPont Pension and Retirement Plan (“Plan”) is an “employee pension benefit plan” within the meaning of ERISA § 3(2)(A), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(2)(A). It is also a “defined benefit pension plan” within the meaning of ERISA § 3(35), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(35).

13. Defendant The Benefit Plans Administrative Committee (“Administrative Committee”) is the “Plan Administrator” and “named fiduciary” of the Plan, pursuant to Title I, Section II of the Plan documents. Under the Plan, the Administrator has authority to adopt rules, regulations, and policies for the Plan’s administration, to make eligibility and other benefits determinations under the Plan, and to interpret and/or effectuate the Plan. Thus, the Administrative Committee is the “Administrator” of the Plan, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(A)(i); a plan fiduciary with discretionary authority to manage and administer the plan within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21)(A); and a named fiduciary of the Plan with the authority and control to manage the operation and administration of the Plan within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1102(a)

IV. FACTS

History of the Plan

14. The Plan was originally adopted effective September 1, 1904, making it one of the oldest defined benefit pension plans in the United States.

15. On December 11, 2015, the 217-year-old historical DuPont announced its intent to merge with Dow Chemical Company.

16. In November 2016, participants were notified of DuPont's intent to freeze the Plan so that no new benefits would accrue to participants in the Plan and no new employees would become eligible to participate in the Plan. Frequently Asked Questions and Answers were distributed to the participants explaining the "freeze." Question 9 asked "What is changing with the Pension Plan?" The answer stated:

The Pension Plan benefit is calculated using pay and years of service. The pay and service amounts used to calculate your pension benefit will stop growing on November 30, 2018. Your Pension Plan benefit formula will use your pay and years of service as of November 30, 2018 to calculate your benefit. **Your Pension Plan will continue to recognize growth in age and service with the company after November 30, 2018 to determine any applicable early retirement reduction factors.** Continuing service with the company, even after November 30, 2018, may ensure you receive 100% of your benefit. (Emphasis Added).

17. Question 10 asked "How do I find out if early retirement reduction factors will be applied to my Pension Plan benefit?" The answer stated:

Depending on the age at which you retire and your years of service, you may receive less than 100% of the value of your benefit (reduced pension). The amount by which your Pension Plan benefit is reduced to reflect early commencement is known as an early retirement reduction factor. Continuing service with the company, even after November 30, 2018, may ensure you receive 100% of your benefit.

Generally, as an employee who participates in the DuPont (parent company) section of the Pension Plan, you can receive a reduced pension at age 50 and 15 years of service and may be able to receive 100% of the value of your benefit as early as age 58 depending on your service when you terminate employment and your age when you begin payments. The table below illustrates how the early retirement reduction factors are applied to your Pension Plan benefit.

DuPont (Parent Company) Early Retirement Reduction Factor Chart

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|------|
| AGE AT PAYMENT DATE | 65 | 100% | | | | | | | |
| | 64 | 95 | 100% | | | | | | |
| | 63 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | | | |
| | 62 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | | |
| | 61 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | |
| | 60 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | |
| | 59 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | |
| | 58 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% |
| | 57 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 |
| | 56 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 |
| | 55 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 |
| | 54 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 |
| | 53 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 |
| 52 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | |
| 51 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | |
| 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | |
| | 15-20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 and over | |
| | YEARS OF SERVICE | | | | | | | | |

18. The merger of Dow and DuPont closed August 31, 2017, creating the combined entity DowDuPont.

19. The merger was designed to combine the two entities and then spin-off into three separate entities: Corteva, Inc., focusing on agricultural chemicals, a new Dow, Inc., focusing on materials science, and a new DuPont de Nemours, Inc., focusing on specialty product industries, the industry in which the Plaintiffs worked.

20. In a Question and Answer in 2018 about the effect of the spin-off on the Plan for active employees, the question was asked: “I am currently a participant in DuPont’s U.S. Pension Plan and will be an employee of Specialty Products in the US. How does this affect my pension?”

The answer:

The spin of DuPont and Corteva Agriscience will impact Specialty Products employees as follows:

Since Corteva Agriscience will be the ongoing sponsor of the Plan, Specialty Products employees who participate in the Plan will be eligible to commence their pension, at spin, if they meet the Plan commencement requirements in terms of age and service.

At spin, future service for Specialty Products employees who participate in the Plan will no longer be recognized in determining eligibility for pension benefits and any applicable early retirement reduction factors. For those employees who qualify for retirement by meeting the Plan's age and service requirements, **growth in age will continue to be recognized allowing those participants to age into an improved reduction factor prior to commencing their pension.** (Emphasis Added).

21. In March 2019, a presentation was made available for participants in the Plan who were hired or rehired as Full-Service Employees prior to January 1, 2007, and who had, or would have, obtained at least age 50 with 15 years of service as of May 31, 2019. This presentation informed participants in this category who were not immediately eligible for an unreduced pension at the time of the spin-off that, "following your transition to New DuPont, . . . your reduction factor will be based on your service calculated based on your age as of May 31, 2019, **and your age on the date you elect to commence benefit payments.**" (Emphasis Added). This presentation further informed these participants:

If you are entitled to an immediate early reduced pension, your monthly benefit payments will be reduced due to commencing benefits early. You may choose to defer the benefit to decrease or eliminate the reduction. In that case, you will get a larger monthly benefit when you commence your payments in the future.

22. A similar presentation was made available for participants in similar circumstances who were transitioning to New DuPont who had not yet obtained age 50 as of May 31, 2019. This presentation used identical language to inform these participants that

“deferring the benefit to decrease or eliminate the benefit as you age,” assuring them that if they do so, they “will get a larger monthly benefit when you commence your payments in the future.”

23. The presentation notified the age 50 group that they would be considered a “retiree” as of June 1, 2019. The presentation further notified employees who had the age and service for an *unreduced* pension benefit as of June 1, 2019, that they could commence their benefit immediately.

24. The presentation also provided that participants who were age 50 but who would receive a reduced pension benefit as of June 1, 2019, could wait until they reached an age where the benefit was no longer reduced. Specifically, the presentation stated: “If you are entitled to an immediate early reduced pension, your monthly benefit payments will be reduced due to commencing benefits early. You may choose to defer the benefit to decrease or eliminate the reduction. In that case, you will get a larger monthly benefit when you commence your payments in the future.”

2

Immediate early reduced pension

A CLOSER LOOK

If you are entitled to a reduced pension, this means that your monthly benefit payments will be reduced due to commencing your benefits early. You may choose to defer your benefit to reduce or eliminate the reduction, and therefore get a larger monthly benefit.

What it is:

- ✓ A monthly reduced payment following your transition to New DuPont, and continuing for your life and, if applicable, the life of your spouse or beneficiary.

How your pension benefit is determined:

- ✓ Your benefit is calculated based on your pay and service as of the **November 30, 2018, pension sunset.**
- ✓ Your reduction factor will be based on your service calculated as of May 31, 2019, and your age on the date you elect to commence benefit payments.

Internal Use Only 13

Now we'll shift gears and take a closer look at reduced pension benefits.

If you are entitled to an immediate early reduced pension, your monthly benefit payments will be reduced due to commencing benefits early. You may choose to defer the benefit to decrease or eliminate the reduction. In that case, you will get a larger monthly benefit when you commence your payments in the future.

25. As of June 1, 2019, the Plan (along with a company denominated “E.I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company” or “historical DuPont”), including all pension liabilities was moved to Corteva. Neither Specialty Products nor any of its business units were moved to Corteva. This move was specifically designed for the new DuPont to divest itself of any future funding obligations and liabilities of the Plan.

26. Corteva is now responsible for funding and administration of the pension benefits for over 100,000 participants even though the majority of active participants have never worked in the businesses now operating as Corteva. In comparison, Corteva has only about 21,000 total employees.

27. The spin-off created a new parent company that took on the historical DuPont name and logo and most of the historical DuPont businesses, including Specialty Products. The spin-off also created a nominal subsidiary of the newly formed Corteva that was dubbed the continuation of the 217 year-old historical DuPont although it retained none of that venerable DuPont’s business operations, but nevertheless was deemed the Plan’s sponsor with the obligations and duties delegated to the Plan sponsor under ERISA and the Plan. The employees of DuPont nearly all remained in the same location and engaged in the same activities.

Robert F. Cockerill

28. Mr. Cockerill, like many members of his family over three generations, spent most of his working life in the employ of DuPont. Mr. Cockerill’s maternal grandfather worked for DuPont as a Research Chemist for over 30 years from the 1940’s to the 1970’s in the areas of agricultural and polymer product development and processing (and also worked on the Manhattan Project as a DuPont Scientist on loan to the U.S. government during WWII).

29. Mr. Cockerill's paternal grandmother worked for DuPont for several years in the 1940's as an administrative assistant in Delaware prior to starting a family with his paternal grandfather, who also retired from DuPont after more than 30 years of service as a chemical engineer and plant manager across multiple locations from the 1940's to the 1970's.

30. Mr. Cockerill's father worked for DuPont from approximately 1966 until 2004 in the Nylon and Polymers departments. He worked as a Chemical Engineer and Manufacturing and Project Manager during his career, relocating twice during that time in 1978 and 1981. In 2001, at the age of 58, he retired and began receiving an early full pension benefit under the Plan's "rule of 85," which has long been a feature of the Plan that allows an unreduced early retirement if an employee's age plus years of service equals 85.

31. Mr. Cockerill himself has worked for DuPont since June of 1992, starting as a Chemical Engineer out of college and progressing through many roles in Process Engineering, Product R&D, Operations Management, Product Management, Sales, Marketing, Strategic Planning and Mergers/Acquisitions. During Mr. Cockerill's 29 years, his family has been relocated seven times to locations in Texas, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Delaware and California. Mr. Cockerill has traveled for work extensively during his career, in some years spending as much as 35% of his time away from his family.

32. In 1996, DuPont moved Mr. Cockerill and his family from Victoria, Texas (Plant Process Engineer – DuPont Nylon) to Raleigh, North Carolina (Process/Product Development Engineer – DuPont Electronics). Mr. Cockerill's spouse had to resign from her teaching position in Texas and spend an entire year unemployed while obtaining qualifications for a teaching license in North Carolina. Resigning from her Texas teacher position meant abandoning the years she had accumulated under the Texas teacher retirement system. But the family believed that this sacrifice

would help them achieve Mr. Cockerill's goal of obtaining unreduced early retirement benefits under the Plan.

33. In 2000, DuPont again moved Mr. Cockerill's family, from Raleigh, North Carolina to Beaumont, Texas (Operations Manager – DuPont Nylon). This time Mr. Cockerill's spouse had to resign from her teaching position in North Carolina and abandon her years toward the North Carolina State Employees Retirement System.

34. In 2002, Mr. Cockerill's family was forced to pull up roots once again and move from Beaumont, Texas to Towanda, Pennsylvania (Operations Manager – DuPont Electronics). At that time, their daughter had just entered kindergarten and Mr. Cockerill's spouse was planning to return to teaching but was forced to abandon these plans when they learned they would soon be moving again.

35. In 2004, only two years after they arrived in Towanda, Pennsylvania, DuPont moved the family again to Raleigh, North Carolina (Product/Marketing Manager – DuPont Electronics). Because they were only in Pennsylvania a short time, Mr. Cockerill's spouse was not able to complete requirements to obtain a Pennsylvania Teachers License and secure a teaching position during this stop. Instead, she was limited to tutoring and part-time work while in Pennsylvania.

36. In 2011, Mr. Cockerill's family was moved from Raleigh, North Carolina to Sunnyvale, California (Business/Integration Leader for acquired company Innovalight, Inc.). Mr. Cockerill's spouse had resumed teaching in North Carolina, where she had been previously licensed and had to resign her position again and abandon the North Carolina Teacher Retirement System. The Cockerill's daughter had to change high schools after completion of her freshmen

year and their son during middle school after completing seventh grade in North Carolina. This was an especially difficult move for their daughter during high school.

37. In 2015, Mr. Cockerill's family was moved from Sunnyvale, California to Raleigh, North Carolina (Marketing Manager – DuPont Electronics). Mr. Cockerill's spouse was able to get licensed to teach in California but was never able to secure a teaching position due to the fiscal shortages in California schools and lack of position availability. She was able to work as a part-time teacher's assistant while in California and was eligible for a retirement benefit but once again had to abandon any significant accumulation of a pension upon leaving the state. Their daughter was in college at the time of this move and unaffected, but their son had to change high schools between Junior and Senior year, which was difficult for him.

38. In 2016, the Cockerills were moved from Raleigh, North Carolina to Corporate Headquarters in Wilmington, Delaware (Product and Sales Manager – DuPont Tedlar Fluorinated Film). Though employed in Delaware, the family resides in Landenberg, Pennsylvania. Mr. Cockerill's spouse was not able to secure a teaching position during their short time in North Carolina of less than one year.

39. The Cockerills currently reside in Landenberg, Pennsylvania where Mr. Cockerill's spouse has been unable to obtain a full-time teaching position with benefits/pension opportunity in Landenberg. Indeed, because she is over 50 years of age and has had a very inconsistent employment history due to their frequent relocations, she has had difficulty getting strong consideration in competition with younger candidates who would receive lower salary due to their age and experience. West Chester University is a local University with a recognized education program, graduating 250-300 new teachers each year making this an especially difficult area to find employment for experienced and higher salaried teachers. Mr. Cockerill's spouse is currently

employed by a private company that provides contracted paraprofessionals working with special needs children in a local high school. This position offers no retirement benefits.

40. Because of the family's repeated moves, Mr. Cockerill's spouse's longest employment was over two periods in North Carolina, for a total of 5 years. Had the family stayed in North Carolina from 1996 to the present, her salary would be over \$50,000 per year and she would have accrued 25 years participation in the North Carolina Teacher Retirement System, which continues to provide medical benefits to participants and families in retirement. At age 58, she would have qualified for approximately \$23,000 per year in pension benefits, plus medical benefits for herself and her spouse in retirement. Due to the constant relocations, she has not qualified for any pension benefits, including medical benefits, with any of the school systems for which she worked. This has affected the whole family because DuPont eliminated health and dental benefits for retirees who did not meet a certain cutoff date, which includes Mr. Cockerill.

41. Mr. Cockerill was always aware of and intended to take full early retirement at the age of 58, as his father had done, under the Rule of 85 feature of the Plan that has been available to all DuPont employees for more than 30 years. The relocations and sacrifices his family made were all toward the goal of achieving early retirement at age 58.

42. At the time the spin-off was finalized on June 1, 2019, Mr. Cockerill had over 26 years of qualified service with historical DuPont and then DowDuPont within the meaning of the Plan and he had attained the age of 49.85278.

43. Unbeknownst to Mr. Cockerill, the spin-off was intended to divest him of his early retirement benefits because, according to Corteva's interpretation of the spin-off as it relates to the Plan, the spin-off terminated Mr. Cockerill's employment from the Plan Sponsor (historical DuPont/Corteva) even though he continued in the same job at the same location with DuPont

Specialty Products under the former DowDuPont and was certainly not “terminated” in the typical way that termination is understood by an employee. In fact, Mr. Cockerill continues his work for DuPont Specialty Products to this day. The only difference being that the early retirement benefit Mr. Cockerill and his family had carefully planned for and made personal and financial sacrifices towards the goal of achieving, has been taken away from him and his family due to an incomprehensible and illogical interpretation of what “termination of employment” means in the context of a series of corporate spin-offs that split off the Plan sponsor of his Plan from his actual employer.

44. Mr. Cockerill has never worked in any of the Agricultural Products businesses which were spun off to create Corteva. Nor has he ever been employed by Corteva, which has now become the Plan sponsor of the DuPont Pension Plan. Over his dedicated career, Mr. Cockerill has directly created value of over \$1 billion in new product developments and over \$1 billion in sales and business success for business lines that no longer support the Plan but that continue to benefit Specialty Products. The business lines for which he worked and continues to work have nothing to do with Corteva or its agricultural businesses.

45. Mr. Cockerill’s entire career was designed around an early retirement. When the Plan was frozen in 2018, cutting out accruals for additional years of service for normal retirement benefits, Mr. Cockerill’s earliest opportunity to apply for unreduced early retirement under the Rule of 85 was age 58.5 (i.e., since years of service would no longer count toward the benefit, he needed to be a half year older to meet the age plus years of service equal to 85).

46. So long as he was not fired and did not leave his employment before he reached the age of 58.5, Mr. Cockerill had been promised and therefore believed that he would be eligible

for an unreduced Early Retirement Benefit, and he and his family built their retirement plans around this promised benefit.

47. Mr. Cockerill had been advised by many colleagues early in his career that working in the environment of a chemical plant does not lead to long life in retirement and that he should work hard to get away from such an environment and plan to retire early since there are no guarantees in life and often DuPont retirees do not live long after they retire.

48. Over the more than 20 years that he worked for DuPont, Mr. Cockerill and his spouse continuously discussed his plan to retire at age 58. Mr. Cockerill's pension benefit was to be the primary component to their retirement income and was a key factor in his accepting the numerous relocations, even at the expense of his spouse's opportunity to grow her own income and retirement benefits (both medical and financial).

49. When the company began to curtail retirement benefits in 2006, Mr. Cockerill began to model his retirement pension value to understand what the pension he would receive if he retired immediately upon reaching 58 years of age, and also to understand what impact an even earlier retirement might have. The modeling was performed using his age, salary and service information and following the pension calculation formulas that had been provided by DuPont human resources. The results of the models estimated the benefits he would receive based on an early retirement at the age of 58 as well as estimates of retiring between the ages of 50 and 58.

50. During Mr. Cockerill's employment there were some notable changes to the pension benefits, which he reviewed with a keen eye and continued to monitor as he navigated toward retirement. First, in 2006, the company significantly reduced the calculation methodology for pension benefits and closed the program to any unvested employees. At the time of the announcement, Mr. Cockerill had just past the threshold to be included in the group of employees

who would continue to accrue benefits under the Plan. He was relieved to hear this news while at the same time very disappointed and sympathetic to other hard-working employees who would not qualify for a pension.

51. Ten years later, in 2016 the company announced that all pension formulas would be frozen with no further growth of benefits for vested employees. While again disappointed in this significant change in the pension plan which Mr. Cockerill worked so hard to obtain, including by relocating his family numerous times, and accepting reduced salary knowing he would be entitled to a pension, he marched on with his mission to retire at age 58. He did so despite being approached numerous times during his career with other employment opportunities which he declined to pursue due to the long family history and loyalty to DuPont and the time already invested towards his early retirement at age 58.

52. After so many years of hard work and sacrifice for DuPont and careful planning for retirement, Mr. Cockerill was crestfallen when he learned in early 2020 that the spin-off had significantly reduced his pension benefit. DuPont has maintained an employee information/data portal called "DuPont Connection" for many years where employees can review their benefits information. However, in early 2020, he received a notification that employees were now directed to the "Corteva Connection" portal as the pension information would no longer be visible in DuPont Connection. Mr. Cockerill located the web portal and established his account. Navigating through the information he landed on the page for his pension benefit and was shocked to see that his earliest unreduced retirement date was changed to 2034 versus his planned date in 2027. Any retirement prior to the 2034 date per the current company position would result in a 5% reduction for each year so retiring as planned would result in a 35% lifetime reduction. He was never told that this would be the case before or after the spin-off and never suspected that this was possible.

53. Mr. Cockerill contacted the Corteva Connection Customer service line to question what he assumed was an error with regard to when he could qualify for full retirement benefits but was informed it was not an error and that he should discuss the matter with DuPont human resources.

54. Mr. Cockerill immediately scheduled a meeting with Lisa White (DuPont Corporate Human Resources for Pension Affairs), who confirmed that the date was correct based on the design and terms of the separation of Corteva, Dow and DuPont and due to the fact that the Plan was transferred to Corteva.

55. Around November of 2018, when the announcement was made that Corteva would be taking over the Plan, Mr. Cockerill reviewed the 2018 Q&A document that was shared with all DowDuPont employees. As a manager of other employees, it was Mr. Cockerill's responsibility to understand the changes that would impact employees and be able to answer any questions and support any concerns employees might have. As described in Mr. Cockerill's appeal, the language in this Q&A did not make clear the underlying impact of the changes intended by DowDuPont management.

56. Moreover, as a manager Mr. Cockerill was aware that employees were continuing to age into early retirement. He had no reason to believe that the spin-off would eliminate participants' ability to retire once they reached their desired retirement age so long as they had the requisite number of years of service.

57. Mr. Cockerill has been in a leadership role for more than 20 years and is very experienced at both writing and interpreting such Q&A's, but DuPont and Corteva's plan to cut off early retirement benefits for worker such as himself was not in any way apparent from the Q&A document, which instead obscured this critical fact. Nor was the distribution of the Q&A

document about the effect of the spin-off on the Plan consistent with prior communications about changes to the Plan. For example, historically when there were changes to the Plan, human resources would hold meetings with participants and discuss the effects of the changes on the employees. There would be specific site meetings with human resources consultants who would provide PowerPoint presentations. They would take roll and document attendance to ensure that all participants were properly informed of Plan changes. None of this happened in November 2018. Instead, Mr. Cockerill and other affected employees were left to try to understand an unclear and misleading document on their own.

58. Consequently, Mr. Cockerill believes that the majority of employees would not and still do not understand the intent of the companies to take away promised early retirement benefits through a corporate sleight of hand that ostensibly transformed current employees into terminated employees. An employee in the human resources department of Corteva disclosed to Mr. Cockerill that 7,000 of the 23,000 employees of DuPont Specialty Products would be negatively affected by this change, most of whom are likely still in the dark and do not understand what has been taken away from them. Despite this large number of affected employees, there was no presentation given to these employees, no communication provided other than the Q&A, which did not even provide managers with enough information to understand the impact on early retirement benefits.

59. When Mr. Cockerill first learned that he was “terminated” as a result of the spin-off of Corteva he requested approval to qualify for benefits under the Optional Retirement at Involuntary Termination provision of the Plan. This request was denied. Mr. Cockerill asked why this option was not available to him and in response DuPont Human Resources stated that he was not terminated but, rather, “divested” and therefore the Optional Retirement provision did not apply.

60. On February 4, 2020, Mr. Cockerill filed a Level I appeal for benefits, which was denied on May 11, 2020. The denial letter stated that Mr. Cockerill was age 49 years and 9 months with 27.9 years of service when he was terminated from the company. It further stated that he was involuntarily terminated, that he was not terminated due to dishonesty, insubordination or other misconduct. Finally, the letter stated that he was terminated due to the divestiture rather than due to lack of work and was, therefore, ineligible for Optional Retirement at Involuntary Termination. It also stated that “your eligibility service that determines reduction factors stopped on May 31, 2019, when your employment ended with DuPont (Corteva) with your age below 50 at the time of termination. Therefore, as per the rule 85 (age + service = 85), you will not qualify for an unreduced pension at the age of 58, and your request is dnied [sic].”

61. On June 12, 2020, Mr. Cockerill filed a Level II appeal pursuant to the Plan requirements, which was denied on September 4, 2020. Corteva informed him that as of May 31, 2019, he was 49.85278 years of age and that his employment was terminated on that date. Because he was not yet eligible for early retirement, he was not eligible for the Rule of 85 benefit.

62. The June 12, 2020, letter also stated “Please note that in November 2018, the Benefit Plans Administrative Committee, the Plan Sponsor, reviewed the applicability of the Optional Retirement provision [Section IV.D. of the Plan], and determined that Optional Retirement is not applicable when employment is terminated in connection with a corporate spin-off, consistent with the intent of the Plan provisions and consistent with past practices. You are therefore not eligible for the Optional Retirement benefit as you did not terminate employment due to lack of work, but due to the corporate spin-off activity.”

Christopher William Newton

63. Mr. Newton became an employee of E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company on September 7, 1999, in the business of Advanced Fibers Systems, which later became a subsidiary of DuPont Specialty Products on February 1, 2019.

64. Mr. Newton was hired as an engineer in industrial manufacturing process to make aerospace structural honeycomb materials known as Nomex paper.

65. Over his career at DuPont Mr. Newton had stellar performance, which opened new opportunities to work on some of the most challenging projects where DuPont needed to deliver success. For example, he worked on designing and manufacturing Kevlar when the U.S. Military needed protection from improvised explosive devices. Mr. Newton's research work produced the next generation Kevlar with breakthroughs exceeding the goals required to scale up the technology.

66. Mr. Newton's innovation also pioneered next generation fire protection materials and protection from electrical arc events. His innovations and work at DuPont have likely saved many thousands of lives.

67. DuPont continues to use Mr. Newton's work today to highlight their innovation in protecting police, military and firefighters.

68. Mr. Newton received a Pioneering Innovation Award from the American Gas Association recognizing his work with natural gas fire hazard assessments.

69. During his 19 years of employment, DuPont filed for more than 40 patents for Mr. Newton's inventions, almost all of which are still active as of today and continue to be used by DuPont as flagship technology in the company's multi-billion-dollar business. Mr. Newton's patents are publications of invention of the next generation Kevlar. The first generation of Kevlar

has been a pillar product for DuPont for 40 years and Mr. Newton's inventions will likely be a pillar product for the next 40 years to come.

70. In 2007, when DuPont made significant changes to the benefit formula under the Pension and Retirement Plan, the company provided participants, including Mr. Newton, with an Excel calculator called the DuPont Retirement Benefits Illustrator. The calculator stated that it was a tool that employees like Mr. Newton could use to see comparative ways the redesigned savings and pension plan would impact his retirement benefits. Using this calculator, Mr. Newton was able to project his retirement income based on his estimated years of service, age and salary. Using this retirement calculator, Mr. Newton determined that his ideal retirement age would be 58, the earliest age at which he could retire for an unreduced early retirement using the Rule of 85.

71. On May 23, 2019, just 8 days before the close of the spin-off, and just shy of one year from reaching age 50, Mr. Newton was informed that his position was declared "excess" and he was terminated for lack of work.

72. On May 23, 2019, Mr. Newton was required to attend a meeting with human resources manager, Claude Stultz, and the DuPont Technology Director, Stephane Bazzana. During the meeting Mr. Newton was presented with a Career Transition Program ("CTP") package. The Director and Mr. Newton discussed the CTP and Mr. Bazzana told Mr. Newton that he was entitled to an enhanced pension under the Plan due to being involuntarily terminated for lack of work and receiving the CTP. The human resources manager handed Mr. Newton a matrix showing the percentages of retirement based on age at payment start date and years of service. He then circled 55% which correlated to 49 years of age and 19 years of service, which was Newton's age and service as of July 31, 2019, the date of his termination. Mr. Newton was also told that his percentage benefits would increase the longer he waited after termination to commence benefits.

73. Using the matrix for the CTP payout with age and years of service, Mr. Newton created his own spreadsheet to determine the amount of income he would receive from the Plan at different ages to compare benefit commencement scenarios. Mr. Newton determined that if he opted to begin receiving a benefit at age 50, he would get 60% of his projected normal retirement benefit of \$1,652.29, or \$991.37 per month. He noted on the spreadsheet that if he waited until age 60 his benefit would increase to \$1,404.45 a month, but that he would lose \$118,964.90 in retirement benefits over the ten-year period from age 50 to 60. Based on these calculations, Mr. Newton determined that his optimal date to begin receiving benefits under the CTP program was at age 50 to receive the maximum value.

74. Mr. Newton's formal termination letter stated that effective May 23, 2019, Newton was released from his assignment and no longer required to report to work. In addition, all access to company facilities and property was terminated on May 23, 2019.

75. Despite being told on May 23, 2019, that he was no longer employed, was released from his assignments and no longer had to report to work, Mr. Newton's official termination date was set for July 31, 2019, two months after the date of the spin-off.

76. At the time of the spin-off on June 1, 2019, Newton had 19.72 years of service and was 48.919440 years old.

77. On June 26, 2019, Mr. Newton emailed Mr. Bazzana, the Global Innovation Director who Mr. Newton reported to, and Mr. Stultz, from human resources, Mr. Newton reminded them that when he was hired in 1999, he was told by management that his base salary was only part of the compensation he would receive and that the pension was of significant value in his total compensation package. This is consistent with the messaging from DuPont to employees about compensation throughout the years.

78. On June 26, 2019, Mr. Newton sent an email to Stephane Bazzana and Claude Stultz requesting an adjustment to his service date. Mr. Bazzana responded by email stating that “The Career Transition Program is a consistent way for us to support employees transitioning out of DuPont who have experienced a job elimination due to a reduction in force.” He further stated that HR would not change the CTP terms as presented on May 23, 2019.

79. Based on the representations of DuPont, Mr. Newton waited about a year until he was close to 50 to apply for his benefits to commence effective July 1, 2020. Much to his surprise, Corteva sent him a Pension Estimate Calculation Statement listing him as “Deferred Vested” and only entitled to 25% of his normal retirement benefit rather than the 60% he had expected to receive upon turning 50, based on the communications and 19 years of planning.

80. Mr. Newton submitted an appeal explaining that he had been terminated for lack of work under the CTP. Corteva responded that effective on the date of the spin-off, June 1, 2019, Corteva began sponsoring the heritage DuPont CTP and that Newton’s CTP was under the new DuPont CTP.

81. Even though Mr. Newton emailed Mr. Bazzana and Mr. Stultz after the date of the spin-off, neither informed Mr. Newton about any new CTP from a new company, and neither notified Mr. Newton that he was now terminated as of June 1, 2019.

82. On March 19, 2021, Mr. Newton, through his attorneys, submitted a Level II appeal arguing he was involuntarily terminated for lack of work and is entitled to a 60% benefit based on his 19 years of service and being age 50 as of July 1, 2020.

83. On July 6, 2021, Mr. Newton’s Level II appeal was denied. The Committee found that as a result of the spin-off Mr. Newton “voluntarily terminated” his employment because his employment continued under the new DuPont after the date of the spin-off, even though he never

worked after May 23, 2019. It further found that because the spin-off occurred before the official termination date, Mr. Newton was not terminated for “lack of work.” All of this, combined with the Committee’s finding that Mr. Newton was not 50 at the time of his termination, reduced his benefit to just 25% of his full retirement benefit. Mr. Newton’s only option for a higher pension now is to wait another 15 years from age 50 until he reaches the normal retirement age of 65 before taking his pension at a reduced overall value, even though, having been terminated after a long and loyal career with DuPont, he needs his pension now.

84. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the Plan and the Committee’s interpretation of the Plan prior to the spin-off and prior to administration by Corteva allowed participants to age into early retirement benefits. Participants who had the requisite years of service but who terminated service, voluntarily or involuntarily, prior to reaching the requisite age to qualify under the Rule of 85 could choose to commence their pension benefits as soon as they reached the requisite age.

85. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the Plan sent notices to participants who had terminated service prior to reaching their earliest retirement age informing them of the earliest date in the future at which they could commence a reduced or unreduced pension benefit.

Oliver Major

86. Mr. Major began his career with E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company in 1997, as an operator in Newark, Delaware for DuPont Dow Elastomers. Mr. Major was a dedicated worker and quick learner, and his contributions to the company led to regular promotions. He quickly progressed to more and more demanding positions, first as a manufacturing supervisor and then in human resources. By 2017, he was promoted to a position as the company’s North

American Talent Acquisition Leader for Professional Roles. After the spin-off, he remained at DuPont's corporate headquarters in Delaware and was promoted in 2020 to head the Global Talent Acquisition division of DuPont de Nemours, Inc. (also referred to as "DuPont Specialties") He was terminated on September 30, 2021, as part of a restructuring at DuPont Specialties. Throughout his more than two decades of working at DuPont companies, Mr. Majors was thus recognized as a valued, talented and hard-working employee.

87. Despite his management position, when the spin-off occurred on May 31, 2019, Mr. Major was not told and as a result had no understanding that Defendants considered his employment with the Plan sponsor to have ended for purposes of his benefits under the Plan and that his benefits would not increase as he aged. Indeed, because he continued to work in the same position and location as he had before May 31, 2019, he naturally believed that he would be entitled to greater Plan benefits as he aged, and that he would receive unreduced benefits by the time he was 59. He was greatly taken aback when he learned that this would not be the case.

88. On September 30, 2021, Mr. Major's employment with DuPont Specialties was terminated.

89. In January 2022, Mr. Major requested a pension benefit calculation for a benefit commencement date of February 1, 2022. After he was informed that he would only be entitled to 70% of his unreduced pension benefit (or \$1,584.95) on that commencement date, rather than the nearly 90% Optional Retirement benefit he was expecting, he called Corteva Connections to question this calculation.

90. Mr. Major was told that he was not eligible for Optional Retirement benefits because he was terminated from the Plan sponsor on May 31, 2019, and this was due to a corporate spin-off and not lack of work.

91. Mr. Major appealed this determination on January 22, 2022. The Benefit Determination Review Team at Corteva Connections denied this appeal, stating that Mr. Major's involuntary termination on September 30, 2021, had no impact on his pension eligibility, and that his termination from the Plan sponsor on May 31, 2019, was due to a corporate spin-off and not to lack of work. The denial letter pointed to p. 18 of the January 2022 version of the Corteva Agriscience Summary Plan Description ("SPD") for the Plan in reaching this determination.

92. Mr. Major filed a second level appeal on May 15, 2022. He pointed out that the explanation of Optional Retirement provisions on p. 19 of the 2022 SPD did not state that "involuntary termination" provisions did not apply to current employees of DuPont Specialties, and the fact that he would have to wait more than four additional years to receive his unreduced pension was not communicated to him at the time Corteva took on fiduciary responsibility for the Plan. Nor was the impact of the spin-off on pension benefits explained to him despite his management position.

93. On August 22, 2022, the Corteva Benefits Appeals Committees denied Mr. Major's second level appeal. The denial letter first stated that Mr. Major was ineligible for the Optional Retirement Benefit because he was not terminated for lack of work but "because you were no longer an employee of E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company or a wholly owned subsidiary due to the Spin-Off." With regard to the unreduced benefit date, the letter reasoned that Mr. Major would have only been eligible for an unreduced benefit at age 58.8 if he had continued employment with the Company after the spin-off (meaning E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company), and he did not. Moreover, the letter indicated that Mr. Major had been informed of this change in the Statement he received a month after the spin-off on July 30, 2019, which showed his earliest unreduced retirement benefit date as September 1, 2028 (when he will be age 63.2). The letter also

pointed to a FAQ sheet that stated that “future service for Specialty Products employees who participate in the Plan will no longer be recognized in determining . . . any applicable early retirement reduction factors,” but that “growth in age will continue to be recognized allowing those participants to age into an improved reduction factor prior to commencing their pension.”

Darrell D. Benson, Sr.

94. Darrell Benson began working for historical DuPont in the Yerkes facility located in Buffalo, New York in May 1996. He began his long DuPont career as a Tops Finisher and later moved through various roles, including as an operator of C&C Milling Machines, Tevlar Films and Corian Process Operations and finally as a Sanding Machine Operator. Mr. Benson never worked in any of the agricultural business divisions of DuPont, never worked for Corteva and his employment duties and lines of businesses in which he worked had no relation to Corteva or the agricultural side of DowDuPont.

95. At the time of the spin-off on May 31, 2019, Mr. Benson had over 23 years of service under the Plan and was 56.719440 years old, according to the Plan’s records. Mr. Benson had planned to retire at the age of 59, when he would have met the Rule of 85 under the Plan’s early retirement provisions and able to collect 100% of his pension benefit.

96. In 2016, Mr. Benson was diagnosed with a blood cancer called Essential Thrombocythemia. Although he was able to control this disorder through medication, the medication itself caused symptoms such as fatigue, diabetes and hypertension.

97. Given these health challenges, which were exacerbated by his changing work schedule, Mr. Benson wanted to retire as soon as feasible given his economic needs. Thus, he intended to retire as soon as he qualified for a 100% retirement benefit by meeting the Rule of 85 requirement based on his years of service and age.

98. Unbeknownst to Mr. Benson, because his employer became “New” DuPont at the spin-off, his years of service for purposes of his eligibility for the Rule of 85 stopped accruing even though he continued in his same job doing the same duties as he did prior to the spin-off. This resulted in pushing out his unreduced pension retirement date from age 59 to age 62.

99. Moreover, Mr. Benson also lost the right to an optional retirement benefit because the Committee decided that the requirements for such benefits are not met in a spin-off. Under the governing Plan terms, however, Mr. Benson should have been entitled to an optional retirement benefit at the spin-off because he was involuntarily terminated for reasons other than cause. As of May 31, 2019, the date of the spin-off, he was eligible for 70% of his normal retirement benefit under the Plan’s early retirement provisions, whereas he was eligible for 15% more, or 85% of his normal retirement benefit under the optional retirement factors.

100. Had DuPont been up front and transparent about the effect of the spin-off and informed him, among other things, that the company had concluded that he and others like him did not qualify for the larger optional retirement benefits by virtue of the spin-off, and that he could have started his early retirement benefit at the time of the spin-off and continued to work for New DuPont, he would have commenced these benefits.

101. Because he continued in the same work at the same location after the spin-off and no communications from his employers made the matter clear, Mr. Benson did not even realize at the time of the spin-off that his employment was considered terminated for purposes of the Plan by virtue of the transaction making historical DuPont, the Plan sponsor for over a century, a subsidiary of Corteva, rather than New DuPont.

Plan Provisions

102. The following are provisions of the Plan, as amended and restated effective December 16, 2015, and certain amendments thereafter, applicable to the allegations of the complaint:

- a. Section III provides that normal retirement age under the Plan is the later of age 65 or, for employees who commence participation in the Plan after age 60, the 5th anniversary of the time Plan participation commenced.
- b. Section IV A (1) – Normal Retirement Eligibility: “An employee will be eligible for Normal Retirement after reaching age 65 with at least 15 years of service.”
- c. Section IV B (1) – Early Retirement Eligibility: “An employee will be eligible for Early Retirement after reaching age 50 and prior to reaching age 65 with at least 15 years of service.”
- d. Section IV B – Percentage Factor for Early Retirement Pension are as follows:

PERCENTAGE FACTORS FOR EARLY RETIREMENT PENSION

| AGE AT COMMEN- CEMENT OF PAYMENT | <u>SERVICE YEARS</u> | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 15 THROUGH 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 AND OVER | |
| 65 | 100% | | | | | | | | UNREDUCED PENSION |
| 64 | 95 | 100% | | | | | | | |
| 63 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | | | | |
| 62 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | | | |
| 61 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | | |
| 60 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | | |
| 59 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | | |
| 58 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100% | |
| 57 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | |
| 56 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | |
| 55 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | |
| 54 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | |
| 53 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | |
| 52 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | |
| 51 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | |
| 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 60 | |

For intermediate age and service combinations, the percentage factor will be interpolated from the above.

- e. Section IV D (1) – Optional Retirement Eligibility: (a) An employee will be eligible for Optional Retirement after reaching age 50 with at least 15 years of service if his employment would otherwise be involuntarily terminated for reasons other than discharge for dishonesty, insubordination or other misconduct.
- (b) An employee will be eligible for Optional Retirement after reaching age 45 and prior to reaching age 50 with at least 25 years of service if his employment would otherwise be involuntarily terminated due to lack of work. The length and service required for eligibility shall be reduced by two months, or a proportionate part thereof, for each month or portion thereof which has elapsed since the employee reached age 45.

The Plan provides that participants are not eligible for optional retirement benefits in the following circumstances:

- (c) Effective October 15, 1994, an employee will not be eligible for Optional Retirement under the following circumstances but will be eligible for the right described in Section V.A.(2):
- (i) the employee is offered and accepts employment with the buyer or joint venture at the site in conjunction with a sales agreement between the Company and a buyer of company assets or in conjunction with the formation of a joint venture; or
 - (ii) the employee is offered and refuses employment with the buyer or joint venture at the site in conjunction with a sales agreement between the Company and a buyer of Company assets or in conjunction with the formation of a joint venture unless the offer is less than 80% of the employee's Company wage or salary level or the rejection results in a job for another employee who would otherwise have been terminated for lack of work.
 - (iii) the employee is transferred to or employed by a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company, or is transferred to or employed by a subsidiary of the Company or a joint venture in which the Company participates that recognized Company service.

103. None of these exclusions applied to the transaction that separated DowDuPont into three companies because the transaction was an all stock transaction and not a sale of company assets.

104. The Seventh Amendment to the Plan signed December 19, 2019, amended Section IX K of Title I of the Plan effective January 1, 2021, as follows:

“K. Right to Modify Plan

The Company reserves the right to change or discontinue this Plan in its discretion. Upon the complete or partial termination of this Plan, an employee who is affected by such termination and is not otherwise entitled to benefits under this Plan shall acquire a vested right to benefits accrued under this Plan to the date of such termination, to the extent then funded. **Prior to January 1, 2021**, any change which has the effect of reducing or terminating benefits under this Plan will not be effective until one year following announcement of such change by the Company, unless the Company deems that the change is necessary or appropriate to qualify or maintain the Plan as one meeting the requirements of the Code with respect to qualified pension plans. Pensions granted pursuant to this Plan, to former employees who were retired or otherwise terminated prior to any such change may not be reduced, cancelled or suspended except as provided under Section VII and paragraph F of this Section. “

105. The Seventh Amendment to the Plan, signed December 19, 2019, amended Section IX N of Title I of the Plan, and effective June 1, 2019, reads as follows:

3. Section IX.N. of Title I of the Plan is amended to read as follows, effective June 1, 2019:

“N. Transfer of Employment and Multiple Titles

Participation in this Title I shall continue for any employee who transfers on or after January 1, 2012 to an employer who participates in another Title of the ~~DuPont~~ Pension and Retirement Plan unless such transfer is to an employer participating under Title V in which case the effective date to this rule governing transfers (and continuance under Title I) will be on or after January 1, 2009. Such transfer shall not be considered a transfer to an affiliated group company. **Beginning June 1, 2019, participation in this Title I shall continue for an employee for so long as the employee is continuously employed by a U.S. or Puerto Rico legal entity which is wholly owned by Corteva, Inc.”**

106. The Eighth Amendment to the Plan signed November 30, 2020, amended Section IV D of Title I of the Plan, effective February 1, 2021, as follows:

1. Section IV.D.(1)(a) of Title I of the Plan is hereby amended as follows, effective as of February 1, 2021:

“(a) An employee will be eligible for Optional Retirement after reaching age 50 with at least 15 years of service if his employment would otherwise be involuntarily terminated ~~due to lack of work for reasons other than discharge for dishonesty, insubordination or other misconduct.~~”

107. The January 2020 Summary Plan Description sets forth the amount of benefits payable under the Optional Retirement at Involuntary Termination as follows:

Optional Retirement at Involuntary Termination

If your employment ends because of an involuntary termination (for reasons other than dishonesty, insubordination, or other misconduct), you may be eligible for Optional Retirement if you are an FSE and you are over age 50 with at least 15 years of Eligibility Service. If you're terminated involuntarily due to lack of work and have at least 25 years of Eligibility Service, you may be eligible for Optional Retirement as early as age 45. The 25-year service requirement is reduced by two years for each year past your 45th birthday, as follows:

| Age | Required Service |
|-------------|------------------|
| 45 | 25 |
| 46 | 23 |
| 47 | 21 |
| 48 | 19 |
| 49 | 17 |
| 50 or older | 15 |

108. The Optional Retirement section continues to provide:

If you are eligible for a pension due to an involuntary termination as described above, the chart below shows the percentage of your benefit that you will receive, based on your age when benefits begin and your years of eligibility service. For example, if you are entitled to a benefit of \$1,000 per month, payable at age 65, and you have 20 years of service, you would receive 90% of your benefit—or \$900 a month—if you began taking payments at age 61 instead of waiting until age 65. If you wait until you are age 65, you would then be entitled to an unreduced benefit.

The chart below is used to determine the percentage of pension you can receive in the event of an involuntary termination described above.

| Age When Benefit Payments Begin | If You Have This Many Years of Eligibility Service ... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27+ |
| This Is the Percentage of Your Benefit That You Will Receive ... | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | | | | | | |
| 64 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% | | | | | | |
| 63 | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% | | | | | |
| 62 | 85% | 85% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% | | | | |
| 61 | 80% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% | | | |
| 60 | 75% | 77.5% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% | | |
| 59 | 72.5% | 75% | 77.5% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% | |
| 58 | 70% | 72.5% | 75% | 77.5% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 97.5% | 100% |
| 57 | 67.5% | 70% | 72.5% | 75% | 77.5% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 92.5% | 95% | 95% |
| 56 | 65% | 67.5% | 70% | 72.5% | 75% | 77.7% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 87.5% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| 55 | 62.5% | 65% | 67.5% | 70% | 72.5% | 75% | 77.5% | 80% | 82.5% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% |
| 54 | 60% | 62.5% | 65% | 67.5% | 70% | 72.5% | 75% | 77.5% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% |
| 53 | 57.5% | 60% | 62.5% | 65% | 67.5% | 70% | 72.5% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% |
| 52 | 55% | 57.5% | 60% | 62.5% | 65% | 67.5% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| 51 | 52.5% | 55% | 57.5% | 60% | 62.5% | 65% | 65% | 65% | 65% | 65% | 65% | 65% | 65% |

| Age When Benefit Payments Begin | If You Have This Many Years of Eligibility Service ... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27+ |
| | This Is the Percentage of Your Benefit That You Will Receive ... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | 50% | 52.5% | 55% | 57.5% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% |
| 49 | | | 52.5% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% |
| 48 | | | | | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% |
| 47 | | | | | | | 45% | 45% | 45% | 45% | 45% | 45% | 45% |
| 46 | | | | | | | | | 40% | 40% | 40% | 40% | 40% |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | 35% | 35% | 35% |

V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

109. **Class A Definition.** Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a), (b)(1) and (b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and the following class of persons similarly situated (“Class A”):

All Plan participants who were less than age 50, with at least 15 years of service under the Plan as of May 31, 2019, whose employment with historical DuPont, or any other participating employer in the Plan, ended due to the spin-off, and the beneficiaries or estates of such participants.

110. **Class B Definition.** Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a), (b)(1) and (b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and the following class of persons similarly situated (“Class B”):

All Plan participants who were age 50 or older, with at least 15 years of service under the Plan as of May 31, 2019, whose employment with historical DuPont, or any other participating employer in the Plan, ended as a result of the spin-off, and the beneficiaries and estates of such participants.

111. **Numerosity.** Upon information and belief, the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all persons in the classes is impracticable. Pursuant to responses to discovery, Defendants have identified over 2,500 participants who had at least 15 years of service as of the date of the spin-off and who, as of the date of the spin-off, lost their employment with historical DuPont.

112. **Commonality.** There are questions of law or fact common to all members of the Classes that concern Defendants’ actions, including without limitation:

- a.** Whether the Committee acted arbitrarily and capriciously in determining that Plaintiffs and Class A members can no longer age into Early Retirement and Rule of 85 unreduced early retirement.
- b.** Whether the Committee acted arbitrarily and capriciously in determining that participants who lost their employment with the historical DuPont as a result of a spin-off on May 31, 2019, are not entitled to optional retirement benefits.
- c.** Whether Plaintiffs Major, Benson and members of Class B are entitled to optional retirement benefits.
- d.** Whether Defendants acted as ERISA fiduciaries with respect to their communications about Plan benefits to Plaintiffs and the Class and Subclass.
- e.** Whether Defendants, through active misrepresentations and/or omissions, led Cockerill, Newton, and Class A members to believe that as long as they had sufficient years of service as of the date of the spin-off on May 31, 2019, that they could retire under the early retirement provision of the Plan when they reached their desired retirement age.
- f.** Whether Defendants committed co-fiduciary breaches with respect to their communications to Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes.
- g.** Whether Defendants discharged, expelled or discriminated against Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes for the purpose of interfering with their rights to early and optional retirement benefits under the Plan.
- h.** Whether, in applying the requirement that a termination be for “lack of work” as provided in the Plan effective February 1, 2021, rather than an involuntary termination “for reasons other than discharge for dishonesty, insubordination or

other misconduct,” as required in the governing Plan at the date of the spin-off, as amended and restated effective December 16, 2015, Defendants impermissibly denied and/or cut-back the optional retirement benefits of Mr. Major, Mr. Benson, and other similarly situated participants who were over 50 at the time of the spin-off.

Resolution of these questions will not require individual inquiry into the actions or circumstances of individual Plan participants. These and other common questions of law or fact center upon whether the Defendants violated ERISA based on their determination that certain participants who were terminated as of the date of the spin-off do not qualify for nor can they age into an Early Retirement, Optional Retirement or Rule of 85 unreduced early retirement under the Plan. Defendants’ interpretation is inconsistent with the terms of the Plan and has the effect of denying thousands of participants a right to a benefit as defined by the Plan.

113. **Typicality.** Plaintiffs are members of the Classes as defined above. They have all been similarly harmed by the Defendants’ actions in violating ERISA and the Plan documents, by their arbitrary and capricious interpretation of the age requirements for early retirement benefits and for the applicability of the optional retirement provision and in failing to properly protect the Plan and its participants and beneficiaries. They assert the same claims and legal theories under the same provisions of ERISA, and Regulations promulgated thereunder, that all members of the Classes might assert.

114. **Adequacy.** Plaintiff Cockerill will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the absent members of Class A. Likewise, Plaintiffs Major and Benson will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the absent members of Class B. Because their claims are typical of those of absent members of the Classes, Plaintiffs have every incentive to vigorously pursue those claims

on behalf of absent members of the Classes. Their interests coincide with, and are not antagonistic to, those of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiffs are represented by counsel experienced in ERISA and complex class action litigation.

115. **Rule 23(b)(1) Requirements.** The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants, and a risk of adjudications which as a practical matter would be dispositive of the interests of other members of the Classes who are not parties.

116. **Rule 23(b)(2) Requirements.** Defendants have acted and/or refused to act and are likely to act and/or refuse to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes, thereby making appropriate final injunctive and other relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

117. **Rule 23(b)(3) Requirements.** If the Classes are not certified under Rule 23(b)(1) or (b)(2), then certification under (b)(3) is appropriate because questions of law and fact common to members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.

VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

**(Claim to Clarify Benefits under 29 U.S.C. 1132(a)(1)(B)
by Plaintiffs Cockerill and Newton and the Class)
Against Defendant Administrative Committee and the Plan**

118. Plaintiffs and the Class repeat and re-allege the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

119. ERISA Section 502(a)(1)(B), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B), empowers a plan participant to bring suit to recover benefits due him under the terms of the plan, to enforce his rights under the terms of the plan, or to clarify his rights to future benefits under the terms of the plan.

120. Plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative remedies required under ERISA and the Plan and have performed all duties and obligations on Plaintiffs' part to be performed under the Plan.

121. Plaintiffs Cockerill and Newton and the members of Class A (who were under the age of 50 at the time of the spin-off) seek clarification that Defendant Administrative Committee abused its discretion in interpreting the Plan to extinguish their right to age into an early retirement, Rule of 85 unreduced early retirement or optional retirement benefits under the Plan following the spin-off. The Plan terms, and communications related to the Plan, provide that a participant's Early Retirement, Optional Retirement or Rule of 85 unreduced early retirement are based on the length of service with the employer and the age at which they commence their benefit. Nothing in the Plan, the Summary Plan Description or any communications provides for any other interpretation and, in fact, these Plan documents and communications state the contrary.

122. The Plan terms also provide that participants who are involuntarily terminated are entitled to optional retirement benefits, and the Administrative Committee and the Plan erred in denying such benefits to Plaintiffs and Class A on the grounds that they voluntarily terminated their employment with historical DuPont.

COUNT II

(Claim for Benefits and to Clarify Benefits under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B) by Plaintiffs Major, Benson and Subclass A) Against Defendant Administrative Committee and the Plan

123. Plaintiffs Major, Benson and the members of Class B who were over the age of 50 at the time of the spin-off repeat and re-allege the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

124. Plaintiff Major has exhausted his administrative remedies required under ERISA and the Plan and has performed all duties and obligations on Plaintiff's part to be performed under the Plan.

125. Mr. Major and Mr. Benson seek optional retirement benefits and seek clarification and a declaration that they, and the members of Class B, who were over the age of 50 at the time of the spin-off, are entitled to these benefits.

126. Under the terms of the governing Plan document and applicable law, Plaintiffs Major, Benson and Class B members are entitled to optional retirement benefits based on the clear and unambiguous terms of the Plan.

127. In denying Mr. Major's claim for Optional Retirement benefits the Administrative Committee determined that Mr. Major's employment was terminated as of May 31, 2019, as a result of the spin-off. The Optional Retirement provision in effect as of May 31, 2019, provided that an employee who is at least age 50 with 15 years of service and who is terminated "for reasons other than discharge for dishonesty, insubordination or other misconduct" is entitled to Optional Retirement benefits.

128. Mr. Benson did not file a claim and has not exhausted his administrative remedies because doing so would be futile. The Committee has already established a fixed policy of denying claims for optional retirement in connection with the spin-off and has already denied Mr. Major's claim on these grounds.

129. By adopting an interpretation that optional retirement requirements are not met in a spin-off, regardless of the form of the spin-off, and denying optional retirement to participants over the age of 50 as of the date spin-off, the Committee abused its discretion and has wrongfully denied optional retirement benefits to Plaintiffs Major, Benson and Class B members.

COUNT III
(In the Alternative to Claim I,
Claim for Benefits under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B) by Plaintiff Newton)
Against Defendant Administrative Committee and the Plan

130. Plaintiff Newton repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

131. Plaintiff Newton has exhausted his administrative remedies required under ERISA and the Plan and has performed all duties and obligations on Plaintiff's part to be performed under the Plan.

132. If Mr. Newton is not allowed to age into unreduced early retirement benefits, he seeks Optional Retirement benefits and seeks clarification that he is entitled to these benefits.

133. Under the terms of the Plan and applicable law, Plaintiff Newton is entitled to Optional Retirement benefits.

134. Defendant Administrative Committee wrongfully denied Newton's claim for Optional Retirement benefits on the basis that Newton was not terminated for lack of work prior to the spin-off.

COUNT IV
(In the Alternative to Claims I, II and III,
Claim for Breach of Fiduciary Duty, 29 U.S.C. § 1104,
and Breach of Co-Fiduciary Duty, 29 U.S.C. § 1105)
by All Plaintiffs
Against All Defendants Except New DuPont and the Pension and Retirement Plan

135. Plaintiffs and the Classes repeat and re-allege the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

136. ERISA Section 404(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a), requires that a fiduciary discharge its duties with respect to a plan solely in the interests of plan participants and beneficiaries, for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits to participants and their beneficiaries and defraying reasonable expenses of administering the plan, and that a fiduciary act under a prudent person

standard of care. These duties include the duty to provide complete and accurate information regarding participants' benefits.

137. ERISA Section 405(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1105(a), imposes liability on a fiduciary, in addition to any liability under any other provision of ERISA, for a breach of fiduciary responsibility of another fiduciary with respect to the same plan if the fiduciary knows of a breach and fails to remedy it, knowingly participates in a breach, or enables a breach.

138. ERISA Section 502(a)(3), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3), authorizes a plan participant to file suit to obtain injunctive or other appropriate equitable relief to remedy violations of ERISA.

139. Defendants breached their fiduciary duties under ERISA Section 404 to Plaintiffs and the Classes by misleading Plaintiffs and omitting material information about their ability to age into an early retirement or Rule of 85 unreduced early retirement benefit under the Plan in the years and months leading up to the spin-off.

140. Defendants also breached their fiduciary duties by actively and repeatedly misinforming Plaintiff Newton and omitting material information about employees' ability to obtain optional retirement benefits at certain percentages tied to their age at the time of commencement of benefits if they were terminated for lack of work.

141. Defendants also breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs Major and Benson and Class B by misleading and omitting material information about their eligibility for optional retirement benefits after the spin-off.

142. Defendants also breached their co-fiduciary duties under ERISA Section 405 to Plaintiffs and the Classes by failing to remedy the breaches of the other fiduciaries, knowingly participating in their breaches and/or enabling their breaches.

143. Plaintiffs and the Classes have been harmed by Defendants' breaches of their duties as fiduciaries and co-fiduciaries.

COUNT V
(In the Alternative to Claims I, II, and III,
Claim for Interference With Protected Rights, 29 U.S.C. § 1140)
by All Plaintiffs
Against All Defendants Except New DuPont and the Pension and Retirement Plan

144. Plaintiffs and the Classes repeat and re-allege the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

145. ERISA Section 510 makes it “unlawful for any person to discharge, fine, suspend, expel, discipline or discriminate against a participant or beneficiary . . . for the purpose of interfering with the attainment of any right to which such participant may become entitled under the plan” or Title I of ERISA. 29 U.S.C. § 1140.

146. Defendants, acting separately and in concert, have discharged, expelled and otherwise discriminated against Plaintiffs and the Classes for purpose of interfering with their attainment of early and optional retirement pension benefits under the Plan including, without limitation, by: (1) intentionally placing historical DuPont as a subsidiary of Corteva, despite the majority of the participants' continued employment with New DuPont after the spin-off, in order to cut-off their continued ability to have their age and additional service count toward increased early retirement benefits, and; (2) determining that participants who were terminated from historical DuPont as the result of the spin-off are not entitled to optional retirement benefits, in contradiction to the clear language of the Plan.

147. Plaintiffs and the Class have been economically harmed by Defendants' conduct in violation of ERISA Section 510.

COUNT VI

**(Claim for Impermissible Cutback of Accrued Pension Benefits, 29 U.S.C. § 1054(g))
by Plaintiffs Major and Benson and Class B
Against Defendants Administrative Committee and The Pension and Retirement Plan**

148. Plaintiffs and Class B repeat and re-allege the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

149. Section 204(g)(1) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1054(g)(1), provides in relevant part that “[t]he accrued benefit of a participant under a plan may not be decreased by an amendment of the plan.”

150. Section 204(g)(2) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1054(g)(2), provides in relevant part that “[f]or purposes of paragraph (1), a plan amendment which has the effect of (A) eliminating or reducing an early retirement benefit or retirement-type subsidy . . . with respect to benefits attributable to service before the amendment shall be treated as reducing accrued benefits.”

151. Defendants Administrative Committee and The Pension and Retirement Plan violated ERISA Section 204(g) by amending the Plan to eliminate Optional Retirement benefits for participants who were at least age 50 with 15 years of service and who were involuntarily terminated for reasons other than discharge for dishonesty, insubordination or other misconduct prior to the effective date of the amendment.

152. Plaintiffs Major, Benson and Class B members have been harmed by Defendants’ conduct in violation of ERISA Section 204(g).

COUNT VII

**(In the Alternative to Counts I through VI,
State Law Claim for Promissory Estoppel)
by all Plaintiffs**

Against All Defendants Except New DuPont and The Pension and Retirement Plan

153. Plaintiffs and the Class repeat and re-allege paragraphs 1 through 106 as if fully set forth herein.

154. In Pennsylvania, promissory estoppel allows a court, in the absence of an enforceable contract, to enforce a party's promise where (1) the promisor makes a promise that he reasonably expects to induce action or forbearance on the part of the promisee, (2) the promise does induce action or forbearance on the part of the promisee, and (3) injustice can only be avoided by enforcing the promise.

155. For decades, DuPont employees were consistently told that their base compensation was only one component and that the pension was where the real value was in overall compensation.

156. Here, in order to attract and maintain a talented workforce, that Mr. Cockerill, Mr. Newton, Mr. Major and Mr. Benson exemplify, Defendants repeatedly promised Plaintiffs and the Class that they could qualify for full unreduced early retirement benefits under the Plan's Rule of 85 provision so long as they continued to work for DuPont until they met the age and service requirements.

157. Defendants also repeatedly promised Plaintiffs and the Class that they could qualify for reduced early retirement benefits when they reached age 50 if they had at least 15 years of service regardless of whether they continued to work for DuPont.

158. Defendants also promised Optional Retirement benefits at certain percentages tied to an employee's age at the time of commencement of benefits if an employee was terminated for lack of work.

159. As Defendants expected, Plaintiffs and the Class planned their careers around DuPont's promises, remained at DuPont, made break-through innovations that led to numerous patents and billions of dollars in profits for DuPont, gave up other employment opportunities,

moved their families and made other sacrifices based on these promises of a comfortable early retirement.

160. Justice requires that these promises be enforced if this Court determines that Plaintiffs are not entitled to early retirement benefits under the terms of the Plan and that the Defendants were not acting in a fiduciary capacity in making and breaking these promises.

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray this Court enter judgment as follows:

As to Count I

- A. Certify the Class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appoint Plaintiffs Cockerill and Newton as Class Representatives and appoint their attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the members of the Class.
- B. Declare and clarify that Plaintiffs and members of Class A retain the right to age into early retirement benefits.
- C. Award Plaintiffs attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to ERISA Section 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- D. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

As to Count II

- A. Certify the Class B under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appoint Plaintiffs Major and Benson as Class B Representatives and appoint their attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the members of the Class.
- B. Declare that Mr. Major, Mr. Benson and all other Class B members are entitled to benefits under the Optional Retirement at Involuntary Termination Provisions of the governing Plan.

- C. Order the Administrative Committee to cause the Plan to pay Mr. Major the Optional Retirement benefit for which he has applied and qualifies in the event he is not permitted to age into the Rule of 85 unreduced early retirement benefit.
- D. Award Plaintiffs attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to ERISA Section 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- E. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

As to Count III

- A. Declare that Mr. Newton is entitled to benefits under the Optional Retirement at Involuntary Termination Provisions of the Plan.
- B. Order the Administrative Committee to cause the Plan to pay Mr. Newton the optional retirement benefit for which he has applied and qualifies
- C. Award Plaintiffs attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to ERISA Section 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- E. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

As to Count IV

- A. Certify Class A under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appoint Plaintiffs Cockerill and Newton as Class Representatives and appoint their attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the members of Class A.
- B. Certify Class B under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appoint Plaintiffs Major and Benson as Class Representatives and appoint their attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the members of Class B.
- C. Declare that Defendants have breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes.

- D. Declare that Defendants engaged in co-fiduciary breaches in violation of ERISA Section 405, 29 U.S.C. § 1105.
- E. Surcharge Defendants in the amount necessary to place Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes in the position they would have been in but for the Defendants' fiduciary breaches.
- F. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiffs Cockerill, Newton and members of Class A are entitled to age into their early retirement benefits.
- G. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiffs Major, Benson and the members of Class B are entitled to optional retirement benefits.
- H. Reform the Plan to the extent necessary to provide the early and optional retirement benefits the Plaintiffs and members of the Classes were misinformed they could receive.
- I. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiff Newton whose job was eliminated for lack of work prior to the spin-off, is entitled to an optional retirement benefit under the Plan.
- J. Award Plaintiffs attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to ERISA Section 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- K. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

As to Count V

- A. Certify Class A under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appoint Plaintiffs Cockerill and Newton, as Class Representatives and appoint their attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the members of Class A.

- B. Certify Class B under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appoint Plaintiffs Major and Benson as Representatives of Class B and appoint their attorneys as Class Counsel.
- C. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiffs Cockerill, Newton and the members of Class A are entitled to age into their full early retirement benefits.
- D. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiffs Major, Benson and the members of Class B are eligible for optional retirement benefits.
- E. Equitably estop Defendants from denying optional retirement to Plaintiff Newton, whose job was eliminated because of the spin-off of Corteva and who was terminated for lack of work and entitled to an optional retirement benefit under the Plan.
- F. Award Plaintiffs attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to ERISA Section 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- G. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

As to Count VI

- A. Declare that, in attempting to apply the requirement of a later enacted Plan amendment in order to deny optional retirement benefits to Mr. Major, and to make Mr. Benson and members of Class B ineligible for optional retirement benefits, the Committee is violating ERISA's anti-cutback provision, ERISA Section 204(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1054(g).
- B. Declare that Mr. Major, Mr. Benson and the Class B are entitled to and eligible for Optional Retirement benefits.

- C. Equitably estop Defendants from violating ERISA Section 204(g) by denying Optional Retirement benefits to Mr. Major, and denying that Mr. Benson and the Class B members are eligible for such benefits.
- D. Award Mr. Major, Mr. Benson and the Class B members any Optional Retirement benefits wrongfully denied.
- E. Award Mr. Major, Mr. Benson and CB pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the wrongfully denied Optional Retirement benefits.
- F. Award Mr. Major, Mr. Benson and the Class B attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to ERISA Section 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- G. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

As to Count VII

- A. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiffs Cockerill and Newton are entitled to age into their full early retirement benefits.
- B. Equitably estop Defendants from denying that Plaintiffs Major and Benson are entitled to optional retirement benefits.
- C. Equitably estop Defendants from denying Plaintiff Newton and Class A members whose jobs were eliminated for lack of work before the spin-off an optional retirement benefit under the Plan.

DATED: July 21, 2023

Respectfully submitted:

By: s/ Elizabeth Hopkins
Elizabeth Hopkins (*pro hac vice*)
Susan L. Meter (*pro hac vice*)
Jaclyn Conover, PA ID # 312449
KANTOR & KANTOR
19839 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, CA 91324
(818) 886-1212

ehopkins@kantorlaw.net
smeter@kantorlaw.net
jconover@kantorlaw.net

Edward S. Stone (*pro hac vice*)
EDWARD STONE LAW, P.C.
175 West Putnam Ave., 2nd Floor
Greenwich, CT 06830
(203) 504-8425
eddie@edwardstonelaw.com

Daniel Feinberg (*pro hac vice*)
Nina Wasow (*pro hac vice*)
FEINBERG, JACKSON, WORTHMAN &
WASOW LLP
2030 Addison St., Suite 500
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 269-7998
dan@feinbergjackson.com
nina@feinbergjackson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21st day of July 2023, a true and correct copy of **SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF ERISA AND STATE LAW** was filed using the Court's ECF system, and thereby served copies of same on counsel for all parties of record registered with the ECF system.

By: /s/ Elizabeth Hopkins
Elizabeth Hopkins (*pro hac vice*)
Susan L. Meter (*pro hac vice*)
Jaclyn Conover (ID No. 312449)
KANTOR & KANTOR, LLP
19839 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, CA 91324
Telephone: (877) 783-8686
smeter@kantorlaw.net
ehopkins@kantorlaw.net
jconover@kantorlaw.net

Edward S. Stone (*pro hac vice*)
EDWARD STONE LAW, P.C.
175 West Putnam Ave., 2nd Floor
Greenwich, CT 06830
Telephone: 203-504-8425
eddie@edwardstonelaw.com

Daniel Feinberg (*pro hac vice*)
Nina Wasow (*pro hac vice*)
FEINBERG, JACKSON, WORTHMAN
& WASOW LLP
2030 Addison St., Suite 500
Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: (510) 269-7998
dan@feinbergjackson.com
nina@feinbergjackson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs