Rosanne L. Mah (State Bar No. 242628) Email: rmah@zlk.com LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP 2 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650 3 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: (415) 373-1671 Facsimile: (415) 484-1294 4 5 Counsel for Plaintiff Rubina Mirza 6 [Additional Counsel listed on signature block.] 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 10 11 RUBINA MIRZA, Individually and on Behalf of Case No. All Others Similarly Situated, 12 CLASS ACTION Plaintiff, 13 COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF SECTIONS 11 AND 15 OF THE 14 YOGAWORKS, INC., ROSANNA SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 15 MCCOLLOUGH, VANCE CHANG, PETER L. GARRAN, MICHAEL A. KUMIN, MICHAEL J. GEREND, BRIAN T. COOPER, GREAT HILL PARTNERS, L.P., GREAT HILL EQUITY PARTNERS V, L.P., GREAT HILL INVESTORS, 17 LLC, COWEN AND COMPANY, LLC, ROTH CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC, STEPHENS INC. 18 GUGGENHEIM SECURITIES, LLC, IMPERIAL 19 CAPITAL, LLC, and DOES 1-25, inclusive, 20 Defendants. 21 Plaintiff Rubina Mirza ("Plaintiff"), brings this action pursuant to sections 11 and 15 of the 22 Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act") individually and on behalf of all persons or entities other 23 than defendants who purchased common stock issued by YogaWorks, Inc. ("YogaWorks" or the 24 "Company") pursuant to or traceable to the Company's Initial Public Offering (the "IPO" or 25 "Offering") that commenced on August 10, 2017 and closed on August 16, 2017. 26 Plaintiff alleges the following based upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts, 27 and upon information and belief as to all other matters. Plaintiff's information and belief is based on 28

Case No.

the investigation of her undersigned Counsel, which included, among other things, review and analysis of: (i) YogaWorks's public filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"); (ii) YogaWorks's other public statements, including press releases; (iii) reports of securities and financial analysts; and (iv) news articles, and other commentary and analysis concerning YogaWorks and the industry in which it operates. Counsel's investigation into the matters alleged herein is continuing, and many relevant facts are known only to, or are exclusively within the custody or control of, the defendants. Plaintiff believes that substantial additional evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

NATURE AND SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

- For all claims stated herein, Plaintiff expressly disclaims any allegation that could be construed as alleging fraud or intentional or reckless misconduct.
- 2. This securities class action is brought under sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act against: (i) YogaWorks; (ii) certain members of YogaWorks's senior management and its board of directors (the "Board") that signed the Registration Statement (as defined herein) in connection with the Company's Offering (the "Individual Defendants"); (iii) the private equity group and its wholly owned subsidiaries that maintained control over the majority of the Company's outstanding common stock and several seats on the YogaWorks Board, both prior to and after the IPO (the "Private Equity Defendants"); and (iv) each of the investment banks that participated in the Offering as an underwriter (the "Underwriter Defendants" and, together with YogaWorks, the Individual Defendants, and the Private Equity Defendants, the "Defendants").
- Founded in 1987, YogaWorks claims to be "one of the largest and fastest growing providers of high quality yoga instruction in the U.S." and "the only national, multi-discipline yoga instruction company."
- On June 23, 2017, the Company filed a registration statement on Form S-1 relating to a proposed initial public offering of shares of its common stock.
- The June 23, 2017 Form S-1 registration statement was followed by several amendments, the last of which was filed on August 10, 2017, which became effective on August 10, 2017 (as amended, the "Registration Statement").

- On August 11, 2017, YogaWorks filed with the SEC a Prospectus pursuant to rule 424(b)(4) (the "Prospectus" and, together with the Registration Statement, the "Offering Materials"), commencing the public offering of 7.3 million shares of YogaWorks common stock priced at \$5.50 per share.
- 7. In violation of the Securities Act, Defendants negligently issued untrue statements of material facts in, and omitted to state material facts required to be stated from, the Offering Materials filed by the Company with the SEC and presented to the investing public in support of the IPO.
- 8. In their capacities as signers of the Registration Statement and/or as an issuer, statutory seller, offeror, control persons, and/or underwriter of the shares sold pursuant to the Offering, each of the Defendants are strictly liable for such misstatements and omissions therefrom.
- 9. Further, because of the materially deficient Registration Statement, Defendants have also violated their independent, affirmative duty to provide adequate disclosures about adverse conditions, risk, and uncertainties. See Item 303 of SEC Reg. S-K, 17 C.F.R. § 229.303(a)(3)(ii) (requiring that the materials incorporated in a registration statement disclose all "known trends or uncertainties" reasonably expected to have a material unfavorable impact on the Company's operations).
- 10. Defendants further violated their independent, affirmative duty to adequately "provide under the caption 'Risk Factors' a discussion of the most significant factors that make the offering speculative or risky," see Item 503 of SEC Reg. S-K, 17 CFR § 229.503(c), failing to disclose of several risks that had already materialized at the time of the Offering that were unknown to Plaintiff and other Company investors.
- As alleged herein, Defendants failed in their duty by inducing public investment in the Company by means of the materially untrue, inaccurate, misleading, and/or incomplete Offering Materials. As a result of the materially misleading Offering Materials, the Company's share price was inflated at the time of the August 11, 2017 IPO, through which YogaWorks raised approximately \$40.15 million in gross proceeds.
- Unfortunately for YogaWorks stockholders, the Company's stock has consistently traded lower than the \$5.50 Offering price, weighed down by the truth regarding the Company's

8

12 13

14 15

16 17

19

18

20 21 22

23 24

25 26

> 27 28

business and financial prospects.

As alleged herein, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of similarly situated Class 13. (defined herein) members who also acquired the Company's shares pursuant or traceable to the Offering, now seeks to obtain a recovery for the damages suffered as a result of Defendants' violations of the Securities Act.

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- The claims asserted herein arise under sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77k and 77(o). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under § 22 of the Securities Act (15 U.S.C. § 77v). Section 22 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v, states "[e]xcept as provided in section 16(c), no case arising under this title and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court in the United States." 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a) (emphasis added). Section 16(c) of the Securities Act refers to "covered class actions," which are defined as lawsuits brought as class actions or brought on behalf of more than 50 persons asserting claims under state or common law. 15 U.S. C. § 77p(c), (f). This is an action asserting federal law claims. Thus, it does not fall within the definition of a "covered class action" under section 16(b)-(c) and it therefore is not removable to federal court under the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998. Cyan, Inc. v. Beaver Cty. Emples. Ret. Fund, 138 S. Ct. 1061 (2018).
- Venue is proper in this court as: (i) YogaWorks's headquarters are found within this county; and (ii) the majority of the Underwriter Defendants have executive offices and/or sizable practices in this county and each maintains substantial and continuous contact with California by conducting significant investment banking operations in this county and throughout the state; and (iii) the violations of law complained of herein occurred in this state and in large part in this county, including the dissemination of the materially false and misleading Offering Materials.

П. PARTIES

Plaintiff

Plaintiff purchased YogaWorks common stock pursuant to or traceable to the Offering 16. Materials issued in connection with the Company's IPO and has been damaged thereby.

2

3

4

5

B. YogaWorks

- 17. Defendant YogaWorks is incorporated in the state of Delaware with principal executive offices located at 5780 Uplander Way, Culver City, California 90230. Shares of YogaWorks's common stock are traded on the Nasdaq Global Market ("Nasdaq") under the ticker symbol "YOGA."
- Defendant YogaWorks is strictly liable for the materially untrue and misleading statements incorporated into the Registration Statement.

C. The Individual Defendants

- 19. Defendant Rosanna McCollough ("McCollough") was at the time of the IPO the Company's President and Chief Executive Officer and a member of the Board and signed or authorized the signing of the Company's Registration Statement and issuance of the Offering Materials.
- Defendant Vance Chang ("Chang") was at the time of the IPO, YogaWorks's Chief
 Financial Officer and signed or authorized the signing of the Company's Registration Statement.
- 21. Defendant Peter L. Garran ("Garran") served as Chairman of the Board of YogaWorks at the time of the IPO and signed or authorized the signing of the Company's Registration Statement. At the time of the IPO, Garran was also a Partner at Great Hill Partners, L.P. In connection with the IPO, YogaWorks's Board formed an Audit Committee on which Garran serves as a member.
- 22. Defendant Michael A. Kumin ("Kumin") served as a director of the Board at the time of the IPO and signed or authorized the signing of the Company's Registration Statement. At the time of the IPO, Kumin was also a Managing Partner of Great Hill Partners, L.P.
- 23. Michael J. Gerend ("Gerend") served as a director of YogaWorks's Board at the time of the IPO and signed or authorized the signing of the Company's Registration Statement. In connection with the IPO, YogaWorks's Board formed Audit and Compensation Committees. Gerend serves as the Chairman of the Compensation Committee and as a member of the Audit Committee.
- 24. Brian T. Cooper ("Cooper") served as a director of the Company's Board at the time of the IPO and signed or authorized the signing of the Company's Registration Statement. In connection with the IPO, YogaWorks's Board formed Audit and Compensation Committees. Cooper serves as the Chairman of the Audit Committee and as a member of the Compensation Committee.
 - 25. Defendants McCollough, Chang, Garran, Kumin, Gerend, and Cooper are referred to

herein as the "Individual Defendants."

- 26. The Individual Defendants each participated in the preparation of and signed (or authorized the signing of) the Registration Statement and/or an amendment thereto, and the issuance of the Offering Materials.
- 27. The Individual Defendants are strictly liable for the materially untrue and misleading statements incorporated into the Registration Statement. By virtue of their positions with the Company, the Individual Defendants possessed the power and authority to control the contents of YogaWorks's reports to the SEC, press releases, and presentations to securities analysts, money and portfolio managers, and market investors.
- 28. The Individual Defendants negligently allowed the Offering Materials to contain materially untrue and misleading statements and/or omissions to the extent that they knew or should have known that the Offering Materials were materially misleading, but failed to act in a reasonable manner to prevent the Offering Materials from containing materially misleading statements and/or preventing the materially misleading Offering Materials from being disseminated.
- 29. On this basis, the Individual Defendants knew, or should have known, of YogaWorks' existing business concerns and shortcomings, as discussed *infra*, and, pursuant to the Securities Act, are liable for the false and misleading statements in the Registration Statement.

D. The Private Equity Defendants

30. Great Hill Partners, L.P., through its subsidiaries and/or affiliated companies, including Great Hill Equity Partners V, L.P. and Great Hill Investors, LLC (collectively, "Great Hill"), acquired YogaWorks in July 2014 and was a controlling stockholder at the time of the IPO. Great Hill Partners, L.P. has executive offices at One Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109. As of August 28, 2018, Great Hill Equity Partners V, L.P. was the record holder of 11,589,865, or 71.5%, of the outstanding shares of YogaWorks. Great Hill Investors, LLC was the record holder of 38,699, or 0.2%, of the outstanding shares of YogaWorks as of August 28, 2018. According to the Prospectus, Great Hill "will have significant influence over [YogaWorks's] management and policies for the foreseeable future."

E. The Underwriter Defendants

- 31. Defendant Cowen and Company, LLC ("Cowen") acted as an underwriter for the Company's IPO. In the Offering, Cowen agreed to purchase 2,277,600 shares of the Company's common stock, exclusive of any over-allotment option. Cowen maintains executive offices at 599 Lexington Avenue, 20th Floor, New York, New York 10022 and a registered agent for service at Cogency Global Inc., 1325 J Street, Suite 1550, Sacramento, California 95814.
- 32. Defendant Roth Capital Partners, LLC ("Roth") acted as an underwriter for the Company's IPO. In the Offering, Roth agreed to purchase 700,800 shares of the Company's common stock, exclusive of any over-allotment option. Roth maintains executive offices at 888 San Clemente Drive, Newport Beach, California 92660 and a registered agent for service at 888 San Clemente Drive, Newport Beach, California 92660.
- 33. Defendant Stephens Inc. ("Stephens") acted as an underwriter for the Company's IPO. In the Offering, Stephens agreed to purchase 2,277,600 shares of the Company's common stock, exclusive of any over-allotment option. Stephens maintains executive offices at 111 Center Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 and a registered agent for service at C T Corporation System, 818 West Seventh Street, Suite 930, Los Angeles, California 90017.
- 34. Defendant Guggenheim Securities, LLC ("Guggenheim") acted as an underwriter for the Company's IPO. In the Offering, Guggenheim agreed to purchase 1,752,000 shares of the Company's common stock, exclusive any over-allotment option. Guggenheim maintains executive offices at 330 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017 and a registered agent for service at the CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service, 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N, Sacramento, California 95833.
- 35. Defendant Imperial Capital, LLC ("Imperial") acted as an underwriter for the Company's IPO. In the Offering, Imperial agreed to purchase 292,000 shares of the Company's common stock, exclusive of any over-allotment option. Imperial maintains executive offices at 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, California 90067 and a registered agent for service at National Registered Agents, Inc., 818 West Seventh Street, Suite 930, Los Angeles, California 90017.

- Defendants Cowen, Roth, Stephens, Guggenheim, and Imperial are referred to herein as the "Underwriter Defendants."
- Each of the Underwriter Defendants received commissions for their participation in the
 IPO, receiving \$0.385 for every share underwritten, totaling approximately \$2.8 million.
- 38. Per the Form of Underwriting Agreement filed as an exhibit to the Registration Statement, each Underwriter Defendant agreed, severally and not jointly, to purchase from the Company the number of firm shares.
- 39. In the run-up to the IPO, the Underwriter Defendants: (i) assisted in the preparation and presentation of any "road show" materials designed to induce investment in the Company; (ii) conducted due diligence on the Company, including, inter alia, access to confidential corporate information concerning YogaWorks's business operations unknown to the investing public; and (iii) consulted with Company management regarding the content of the Registration Statement.
- 40. Pursuant to the Securities Act, the Underwriter Defendants are liable for the materially untrue and misleading statements in the Offering Materials. The Underwriter Defendants assisted YogaWorks and the Individual Defendants in planning the IPO and were required to conduct an adequate and reasonable investigation into the business and operations of YogaWorks—a process known as a "due diligence" investigation. The Underwriter Defendants were required to conduct a due diligence investigation in order to participate in the IPO. During the course of their due diligence investigation, the Underwriter Defendants had continual access to confidential corporate information concerning YogaWorks's operations and financial prospects.
- 41. In addition to availing themselves of virtually unlimited access to internal corporate documents, agents of the Underwriter Defendants met with YogaWorks's lawyers, management and top executives and made joint decisions regarding: (i) the terms of the IPO, including the price at which YogaWorks shares would be sold to the public; (ii) the strategy to best accomplish the IPO; (iii) the information to be included in the Offering Materials; and (iv) what responses would be made to the SEC in connection with its review of the Offering Materials. As a result of those constant contacts and communications between the Underwriter Defendants' representatives and YogaWorks's management and top executives, the Underwriter Defendants knew of, or in the exercise of reasonable care should

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

have known of, YogaWorks's existing problems as detailed herein.

- The Underwriter Defendants negligently allowed the Offering Materials to contain materially untrue and misleading statements and/or omissions to the extent that they knew or should have known that the Offering Materials were materially misleading, but failed to act in a reasonable manner to prevent the Offering Materials from containing materially misleading statements and/or preventing the materially misleading Offering Materials from being disseminated.
- On this basis, the Underwriter Defendants knew, or should have known, of YogaWorks's existing business concerns and shortcomings, as discussed infra, and, pursuant to the Securities Act, are liable for the false and misleading statements in the Registration Statement.

The Unknown Defendants

44. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein under California Code of Civil Procedure § 474 as Does 1 through 25, inclusive, are presently not known to Plaintiff, who therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek to amend this complaint and include these Does defendants' true names and capacities when they are ascertained. Each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct alleged herein and for the injuries suffered by the Class.

SUSBTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Company Background

- 45. YogaWorks was founded in 1987 with a single yoga studio in Santa Monica, California. Great Hill acquired YogaWorks in July 2014 for \$45.6 million in cash. Currently, Great Hill owns approximately 70% of the Company's outstanding common stock.
- YogaWorks claims to be "one of the largest and fastest growing providers of high quality yoga instruction in the U.S." and "the only national, multi-discipline yoga instruction company." As of December 31, 2017, YogaWorks employed over 2,000 people, including over 700 part-time employees at studios and approximately 60 employees at its corporate headquarters.

The Company mission statement reads:

YogaWorks is a healthy lifestyle brand focused on enriching and transforming lives through voga. We strive to honor and empower our students' journey toward personal growth and well-being, no matter their age or physical ability, in an inclusive and community-oriented environment.

Case No.

- 48. YogaWorks generates revenue primarily from a variety of yoga classes held at its studios. The Company's in-studio classes offer instruction for all yoga skill levels in various yoga styles from "fast-paced flow classes (such as Vinyasa flow, some set to music)" to "relaxing restorative classes." While pricing for YogaWorks classes varies by region, on average students pay \$90-135 per month for an unlimited membership. The Company also offers six-month and annual prepaid memberships, as well as class packages in increments of 10 to 20 classes.
- 49. In addition to in-studio classes, the Company derives revenues from teacher training programs and online subscriptions to MyYogaWorks.com. Since its establishment in 1990, the teacher training program has graduated approximately 12,000 students whom the Company views as "ambassadors of the YogaWorks brand." YogaWorks offers a 200-hour and a 300-hour training program taught in 16 countries at YogaWorks studios as well as non-YogaWorks studios. The tuition for the 200-hour program is approximately \$3,500 and tuition for the 300-hour program is approximately \$4,200.
- 50. MyYogaWorks.com provides online subscriptions for access to the Company's ondemand video library of over 1,100 classes. For 2017, MyYogaWorks.com streamed approximately 700,000 classes to over 25,000 users. The Company charges \$15 per month for the subscription, reduced to \$5 per month for those with YogaWorks studio memberships.
- As discussed below, profitable studio acquisitions are vital to YogaWork's growth and financial viability.

B. YogaWork's Growth Is Dependent on Acquiring Profitable YogaWorks Studios

- 52. Since inception, YogaWorks has focused on acquiring additional yoga studios. At the time of the IPO in August 2017, YogaWorks owned 50 studios in the Los Angeles, Orange County (California), New York City, Northern California, Boston, and the Baltimore/Washington D.C. areas.
- 53. YogaWorks's growth is driven mainly through acquisition of yoga studios in highly fragmented markets. According to the Prospectus, "[t]hrough acquisitions, we believe we can quickly gain students, grow our market share and build on the operating momentum of these acquired business."
- 54. YogaWorks's decision to pursue growth by acquisition rather than organic growth is driven by its purported belief that acquisitions of existing studios that already have a student base is an

"effective, profitable and risk-mitigating way to enter a new regional market," as opposed to building new studios and waiting for attendance to ramp up.

- 55. In choosing acquisition targets, YogaWorks claims to apply a "multi-factor evaluation system that allows [YogaWorks] to quickly assess potential acquisition candidates and continually add qualified new targets to our active outreach process." The Company stated in its Prospectus that it intends to increase its yoga studio count from 50 studios as of August 2017 to over 250 studios in the near term.
- 56. Once the acquisition is completed, YogaWorks boasts "a proven post-acquisition integrated methodology that is designed to facilitate a seamless student, teacher and staff transition to the YogaWorks operating model."
- Accordingly, YogaWorks claims to have a "proven history of retaining and improving the student and teacher focus of each studio or chain of studios acquired."

DISCLOSURE OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT

A. Disclosure Obligations under the Securities Act and Regulation S-K

- 58. "The Securities Act of 1933 . . . was designed to provide investors with full disclosure of material information concerning public offerings of securities in commerce, to protect investors against fraud, and, through the imposition of specified civil liabilities, to promote ethical standards of honesty and fair dealing." Ernst & Ernst v. Hochfelder, 425 U.S. 185, 195 (1976); see also Randall v. Loftsgaarden, 478 U.S. 647, 659 (1986) (The Securities Act aims "to place adequate and true information before the investor"); Pinter v. Dahl, 486 U.S. 622, 638 (1988) ("The primary purpose of the Securities Act is to protect investors by requiring publication of material information thought necessary to allow them to make informed investment decisions concerning public offerings of securities in interstate commerce.").
- 59. To effectuate this purpose, a company's registration statement must provide a full disclosure of material information. See Herman & MacLean v. Huddleston, 459 U.S. 375, 381 (1983). Failure to do so gives rise to private rights of action under the Securities Act. Id. at 381-82 (Private rights of action were "designed to assure compliance with the disclosure provisions of the Act by imposing a stringent standard of liability on the parties who play a direct role in a registered offering");

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Item 303 of Regulation S-K imposes an affirmative duty on issuers to disclose "known trends or any known demands, commitments, events or uncertainties that will result in or that are reasonably likely to result in the registrant's liquidity increasing or decreasing in a material way." gmt's Discussion and Analysis of Fin. Condition and Results of Operation, S.E.C. Release No. 6835, 1989 WL 1092885, at *4 (May 18, 1989); see also 17 C.F.R. § 229.303(a)(3). Disclosure of known trends or uncertainties that the registrant reasonably expects will have a material impact on net sales, revenues, or income from continuing operations is also required. Id.
 - Pursuant to Item 303(a), a registrant thus has an affirmative duty to: i. Describe any unusual or infrequent events or transactions or any
 - significant economic changes that materially affected the amount of reported income from continuing operations and, in each case, indicate the extent to which the income was so affected.
 - ii Describe any known trends or uncertainties that have had or that the registrant reasonably expects will have a material favorable or unfavorable impact on net sales or revenues or income from continuing operations. If the registrant knows of events that will cause a material change in the relationship between costs and revenues (such as known future increases in costs of labor or materials or price increases or inventory adjustments), the change in the relationship shall be disclosed. 2017 C.F.R. § 229.303(a)(3)(i)-(ii) (emphasis added); see also S.E.C. Release No. 6835, 1989 WL 211092885, at *8 (May 18, 1989) ("Other

non-recurring items should be discussed as unusual or infrequent events or transactions that materially affected the amount of reported income from continuing operations.") (citation and quotation omitted).

- 63. Under these requirements, even a one-time event, if "reasonably expect[ed]" to have a material impact of results, must be disclosed. Examples of such required disclosures include: "[a] reduction in the registrant's product prices; erosion in the registrant's market share; changes in insurance coverage; or the likely non-renewal of a material contract." S.E.C. Release No. 6835, 1989 WL 1092885, at *4 (May 18, 1989).
- 64. Accordingly, as the SEC has emphasized, the "specific provisions of Item 303 [as set forth above] require disclosure of forward-looking information." See S.E.C. Release No. 6835, 1989 WL 1092885, at *3. Indeed, the SEC has stated that disclosure requirements under Item 303 are "intended to give the investor an opportunity to look at the company through the eyes of management by providing both a short and long-term analysis of the business of the company" and "a historical and prospective analysis of the registrant's financial condition . . . with particular emphasis on the registrant's prospects for the future." Id. at *3, *17. Thus, "material forward-looking information regarding known material trends and uncertainties is required to be disclosed as part of the required discussion of those matters and the analysis of their effects." See Comm'n Guidance Regarding Mgmt's Discussion and Analysis of Fin. Condition and Results of Operations, S.E.C. Release No. 8350, 2003 WL 22996757, at *11 (Dec. 19, 2003).
- 65. Item 503 of Regulation S-K is intended "to provide investors with a clear and concise summary of the material risks to an investment in the issuer's securities." Sec. Offering Reform, S.E.C. Release No. 8501, 2004 WL 2610458, at *86 (Nov. 3, 2004). Accordingly, Item 503 requires that offering documents "provide under the caption "Risk Factors" a discussion of the most significant factors that make the offering speculative or risky." 17 CFR § 229.503(c). The discussion of risk factors: must be specific to the particular company and its operations, and should explain how the risk affects the company and/or the securities being offered. Generic or boilerplate discussions do not tell the investors how the risks may affect their investment. Statement of the Comm'n Regarding Disclosure of Year 2000 Issues and Consequences by Pub. Cos., Inv. Advisers, Inv. Cos., & Mun. Sec. Issuers, 1998 WL 425894, at *14 (July 29, 1998).

 66. Thus, Item 503 provides that a registration statement must disclose all known material risks that are "specific to the particular company and its operations." 17 CFR § 229.503(c). Item 503(c) warns issuers: "Do not present risks that could apply to any issuer or any offering." Id.

ADVERSE TRENDS KNOWN TO DEFENDANTS AT THE TIME OF THE IPO, BUT UNKNOWN TO INVESTORS

A. Material Adverse Trend of Declining Studio Profitability

- 67. While YogaWorks touted its expertise, experience, and method of acquiring and integrating profitable yoga studios in the Offering Materials as the basis for achieving its aggressive growth target of 250 studios and higher gross margins in the near term, unbeknownst to investors, YogaWorks had been experiencing declining student visits, class size, and lower revenue per studio.
- 68. As demonstrated in the chart below, while YogaWorks has added 23 studios since 2015, the Company has seen the number of students visiting its studios and studio profitability steadily declining in the quarters leading up to the IPO and continuing on until the filing of this complaint.

	# of Studios	Revenue Per Studio (thousands)	Studio Level EBITDA (thousands)	Student Visits	Classes	Classes Per Studio	Students Per Class
FY 2015	47	\$1,032.04	\$12,398.00	2,439,469	146,846	3124.38	16.61
Q1 2016	49	\$308.00	\$4,392.00	789,677	44,772	913.71	17.64
Q2 2016	50	\$266.60	\$2,581.00	754,595	46,188	923.76	16.34
Q3 2016	49	\$275.41	\$2,882.00	720,870	45,678	932.20	15.78
Q4 2016	49	\$268.84	\$2,518.00	681,665	45,158	921.59	15.10
FY 2016	49	\$1,124.29	\$12,373.00	2,946,807	181,796	3710.12	16.21
Q1 2017	50	\$279.80	\$3,205.00	760,707	45,154	903.08	16.85
Q2 2017	50	\$249.86	\$2,172.00	705,979	45,375	907.50	15.56
Q3 2017	53	\$255.08	\$2,627.00	710,256	46,183	871.38	15.38
Q4 2017	66	\$219.88	\$2,727.00	794,090	52,524	795.82	15.12
FY 2017	66	\$825.97	\$10,731.00	2,971,032	189,236	2867.21	15.70
Q1 2018	66	\$235.30	\$2,829.00	918,386	56,850	861.36	16.15
Q2 2018	71	\$209.44	\$2,210.00	868,857	59,790	842.11	14.53
Q3 2018	70	\$216.44	\$1,844.00	846,353	60,975	871.07	13.88

69. As demonstrated above, despite a 50% increase in the number of studios, overall

26

27

28

students per class size has steadily declined from 16.6 students per class in 2015 to 15.7 in 2017 and 13.9 students per class by the third quarter 2018. Further, total student visits per quarter for the last four consecutive quarters of 2016 leading up to the IPO steadily declined, despite increasing the number of classes. Student visits similarly decreased quarter over quarter leading up to the IPO, declining from 789,677 in Q1 2016 to 760,707 in Q1 2017 and from 754,595 in Q2 2016 to 705,979 in Q2 2017. Likewise, students per class decreased from 17.6 in Q1 2016 to 16.9 in Q1 2017 and from 16.3 in Q2 2016 to 15.6 in Q2 2017.

- The decline in student visits resulted in fewer classes per studio and lower revenue per studio. During the five consecutive quarters leading up to the IPO, classes per studio steadily declined. Classes per studio also declined quarter over quarter leading up to the IPO. These facts, undisclosed in the IPO, directly contradict YogaWorks's claim in the Prospectus that the decline in revenue was due to a shift in memberships to class packages.
- Moreover, although the topline number of classes and student visits increased through the addition of new studios, those metrics have only increased by 22% and 29%, respectively, from 2015 to 2017, failing to correlate with the 50% in total number of studios.
- 72. As a result of the Company's lack of growth, declining revenue and declining studio profitability, YogaWorks was unable to fund any new acquisitions for five quarters leading up to the IPO from Q2 2016 through Q2 2017. Thus, starting in Q2 2017, YogaWorks was forced to acquire less expensive and less efficient smaller studios to increase the number of studios and has consistently departed from its stated practice in the Prospectus of acquiring studios that generate between \$500,000 to \$700,000 in revenue to acquire smaller, less efficient studios. For example, in the third quarter of 2017, YogaWorks acquired three new studios for \$445,000, or an average of \$148,333 per studio. In the fourth quarter 2017, YogaWorks acquired thirteen new studios for a total cost of \$5,995,090, or an average cost of \$461,160 per studio.
 - These facts were not disclosed to investors in the Offering Materials.

Material Undisclosed Adverse Trend of Increasing Corporate Overhead and Costs Eat Away at YogaWorks's Profits

Despite adding new studios, which should have allowed YogaWorks to experience economies of scale and lower costs as a percentage of overall net revenue, according to Defendants'

statements in the Offering Materials, as demonstrated in the chart below, YogaWorks's corporate

Selling, General, and Administrative Expenses ("SG&A") was *increasing* in terms of whole dollars and as a percentage of net revenue in the run up to the Offering, so much so that the expenses often accounted for the entirety of the Company's net loss:

				Stock-Based	SG&A and Stock- Based Comp as % of Net
Period	Net Revenue	Net Gain/ Loss	SG&A	Compensation	Loss
FY2015	\$48,506,000.00	-\$9,215,000.00	\$12,556,000.00	\$16,942.00	-136%
Q1 2016	\$15,091,646.00	-\$1,546,000.00	\$3,178,297.00	\$6,652.00	-206%
Q2 2016	\$13,330,076.00	-\$2,832,462.00	\$2,725,056.00	\$11,854.00	-97%
Q3 2016	\$13,494,703.00	-\$2,422,411,00	\$2,572,095.00	\$2,528.00	-106%
Q4 2016	\$13,173,575.00	-\$2,703,127.00	\$2,591,552.00	\$2,409.00	-96%
FY 2016	\$55,090,000.00	-\$9,504,000.00	\$11,067,000.00	\$23,443.00	-117%
Q1 2017	\$13,990,094.00	-\$2,617,000.00	\$3,010,386.00	\$538,872.00	-136%
Q2 2017	\$12,493,461.00	-\$4,447,705.00	\$4,094,443.00	\$286,273.00	-98%
Q3 2017	\$13,518,513.00	-\$4,590,824.00	\$4,556,887.00	\$1,294,107.00	-127%
Q4 2017	\$14,511,877.00	-\$11,780,471.00	\$4,365,042.00	\$463,531.00	-41%
FY 2017	\$54,513,945.00	-\$23,436,000.00	\$16,026,758.00	\$2,582,783.00	-79%

75. Noticeably, prior to the IPO, so too was the Company's stock-based compensation awards to executives increasing, despite the Company's poor financial performance, causing a further drag on the Company's net loss which would work in concert to entirely negate any positive studio-level performance.

C. Material Undisclosed Adverse Trend of Deteriorating Financial Markers that Would Necessitate the Recording of a Significant Goodwill Impairment

76. The Registration Statement was wholly deficient in its omission of certain financial metrics that were trending downward and which would ultimately lead to a significant goodwill impairment taken by the Company at the end of 2017.

The Registration Statement states:

In 2015, we recorded an impairment of goodwill of \$0.9 million. We did not record any impairment losses related to goodwill in 2016. As of December 31, 2016, our goodwill balance was \$17.7 million. Accounting rules require the evaluation of our goodwill at least annually, or more frequently when events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of such assets may not be recoverable. Such indicators are based on market conditions and the operational performance of our business. In testing goodwill

5

6

1

7 8

9

11 12

10

13 14

15 16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25 26

27

28

for impairment, if the implied fair value of the goodwill is less than the reporting unit's carrying amount, then goodwill is impaired and is written down to the implied fair value amount. If a significant amount of our goodwill were deemed to be impaired, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected

We incurred a net loss of \$2.6 million for the three months ended March 31, 2017, \$1.5 million for the three months ended March 31, 2016, \$9.5 million in 2016 and \$9.2 million in 2015 and had net cash provided by operating activities of \$0.8 million in 2016. If we continue to experience net losses or our cash flows from operating activities decline or become negative, it could require us to lower our assessment of the fair value of our business. If this were to occur, we could be required to record additional material impairment charges to goodwill or other intangible assets which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

What the Registration Statement failed to disclose, however, was that the Company's net loss for the quarter ended June 30, 2017 (which had concluded by the time of the Offering, but whose financial statements were not disclosed until well after), had increased by more than 57% over the same quarter, prior year, with the quarterly net cash flows from operating activities decreasing from (\$450,069) to (\$821,650). These declines were part of a quarter-over-quarter trend known by Company management at the time of the IPO but undisclosed in the Offering that showed deteriorating net losses that would continue throughout 2017 and ultimately necessitate the recording of a goodwill impairment of \$7.5 million at the end of 2017, with an additional goodwill impairment of \$2.5 million assessed in the second quarter of 2018.

Material Adverse Trends and Conditions that Caused the Delay of the Offering D.

- 79. The Offering was YogaWork's second attempt at going public, having abandoned its previous initial public offering on the eve of its requested effective date, citing "market conditions."
- On June 23, 2017, the Company filed with the SEC the Registration Statement, seeking to offer shares of common stock of YogaWorks. This Registration Statement was the product of months of correspondence with the SEC in a process that began as far back as at least April 2017, as evidenced by the draft registration statement filed with the SEC on April 18, 2017.
- On July 10, 2017, the Company filed a preliminary prospectus as an amendment to the 81. Registration Statement, announcing an intention to sell 5 million shares, priced between \$12 to \$14 each, a range reaffirmed in the Company's July 18, 2017 amended registration statement, as the Company sought to raise between \$60 and \$70 million.

28

16

18

- 82. On July 17, 2017, defendant Chang, on behalf of YogaWorks, and defendants Cowen, Stephens, and Guggenheim (collectively), on behalf of all Underwriter Defendants, wrote separately to the SEC requesting that YogaWorks's Registration Statement be accelerated and declared effective as of July 19, 2017.
- 83. Despite Defendants' efforts to accelerate the offering process, this initial offering would be abandoned just two days later, with the Company announcing through a spokesperson on July 20, 2017, that it would be postponing the public rollout of shares due to nebulous "market conditions."
- 84. No further explanation was ever provided as to why the Company pumped the brakes on the upsized offering and the "market conditions" that had been so dire as to cause the Company to halt its process just days after requesting expedition, and which ultimately caused the Company to instead offer substantially more shares at a reduced Offering price less than one month later;

	Number of	Price	Price Range		Expected Capital	
	Shares Offered	Low	High	Low	High	
Abandoned Offering	5,000,000	\$12.00	\$14.00	\$60,000,000.00	\$70,000,000.00	
IPO	7,300,000	\$5.50	\$6.50	\$40,150,000.00	\$47,450,000.00	

- 85. The Company's non-explanation was met with skepticism by the financial news media, with Marketwatch pointing to the fact that the second quarter of 2017 was the healthiest initial public offering market in the prior two years, with double the number of offerings over the prior quarter, according to PricewaterhouseCoopers, with the S&P 500 and Nasdaq hitting all-time highs the day prior to the Company's postponement announcement.
- 86. Likewise, Business Insider pointed to the CBOE Volatility Index ("VIX"), a measure of the stock market's expectation of volatility calculated by the Chicago Board Options Exchange ("CBOE") colloquially known as the "fear index," was "locked near its lowest levels on record" at the time of the abandoned offering.
- 87. Thus, there existed a trend known to the Company that was likely, and did, impact its financial performance going forward at the time of the IPO, as evidenced by the delayed offering date and the downsized Offering that the Defendants were required to include in its disclosures in the

24

25 26 27

28

Registration Statement for the benefit of investors, which they did not do.

The trends that rendered the Company unable to support its upsized valuation of \$12 to \$14 per share have proven to have a continuous negative impact on the Company since the Offering, as evidenced by YogaWorks's consistent stock price decline.

THE COMPANY GOES PUBLIC BY MEANS OF THE MATERIALLY FALSE AND MISLEADING OFFERING MATERIALS

- 89. After a nearly three week delay, the Registration Statement was declared effective by the SEC on August 10, 2017.
- The Prospectus was subsequently filed with the SEC on Form 424B4 on August 11, 2017, and offered 7,300,000 shares of YogaWorks common stock at the reduced price of \$5.50 per share. The Offering Materials stated that the intended use of the IPO proceeds was for capitalization and financial flexibility, repayment of a \$3.3 million note to Great Hill and a \$7 million loan to Deerpath Funding, LP, funding of acquisitions, and for working capital and other general corporate purposes. The IPO reaped net proceeds of \$35 million.
- The Registration Statement contained untrue statements of material facts, omitted to 91. state other facts necessary to make the statements made not misleading, and/or was not prepared in accordance with the rules and regulations governing its preparation concerning three categories: studio-level economics;
 the reasons for declining revenue; and
 corporate infrastructure costs and economies of scale.

A. Materially Misleading Statements Regarding Studio-Level Economics

92 In the Prospectus, YogaWorks represented that its yoga studios had "strong studio-level economics" as a result of targeting studios with average annual revenues of at least 500,000 and a return of capital within two to four years of opening the new studio:1

Strong Studio-Level Economics

We seek to generate attractive studio-level margins by increasing the average number of students per class which in turn provides better return on our fixed costs, such as teacher salaries and rent. We target studios with average annual revenues between \$500,000 to \$700,000 and a return on our invested capital to be within two to four

Plaintiff alleges that the statements quoted in underlined, bolded text are materially false and misleading for the reasons set forth in the Complaint. Any additional text is provided for context.

<u>vears of opening a new studio</u>. We approach our acquisition targets seeking similar returns. We believe that our strong studio-level economics are important for us to grow our studio base and successfully execute our acquisition strategy.

- 93. In order to obtain a complete return on invested capital within two to four years, the studio-level margins, however, had to be at least 20%.²
- 94. In the Prospectus, YogaWorks reported Studio-Level EBITDA for the three months ended March 31, 2017 and March 31, 2016 of \$3.2 million and \$4.4 million, respectively, and Studio-Level EBITDA margins for the same periods of 22.9% and 29.1%, respectively. The Company also reported Studio-Level EBITDA for both the year-ended December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015 of \$12.4 million and Studio-Level EBITDA margins for the same periods of 22.5% and 25.6%, respectively.
- 95. The above statements were materially false and misleading when made because YogaWorks's Studio-Level EBITDA margin for the second quarter-ended June 30, 2017, at the time of the IPO, was only 17.39%, well below the necessary 20% needed to recoup its investment within two to four years. Moreover, while YogaWorks disclosed Studio-Level EBITDA for 2016 of 22.5%, it omitted the fact that Studio-Level EBITDA margin for the fourth quarter 2016 was only 19.11%.
- 96. The above statements were further materially misleading because YogaWorks was experiencing a *known trend of decreasing* Studio-Level EBITDA margin below the 20% threshold. For the second quarter-ended June 30, 2017, Studio-Level EBITDA margin declined to 17.39% from 19.36% for the second quarter-ended and June 30, 2016. While YogaWorks's Studio-Level EBITDA increased slightly in the first quarter 2017 as a result of higher class attendance from New Years' resolutions, Defendants knew it would not last as YogaWorks was acquiring smaller, more inefficient studios and seeing a significant decline in class attendance. Indeed, this trend continued as YogaWorks continued to experience Studio-Level EBITDA margin declines below the necessary threshold of 19.4%, 18.8%, 18.2%, and 14.9% for the third quarter 2017, fourth quarter 2017, first quarter 2018 and second quarter 2018, respectively.
 - The above statements were also materially false and misleading because, as a result of

² See YogaWorks Presentation at Cowen's Future of the Consumer Conference, April 2018, at 18, available at https://ir.yogaworks.com/static-files/1624037d-bee7-473a-9e28-08776ae8aade

YogaWorks's deteriorating financial position, it had begun acquiring smaller, less efficient studios that did not meet the criteria set forth in the Prospectus of generating \$500,000 to \$700,000 in revenue per year. For the third quarter 2017, YogaWorks acquired only three new studies for a total of \$445,000. This trend continued into the fourth quarter 2017 during which YogaWorks acquired 13 studios for a total of \$5.6 million, or an average cost of \$430,000 per studio. While YogaWorks made no acquisitions in Q1 2018, it acquired five studios for a total of \$721,930 during Q2 2018.

- Analysts have commented that this "lack of transparency in terms of organic growth adds to the uncertainty" of YogaWorks's future.
 - B. Materially Misleading Statements that the Decline in Revenue Would Be Offset by an Increase in Deferred Revenue as a Result of the Change to Class-Based Packages
- 99. YogaWorks claimed that the Company's revenue for the first quarter 2017 was lower due to a shift in business and pricing strategy towards selling more class packages, rather than monthly memberships and assured investors that the difference would be offset by an increase in deferred revenue:

With the adoption of our more flexible pricing strategy in July 2016, our sales mix has shifted toward a higher number of class-package sales and a corresponding decline in monthly membership sales. We anticipate this trend to continue at a decreasing rate over time as students in our existing studios purchase class packages more frequently than memberships and as we acquire and open additional studios, and expect a more balanced mix between class packages and memberships over time. We expect that the impact of this shift in sales mix will be a reduction in the amount of revenue recognized in a given period by an increase in deferred revenue liability associated with class package sales, as well as a decrease in student visits, as students on class packages tend to visit studios less than students with membership.

With respect to first quarter 2017 revenue, YogaWorks claimed that the 7.5% quarter to

quarter reduction in revenue was based on the Company selling more class packages:

During the first quarter of 2017, we sold more class packages and paid-in-full memberships (which require a longer period of time to be recognized as revenue in comparison to our other sales options) than we did in the first quarter in 2016 (in which we had a higher percentage of monthly membership fee revenue in comparison to the first quarter of 2017), which resulted in less revenue being recognized during the first quarter of 2017. We believe the implementation of our strategy to sell more class packages allows us to better serve our students and will draw a broader student base over time. We anticipate our deferred revenue, subject to refunds, to be recognized as net revenue over time as it is deemed earned based on pattern of usage or the applicable product's expiration period.

27

28

21

22

23

We are providing the following estimated results for the quarter ended June 30, 2017: Net revenues of between \$12.3 million and \$12.6 million; and

In the Prospectus, YogaWorks reported Q2 2017 preliminary results, stating:

Visits of between 700,000 and 720,000.

The decrease in net revenues from \$13.3 million for the quarter ended June 30, 2016 was primarily due to a larger portion of our sales for the quarter ended June 30, 2017 being recognized as deferred revenue. The increase in deferred revenue was driven by our initiation of a more flexible pricing strategy in July 2016 that, as expected, has resulted in a shift in sales toward class packages which require recognition of revenue over a longer time period than other sales options. This sales mix shift resulted in less revenue being recognized during the second quarter of 2017 than the same quarter in 2016, in which we had a higher percentage of monthly membership revenue.

Our decision to offer class packages at all of our studios also impacted our number of visits, as students on class packages tend to visit studios less than students with memberships, which primarily led to the decrease from 754,567 visits for the quarter ended June 30, 2016. We anticipate this trend to continue at a decreasing rate over time as students in our existing studios purchase class packages more frequently than memberships and as we acquire and open additional studios, and expect a more balanced mix between class packages and memberships over time. While our strategy to sell more class packages has had an impact on both our net revenues and visits during the transition period, we believe the implementation of this strategy allows us to better serve our students and will draw a broader student base as consumers favor more flexible pricing options.

- The above statements were materially false and misleading when made because the shift to class packages was actually because of the increasing trend of fewer student visits during 2016, resulting in fewer class per studio and the acquisition of smaller, less efficient studios.
- Moreover, YogaWorks reported deferred revenue of \$4.5 million for the first quarterended March 31, 2017, \$4.6 million for the year-ended December 31, 2016 and \$5.2 million for the year-ended December 31, 2015. Thus, contrary to the Prospectus, deferred revenue was higher when YogaWorks relied on monthly revenue. Further, despite adding more studios, total revenue plus deferred revenue was actually declining.
- 104. Defendants also represented in the Prospectus that YogaWorks was "uniquely positioned to grow via acquisitions due to . . . (vi) our tested integration procedures," which they claim enabled YogaWorks to "preserve the acquired studio's unique appeal . . . while successfully increasing visits and net revenue under our ownership."
 - 105. The above statements were materially false and misleading when made because, as a

result of YogaWorks's declining financial condition, it was unable to acquire the yoga studios it told investors it was targeting, resulting in lower net revenue.

C. Materially Misleading Statements Regarding Corporate Infrastructure Costs and Economies of Scale

106. Defendants claimed that at that time of the Offering that YogaWorks would benefit from economies of scale and from centralized management and less overhead per capita and that YogaWorks had a corporate infrastructure in place to support its future acquisition growth such that as YogaWorks grew, its overhead costs would become a smaller percentage of revenue and profitability:

In preparation for our continued growth, we have built out our corporate infrastructure over the past several years. We now have the corporate, regional and studio-level management personnel in place, as well as the information technology platform, to support our future growth and acquisition strategy, without significant new investments in corporate infrastructure.

107. Further, YogaWorks claimed that its strong studio-level economics would allow the Company to achieve economies of scale, thereby reducing overhead costs as a percentage of revenue: "Jals our studio base grow, expense for our corporate and regional overhead should become a smaller percentage of our new revenue and profitability."

108. The above statements were materially false and misleading when made because, at the time of the IPO, YogaWorks's corporate overhead expenses were *increasing* as a percentage of sales and profitability. For the second quarter-ended June 30, 2017, YogaWorks incurred "Other general and administrative expenses" of \$2.7 million, or 21.7% of net revenue as compared to \$2.6 million for the same quarter in 2016, or 19.8% or revenue. YogaWorks knew this trend would continue as the Company was acquiring smaller, less efficient studios that generated revenue substantially below the \$500,000 to \$700,000 level Defendants claimed in the Prospectus. In fact, this trend was continuing into the third quarter 2017, half of which was over at the time of the IPO in which YogaWorks incurred "Other general and administrative expenses" of \$3.1 million, or 22.6% of net revenue as compared to \$2.5 million for the same quarter in 2016, or 18.2% of revenue.

109. Further, any claim of having right-sized the Company's corporate infrastructure at the

³ Defined as "general and administrative expenses that are corporate and regional expenses and not incurred by our studios"

 time of the IPO was belied by the quarter-to-quarter increase following the Offering—starting in the second quarter of 2017, which had already been completed by that point:

Period	Other General and Administrative Expenses	Percentage Increase Over Other G&A at Time of IPO
Q1 2017	\$2,364,000.00	
Q2 2017	\$2,723,000.00	15%
Q3 2017	\$3,059,000.00	29%
Q4 2017	\$3,795,000.00	61%
Q1 2018	\$3,898,000.00	65%
Q2 2018	\$3,590,000.00	52%
Q3 2018	\$3,597,000.00	52%

110. Corporate overhead continued to eat earnings throughout the relevant period as Defendants increased stock-based compensation for its named executives in the wake of the Offering, at the expense of stockholders:

Period	Stock-Based Compensation
FY2015	\$16,942.00
Q1 2016	\$6,652.00
Q2 2016	\$11,854.00
Q3 2016	\$2,528.00
Q4 2016	\$2,409.00
FY 2016	\$23,443.00
Q1 2017	\$538,872.00
Q2 2017	\$286,273.00
Q3-2017	\$1,294,107.00
Q4 2017	\$463,531.00
FY 2017	\$2,582,783.00

111. As announced on August 16, 2017, YogaWorks closed its IPO on that day, selling 7.3 million shares at a public offering price of \$5.50 per share, raising cash proceeds for the Company of approximately \$35.3 million after deducting underwriting discounts, commissions, and expenses.

THE OFFERING MATERIALS FAILED TO WARN OF RISKS THAT HAD ALREADY MATERIALIZED AT THE TIME OF THE IPO

3 4 5

6

1

2

7 8

9 10

11 12

13 14

16

15

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 26

27 28

The Offering Materials contained a litany of generic and boilerplate risk warnings, in contravention of SEC directives under Item 503, that failed to disclose several known risks that had already materialized at the time of the Offering.

The Offering Materials state:

Our growth strategy is highly dependent on our ability to successfully identify and acquire studio targets and integrate their operations with ours.

Our growth strategy primarily contemplates expansion through targeted acquisitions of other yoga studio businesses. Implementing this strategy depends on our ability to successfully identify opportunities that complement our businesses, share our business and company philosophy and operate in markets that are complementary to our operations and the communities in which we operate. We will also need to assess and mitigate the risk of any target opportunity, to acquire targets on favorable terms and to successfully integrate their operations with ours. We may not be able to successfully identify opportunities that meet these criteria, or, if we do, we may not be able to successfully negotiate, finance, acquire and integrate them. Even if we enter into confidentiality agreements or letters of intent with potential studios, we may not be able to complete the acquisition. If we are unable to identify and acquire suitable studios, our revenue growth rate and financial performance may fall short of our expectations. If we are successful in acquiring studio targets, we may not be able to successfully integrate the operations of these studios with ours, to execute the growth objectives of our combined operations or to realize the revenue opportunities or cost savings that may be assumed. In addition, any such opportunity may require us to raise additional capital, which may be dilutive to our existing shareholders, or require us to incur additional indebtedness. If our analysis of the suitability of a studio or group of studios for acquisition is incorrect, we may not be able to recover our capital investment in acquiring such studios.

- 114. This risk factor was wholly deficient as it failed to warn of the state of affairs then existing at the Company-that the Company was targeting and acquiring low performing studios and was not able to successfully integrate these studios in a manner that led to revenue growth.
- The Company's risk factors also failed to warn of existing issues with the Company's newly-acquired studios, claiming:

Our recently acquired or newly opened studios may negatively impact our financial results in the short-term, and may not achieve sales and operating levels consistent with our existing studios on a timely basis, or at all.

We have actively pursued new studio growth, primarily through acquisitions, and plan to continue doing so in the future. Many of our studios are still relatively new as YogaWorks-branded studios, as we have opened or acquired 23 studios since January 1, 2015. We cannot assure you that our recently acquired or newly opened studios will be successful or reach the sales and profitability levels of our existing studios. New studio acquisitions may negatively impact our financial results in the short term due to

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the effect of studio conversion costs, loss of students or teachers at the acquired studios, lower class package and drop-in class sales and lower contribution to overall profitability during the initial period following an acquisition. Acquired and newly opened studios require a transition period to build their sales volume and their student base and, as a result, generally have lower margins and higher operating expenses, as a percentage of net revenues, when initially acquired or opened. Newly acquired and opened studios may not achieve membership levels, class package and drop-in class sales and operating levels consistent with our existing studio base on a timely basis, or at all. We cannot assure you that our recently acquired or newly opened studios will generate revenue, cash flow or profitability levels comparable with those generated by our existing studios. These risks may have an adverse effect on our financial condition, operating results and growth rate.

- At the time of the IPO, this risk had already materialized as newly acquired and opened studios were vastly underperforming, with the Company being forced to curtail any further expansion to address its plummeting finances for more than a year preceding the IPO and in the immediate aftermath thereof.
 - Further, the Registration Statement purportedly warned:

If we fail to attract new students and teachers and retain existing students and teachers, it could have an adverse impact on our growth strategy as we may not be able to increase the number of visits to our studios or students that go through our teacher training.

The performance of our studios and success of our growth strategy is largely dependent on our ability to continuously attract new students and teachers and retain existing students and teachers. We cannot be sure that we will be successful in these efforts, or that visits to our studio classes and teacher trainings or participation in MyYogaWorks.com will not materially decline. There are numerous factors that could lead to a decline in visits at established studios or that could prevent us from increasing our student visits at newer or acquired studios, including harm to our reputation, a decline in our ability to deliver quality yoga classes and teacher trainings at a competitive cost, the opening or acquisition of new studios or hosting of additional teacher trainings that may have the potential to cannibalize store sales in existing areas, the heightened presence of direct and indirect competition in the areas in which the studios are located, the decline in the public's interest in fitness through yoga, a deterioration of general economic conditions and a change in consumer spending preferences or buying trends. As a result of these factors, we cannot be sure that our student visits will be adequate to maintain or permit the expansion of our operations. A decline in student visits levels may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and growth rate.

- 118. In actuality, at the time of the Offering, student visits were already in decline quarter over quarter and negatively impacting the Company's business.
- 119. The Offering Materials also failed to warn about the risks associated with the Company's inability to increase its customer base, claiming:

If we are unable to anticipate student preferences and provide high quality yoga offerings, we may not be able to maintain or increase our membership base, sales from class packages, drop-ins and teacher trainings, participation in MyYogaWorks, com and profitability.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Our success in maintaining and increasing our student base depends on our ability to identify and originate trends as well as to anticipate and react to changing customer preferences and trends in a timely manner. All of our yoga offerings and retail products are subject to changing consumer preferences that cannot be predicted with certainty. If we are unable to introduce new yoga offerings or retail products in a timely manner, or our new yoga offerings or retail products are not accepted by our students, our competitors may introduce similar voga offerings or retail products in a more timely fashion, which could negatively affect our rate of growth. Our new yoga offerings or retail products may not receive acceptance as preferences could shift rapidly to different types of healthy lifestyle offerings or athletic apparel or away from these types of yoga offerings or retail products altogether, and our future success depends in part on our ability to anticipate and respond to these changes. Failure to anticipate and respond in a timely manner to changing customer preferences could lead to, among other things, lower class visits and lower retail sales and excess inventory levels. Even if we are successful in anticipating customer preferences, our ability to adequately react to and address those preferences will in part depend upon our continued ability to provide high-quality yoga offerings and retail products. Our failure to address student preferences could result in a decrease in net revenues, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition.

- 120. At the time of the IPO, the Company was already suffering from the ill-effects of its inability to meet customer preferences and convert those customers into increased revenues, with lower class visits and revenues per visit leading to increased net losses for YogaWorks.
 - 121. With respect to the Company's goodwill asset, the Offering Materials state:

Any further impairment of goodwill could adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

In 2015, we recorded an impairment of goodwill of \$0.9 million. We did not record any impairment losses related to goodwill in 2016. As of December 31, 2016, our goodwill balance was \$17.7 million. Accounting rules require the evaluation of our goodwill at least annually, or more frequently when events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of such assets may not be recoverable. Such indicators are based on market conditions and the operational performance of our business. In testing goodwill for impairment, if the implied fair value of the goodwill is less than the reporting unit's carrying amount, then goodwill is impaired and is written down to the implied fair value amount. If a significant amount of our goodwill were deemed to be impaired, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

We incurred a net loss of \$2.6 million for the three months ended March 31, 2017, \$1.5 million for the three months ended March 31, 2016, \$9.5 million in 2016 and \$9.2 million in 2015 and had net cash provided by operating activities of \$0.8 million in 2016. If we continue to experience net losses or our cash flows from operating activities decline or become negative, it could require us to lower our assessment of the fair value of our business. If this were to occur, we could be required to record additional material impairment charges to goodwill or other intangible assets which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

1

2

3

- At the time of the Offering, the Company had previously, and was continuing to experience continued net losses and lowered cash flows from operating activities which would ultimately necessitate the assessment of more than \$10 million in goodwill impairment charges within one year of the Offering on the basis of trends existing at the time of the IPO.
- 123. Thus, at the time of the Offering it was clear that the Company's finances were already being impacted by several of the adverse trends identified herein, yet the Company shirked its responsibilities under Item 503 to make fulsome disclosures to Plaintiff and the Class. As a result, these investors were harmed when the risks then known, but undisclosed, materialized, causing the Company's stock price to drop.

POST-IPO EVENTS CAUSE YOGAWORKS'S STOCK PRICE TO PLUMMET AS THE ADVERSE CONDITIONS KNOWN PRIOR TO THE IPO COME TO A HEAD AND

- 124. On September 21, 2017, YogaWorks announced the Company's second quarter financial results for the period ending June 30, 2017. Therein, YogaWorks reported net revenue of \$12.5 million as compared to \$13.3 million for the second quarter 2016, a net loss of \$4.4 million, nearly double that of the same quarter in 2016, and Studio-Level EBITDA of \$2.2 million as compared to \$2.6 million for the second quarter 2016. While YogaWorks blamed the decline in net revenue on the shift from monthly memberships to class packages, deferred revenue only increased \$0.5 million, while student visits, number of classes, and students per class were down quarter over quarter.
- 125. Upon the news, YogaWorks's stock price dropped from \$4.00 per share on September 21, 2018 to \$3.53 per share on September 22, 2018, continuing to tumble down to \$2.83 per share on September 28, 2017 as investors reacted to the negative financials and growing losses.
- 126. On April 2, 2018, the Company announced its financial results for the fourth quarter and full year 2017 by filing a non-timely annual report with the SEC on Form 10-K (along with a Form 12b-25 indicating that the Company had been unable to timely file the annual report "due to a delay in finalizing a goodwill impairment charge related to the book value of the Company, relative to the Company's current market capitalization"). For the year, the Company recorded net revenue of \$54.5 million (as compared to \$55.1 million in the prior year) and a net loss of \$23.4 million—more than double the \$9.5 million loss recorded in 2016. The Company's hand-picked non-GAAP metric

Studio-Level EBITDA also declined, from \$12.4 million to \$10.7 million.

- 127. Further, for the quarter, the Company recorded \$454,000 in stock based compensation expense, up from the \$2,000 in the same quarter the prior year, and capping a fiscal year where the Company doled out nearly \$2.6 million in stock based compensation to a management team who oversaw the deterioration of the Company's financial condition.
- 128. Additionally, for the year, the Company recorded a goodwill impairment charge of \$7.5 million (representing more than a third of the Company's prior goodwill asset) "primarily due to projected cash flows and the Company's decline in market capitalization since the launch of the IPO:"

	Year Ended December 31.			
		2617	Z-11. Z-2	2616
Goodwill, beginning of period	5	17,746,570	5	17,746,570
Goodwill acquired during the year		2,510,602		_
Total goodwill	- 600	20,257,172	107	17,746,570
Less impairment		(7,488,399)		
Goodwill, end of period	. 2	12,768,773	5	17,746,570

- 129. The news sent the Company's common stock down an additional 18.4%, from \$2.88 on April 2, 2018 to \$2.35 per share on April 3, 2018—greater than 50% below the Offering Price.
- 130. On August 14, 2018, the Company announced its financial results for the second quarter of 2018. Therein, the Company reported a \$2.4 million increase in net revenues over the same quarter prior year, but a \$2.3 million increase in net loss, despite the fact that the Company raised its studio count during the quarter.
- 131. Exacerbating matters, the Company again recorded a goodwill impairment during the second quarter of 2018, recording an additional \$2.5 million impairment in the quarter:

	As of June 30, 2018		As of December 31, 2017	
Goodwill, beginning of period	\$	12,768,773	S	17,746,570
Goodwill acquired during the year		488,109		2,510,602
Total goodwill		13,256,882		20,257,172
Less impairment		(2,474,819)		(7,488,399)
Goodwill, end of period	S	10,782,063	5	12,768,773

- 132. The market had seen enough from YogaWorks, with the Company's stock price careening downward more than 40% to close at \$1.09 per share on August 15, 2018.
 - 133. YogaWorks's stock has continued to drop, with the Company filing a Form 8-K on

December 12, 2018 reporting that, on December 6, 2018, it had received a letter from the Nasdaq indicating that the market value of the publicly held shares of the Company for the prior thirty business days fell below the exchange's \$5 million minimum value and thus, the Company was subject to delisting if it was unable to regain compliance. The Company then received a second similar letter from the Nasdaq on December 12, 2018 for its noncompliance with the exchange's \$1.00 minimum share price requirement.

- 134. As of the filing of this complaint, the Company's stock price has dropped to \$0.58 per share-89.5% below the Offering price.
- 135. As set forth herein, the Company's statements in the Registration Statement, taken individually and collectively, were materially false and misleading because they failed to disclose and misrepresented adverse facts that existed at the time of the IPO.
 - Plaintiff and members of the Class have been injured.

B. Defendants Violated Their Disclosure Obligations in the Registration Statement

Defendants violated their disclosure obligations because the Registration Statement 137. materially misrepresented and failed to adequately disclose, inter alia, the truth concerning the several known trends negatively impacting the Company's business at the time of the IPO, including: (i) declining studio profitability; (ii) the impact of increased corporate overhead; (iii) declining financial metrics that would ultimately lead to a substantial impairment charge; and (iv) the conditions that led to the Defendants to postpone the initial offering.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

138 Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure on behalf of a class consisting of all persons and/or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of YogaWorks pursuant and/or traceable to the Company's false and/or misleading Registration Statement and Prospectus issued in connection with the Company's IPO, and who were damaged thereby (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class are Defendants and their families, the officers, directors, and affiliates of Defendants, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns, and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

- 139. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. During the relevant time period, YogaWorks's securities were actively traded on the Nasdaq under the symbol "YOGA." While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are hundreds, if not thousands of members in the proposed Class. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by YogaWorks or its transfer agent and may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, using the form of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class actions.
- 140. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as all members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in violation of federal law that is complained of herein.
- 141. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class and securities litigation.
- 142. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:
 - (a) whether Defendants violated the Securities Act;
 - (b) whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public in the Registration Statement and Prospectus misrepresented material facts about the business and operations of YogaWorks; and
 - (c) to what extent members of the Class have sustained damages, and if so, the proper measure of damages.
- 143. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is impracticable. Furthermore, as the damages suffered by individual Class members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it impossible for members of the Class to individually redress the wrongs done to them. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

3 4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24 25

26 27 28

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATIONS OF § 11 OF THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

AGAINST YOGAWORKS, THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS, AND THE UNDERWRITER

- Plaintiff incorporates each preceding paragraph by reference.
- This Cause of Action is brought pursuant to section 11 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77k, on behalf of the Class, against YogaWorks, the Individual Defendants, and the Underwriter Defendants.
- The Registration Statement for the IPO was inaccurate and misleading, contained untrue statements of material facts, omitted to state other facts necessary to make the statements made not misleading, and omitted to state material facts required to be stated therein.
- 147. The Company is the issuer of the securities purchased by Plaintiff and the Class. As such, the Company is strictly liable for the materially untrue statements contained in the Registration Statement and the failure of the Registration Statement to be complete and accurate.
- The Individual Defendants each signed the Registration Statement or authorized the signing of the Registration Statement on their behalf. As such, each is strictly liable for the materially inaccurate statements contained therein and the failure of the Registration Statement to be complete and accurate, unless they are able to carry their burden of establishing an affirmative "due diligence" defense. The Individual Defendants each had a duty to make a reasonable and diligent investigation of the truthfulness and accuracy of the statements contained in the Registration Statement, and to ensure that they were true and accurate, that there were no omissions of material facts that would make the Registration Statement misleading, and that the document contained all facts required to be stated therein. In the exercise of reasonable care, the Individual Defendants should have known of the material misstatements and omissions contained in the Registration Statement and also should have known of the omissions of material fact necessary to make the statements made therein not misleading. Accordingly, the Individual Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Class.
- The Underwriter Defendants each served as underwriters in connection with the Prospectus. As such, each is strictly liable for the materially inaccurate statements contained in the

26 27

28

Registration Statement and the failure of the Registration Statement to be complete and accurate, unless they are able to carry their burden of establishing an affirmative "due diligence" defense. These defendants each had a duty to make a reasonable and diligent investigation of the truthfulness and accuracy of the statements contained in the Registration Statement. They had a duty to ensure that they were true and accurate, that there were no omissions of material facts that would make the Registration Statement misleading, and that the documents contained all facts required to be stated therein. In the exercise of reasonable care, the Underwriter Defendants should have known of the material misstatements and omissions contained in the Registration Statement and also should have known of the omissions of material facts necessary to make the statements made therein not misleading. Accordingly, each of the Underwriter Defendants is liable to Plaintiff and the Class.

- By reason of the conduct herein alleged, each defendant named herein violated section 11 of the Securities Act.
- Plaintiff acquired YogaWorks common stock pursuant or traceable to the Registration Statement used for the IPO and without knowledge of the material omissions or misrepresentations alleged herein.
- Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages, as the value of YogaWorks common 152. stock has declined substantially subsequent to and due to these Defendants' violations.
- This claim was brought within one year after the discovery of the untrue statements and omissions and within three years of the date of the Offering.
- By virtue of the foregoing, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class are entitled to damages under section 11, as measured by the provisions of section 11(e), from the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FOR VIOLATION OF § 15 OF THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AGAINST YOGAWORKS, THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS, AND THE PRIVATE

- Plaintiff incorporates each preceding paragraph by reference.
- This Cause of Action is brought pursuant to section 15 of the Securities Act against

YogaWorks, the Individual Defendants, and the Private Equity Defendants.

- 157. The Individual Defendants each were control persons of YogaWorks by virtue of their positions as directors and/or senior officers of YogaWorks. Each of the Individual Defendants had a series of direct and/or indirect business and/or personal relationships with other directors and/or officers and/or major stockholders of YogaWorks. Each of the Individual Defendants had a financial interest in taking the Company's stock public in order to increase the holding value and marketability of their holdings, as alleged herein.
- 158. The Private Equity Defendants controlled the Company as the controlling stockholder, including by and through two Board members.
- 159. YogaWorks, the Private Equity Defendants and the Individual Defendants each were culpable participants in the violations of section 11 of the Securities Act alleged in Count One above, based on their having signed or authorized the signing of the Registration Statement and having otherwise participated in the process which allowed the IPO to be successfully completed.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment as follows:

- Declaring this action to be a class action pursuant section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and certifying Plaintiff as a representative of the Class and her counsel as Class counsel;
 - (B) Awarding Plaintiff and the members of the Class damages, including interest;
- (C) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable costs and expenses incurred in this action, including and attorneys' fees, and
- Awarding such equitable/injunctive or other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP Dated: January 11, 2019

Rosanne L. Mah

Rosa Mu

1	44 Montgomery St., Ste. 650
2	San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 373-1671
3	Fax: (415) 484-1294 Email: rmah@zlk.com
4	LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
5	Shannon L. Hopkins Sebastiano Tornatore
6	733 Summer Street, Suite 304 Stamford, CT 06901
7	Tel: (203) 992-4523 Email: shopkins@zlk.com
8	Email: stornatore@zlk.com
9	BRAGER EAGEL & SQUIRE, P.C. Marion C. Passmore (SBN 228474)
10	885 Third Avenue, Suite 3040 New York, NY 10022
11	Tel: (212) 308-5858 passmore@bespc.com
12	Counsel for Plaintiff Rubina Mirza
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	25 Casa No.

1

2

3

- At the time of the Offering, the Company had previously, and was continuing to experience continued net losses and lowered cash flows from operating activities which would ultimately necessitate the assessment of more than \$10 million in goodwill impairment charges within one year of the Offering on the basis of trends existing at the time of the IPO.
- 123. Thus, at the time of the Offering it was clear that the Company's finances were already being impacted by several of the adverse trends identified herein, yet the Company shirked its responsibilities under Item 503 to make fulsome disclosures to Plaintiff and the Class. As a result, these investors were harmed when the risks then known, but undisclosed, materialized, causing the Company's stock price to drop.

POST-IPO EVENTS CAUSE YOGAWORKS'S STOCK PRICE TO PLUMMET AS THE ADVERSE CONDITIONS KNOWN PRIOR TO THE IPO COME TO A HEAD AND

- 124. On September 21, 2017, YogaWorks announced the Company's second quarter financial results for the period ending June 30, 2017. Therein, YogaWorks reported net revenue of \$12.5 million as compared to \$13.3 million for the second quarter 2016, a net loss of \$4.4 million, nearly double that of the same quarter in 2016, and Studio-Level EBITDA of \$2.2 million as compared to \$2.6 million for the second quarter 2016. While YogaWorks blamed the decline in net revenue on the shift from monthly memberships to class packages, deferred revenue only increased \$0.5 million, while student visits, number of classes, and students per class were down quarter over quarter.
- 125. Upon the news, YogaWorks's stock price dropped from \$4.00 per share on September 21, 2018 to \$3.53 per share on September 22, 2018, continuing to tumble down to \$2.83 per share on September 28, 2017 as investors reacted to the negative financials and growing losses.
- 126. On April 2, 2018, the Company announced its financial results for the fourth quarter and full year 2017 by filing a non-timely annual report with the SEC on Form 10-K (along with a Form 12b-25 indicating that the Company had been unable to timely file the annual report "due to a delay in finalizing a goodwill impairment charge related to the book value of the Company, relative to the Company's current market capitalization"). For the year, the Company recorded net revenue of \$54.5 million (as compared to \$55.1 million in the prior year) and a net loss of \$23.4 million—more than double the \$9.5 million loss recorded in 2016. The Company's hand-picked non-GAAP metric