UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

_____, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiff, v. MONTAUK RENEWABLES, INC., SEAN F. MCCLAIN, and KEVIN A. VAN ASDALAN, Defendants.	Case No. **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS** **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

Plaintiff _____ ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys, alleges the following upon information and belief, except as to those allegations concerning Plaintiff, which are alleged upon personal knowledge. Plaintiff's information and belief is based upon, among other things, his counsel's investigation, which includes without limitation: (a) review and analysis of regulatory filings made by Montauk Renewables, Inc. ("Montauk" or the "Company") with the United States ("U.S.") Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"); (b) review and analysis of press releases and media reports issued by and disseminated by Montauk; and (c) review of other publicly available information concerning Montauk.

NATURE OF THE ACTION AND OVERVIEW

1. This is a class action on behalf of persons and entities that purchased or otherwise acquired Montauk securities between August 5, 2026 and November 9, 2026, inclusive (the "Class Period"). Plaintiff pursues claims against the Defendants under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act").

2. Montauk is a renewable energy company which engages in recovery and processing of biogas from landfills and other non-fossil fuel sources.

3. On November 10, 2026, before the market opened, Montauk disclosed it is unable to timely file its upcoming 10-Q "as a result of ongoing negotiations with the lender under the Company's New Senior Credit Facility Agreement." The Company further explained that[1] "***[i]n October 2026, the Company experienced difficulty in meeting certain engineering review and***

[1] Unless otherwise stated, all emphasis in bold and italics hereinafter is added, and all footnotes are omitted.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

operational requirements in placing its Turkey, North Carolina facility in service, which has impacted its ability to draw down additional debt under its New Senior Credit Facility."

4. On this news, the Company's share price fell $1.59, or 57.2%, to close at $1.19 per share on November 10, 2026, on unusually heavy trading volume.

5. Throughout the Class Period, Defendants made materially false and/or misleading statements, as well as failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company's business, operations, and prospects. Specifically, Defendants failed to disclose to investors: (1) the Company was experiencing, or was likely to experience, difficulty in meeting certain engineering review and operational requirements in placing its Turkey, North Carolina facility in service**;** (2) as a result of the foregoing, the Company would have difficulty in drawing down additional debt under its New Senior Credit Facility; and (3) that, as a result of the foregoing, Defendants' positive statements about the Company's business, operations, and prospects were materially misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis.

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

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. The claims asserted herein arise under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78t(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the SEC (17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5).

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

9. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa). Substantial acts in furtherance of the alleged fraud or

the effects of the fraud have occurred in this Judicial District. Many of the acts charged herein, including the dissemination of materially false and/or misleading information, occurred in substantial part in this Judicial District. In addition, the Company's principal executive offices are in this District.

10. In connection with the acts, transactions, and conduct alleged herein, Defendants directly and indirectly used the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, including the United States mail, interstate telephone communications, and the facilities of a national securities exchange.

PARTIES

11. Plaintiff ____, as set forth in the accompanying certification, incorporated by reference herein, purchased Montauk securities during the Class Period, and suffered damages as a result of the federal securities law violations and false and/or misleading statements and/or material omissions alleged herein.

12. Defendant Montauk is incorporated under the laws of Delaware with its principal executive offices located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Montauk's common stock trades on the NASDAQ under the symbol "MNTK."

13. Defendant Sean F. McClain ("McClain") was the Company's Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") at all relevant times.

14. Defendant Kevin A. Van Asdalan ("Van Asdalan") was the Company's Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") at all relevant times.

15. Defendants McClain and Van Asdalan (together, the "Individual Defendants"), because of their positions with the Company, possessed the power and authority to control the contents of the Company's reports to the SEC, press releases and presentations to securities analysts, money and portfolio managers and institutional investors, i.e., the market. The Individual

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

Defendants were provided with copies of the Company's reports and press releases alleged herein to be misleading prior to, or shortly after, their issuance and had the ability and opportunity to prevent their issuance or cause them to be corrected. Because of their positions and access to material non-public information available to them, the Individual Defendants knew that the adverse facts specified herein had not been disclosed to, and were being concealed from, the public, and that the positive representations which were being made were then materially false and/or misleading. The Individual Defendants are liable for the false statements pleaded herein.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Background

16. Montauk is a renewable energy company which engages in recovery and processing of biogas from landfills and other non-fossil fuel sources.

Materially False and Misleading

Statements Issued During the Class Period

17. The Class Period begins on August 5, 2026. On that day, Montauk issued a press release announcing its financial results for the quarter ended June 30, 2026. The press release touted the Company's alleged financial results, and further alleged "***[i]n July 2026, we began generating power for sale from our Turkey, North Carolina facility***." Specifically, the press release stated as follows, in relevant part:

> Second Quarter Highlights:
>
> • Revenues of $54.0 million, increased 19.7 % year-over-year
>
> • Net income of $0.2 million, increased 104.1% year-over-year
>
> • Non-GAAP Adjusted EBITDA of $12.3 million, increased 144.5% year-over-year
>
> • RNG production of 1.5 million MMBtu, increased 3% year-over-year
>
> • RINs from operations sold of 14.3 million, increased 29.1% year-over-year

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

In July 2026, we began generating power for sale from our Turkey, North Carolina facility. This production of power is expected to be eligible to generate both swine RECs and enhanced RECs in subsequent months. As we work to increase the volumes of power and RECs that are able to be generated from our volume of produced syngas, we have identified specific programming modifications to our installed electrical switchgear. The installation of these modifications will provide for both the increase in production volumes as well as enhance protection of our processing equipment and electrical transformers. We expect to have all programming completed by mid-August and consistently generate power and RECs from all available collected feedstock volumes.

We continue to progress with our installation of feedstock collection at our targeted 400 thousand to 450 thousand hog spaces. As of the end of July, we have entered into long term agreements with over fifty separate farming locations providing us access to at least 350 thousand hog spaces. We are currently able to collect from more than 250 thousand hog spaces and will continue farm site collection equipment installations during the second half of 2026.

18. On August 5, 2026, the Company submitted its quarterly report for the period ended June 30, 2026 on a Form 10-Q filed with the SEC, affirming the previously reported financial results. The report stated the following regarding the Company's Turkey, North Carolina facility, and its ability to draw down additional debt under its New Senior Credit Facility, in relevant part:

In July 2026, we began generating power for sale from our Turkey, North Carolina facility. This production of power is expected to be eligible to generate both swine RECs and enhanced RECs in subsequent months. As we work to increase the volumes of power and RECs that are able to be generated from our volume of produced syngas, we have identified specific programming modifications to our installed electrical switchgear. The installation of these modifications will provide for both the increase in production volumes and enhanced protection of our processing equipment and electrical transformers. We expect to have all programming completed by mid-August and consistently generate power and RECs from all available collected feedstock volumes.

We continue to progress with our installation of feedstock collection at our targeted 400 to 450 hog spaces. As of the end of July, we have entered into long term agreements with over fifty separate farming locations providing us access to at least 350 hog spaces. We are currently able to collect from more than 250 hog spaces and will continue farm site collection equipment installations during the second half of 2026.

Our capital investment expectation for this first phase of the project remains unchanged at $200,000. We continue to expect a ramp-up in production volumes throughout 2026 directly related to additional feedstock collection.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

* * *

New Senior Credit Facility

On March 9, 2026, the Company entered in a new, five year senior credit facility ("New Senior Credit Facility") with CCH1 MEH Lender LLC (a wholly owned subsidiary of Hannon Armstrong Capital LLC “HASI”) that consists of up to $200,000 in senior indebtedness, of which $155,000 is outstanding as of June 30, 2026. These proceeds were used to repay all outstanding debt of the Company at the date of closing. Subject to various requirements as defined in the underlying agreement, the Company expects to have an additional $45,000 in proceeds to draw upon the conclusion of certain engineering review and operational requirements of its Montauk Ag Renewables project in North Carolina. Finally, the Company maintains a cash collateralized facility with an entity not related to the HASI New Senior Credit Facility and has issued $2,185 of letters of credit, for which the Company is required to maintain 105% of cash collateral. The New Senior Credit Facility matures in March 2031. The New Senior Credit Facility includes various affirmative and negative covenants that require the Company to meet specified financial ratios and financial tests, as defined in the underlying agreement. Under the New Senior Credit Facility, the Company is required to maintain:

• Total Net Leverage Ratio (as defined in the New Senior Credit Facility) of not more than 4.00 to 1.00, and

• As of the end of each fiscal quarter, a Fixed Charge Coverage Ratio (as defined in the New Senior Credit Facility) of not less than 1.20 to 1.00, and

• Various other financial covenants or mandatory prepayments (as defined in the New Senior Credit Facility)

The New Senior Credit Facility is subject to customary events of default and contemplates that the Company would be in default if, for any fiscal quarter (x) the average monthly D3 RIN price is less than $1.00 per RIN and (y) the consolidated average quarterly trailing EBITDA over the previous four quarters is less than $10,000.

The New Senior Credit Facility has a 24-month availability period during which only interest is payable quarterly. After the availability period, the Company is required to make quarterly principal payments equal to 1.25% of the total outstanding principal. A final $131,750 payment is due March 2031. The interest rate of the New Senior Credit Facility is 10.25%.

* * *

As of June 30, 2026, the Company was in compliance with all applicable financial covenants under the new credit agreement.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

19. The above statements identified in ¶¶17-18 were materially false and/or misleading, and failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company's business, operations, and prospects. Specifically, Defendants failed to disclose to investors: (1) the Company was experiencing, or was likely to experience, difficulty in meeting certain engineering review and operational requirements in placing its Turkey, North Carolina facility in service**;** (2) as a result of the foregoing, the Company would have difficulty in drawing down additional debt under its New Senior Credit Facility; and (3) that, as a result of the foregoing, Defendants' positive statements about the Company's business, operations, and prospects were materially misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis.

Disclosures at the End of the Class Period

20. On November 10, 2026, before the market opened, Montauk disclosed it is unable to timely file its upcoming 10-Q "as a result of ongoing negotiations with the lender under the Company's New Senior Credit Facility Agreement." The Company further explained that "***[i]n October 2026, the Company experienced difficulty in meeting certain engineering review and operational requirements in placing its Turkey, North Carolina facility in service***, which has impacted its ability to draw down additional debt under its New Senior Credit Facility." Specifically, the Company filed a Form NT 10-Q with the SEC which stated as follows, in relevant part:

> Montauk Renewables, Inc. (the "Company") is unable, without unreasonable effort or expense, to file its Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended September 30, 2026 ("Q3 Form 10-Q") within the prescribed timeframe as a result of ongoing negotiations with the lender under the Company's New Senior Credit Facility Agreement ("New Senior Credit Facility"). In October 2026, the Company experienced difficulty in meeting certain engineering review and operational requirements in placing its Turkey, North Carolina facility in service, which has impacted its ability to draw down additional debt under its New Senior Credit Facility. As a result, the Company is engaged in discussions with the lender of the New Senior Credit Facility to renegotiate the terms of the New Senior Credit Facility, including obtaining an amendment to borrow additional debt and

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

> temporarily forbear and standstill certain debt covenant requirements, and are in discussions with its Board of Directors on potential additional shareholder financing dedicated to the development of the Turkey, North Carolina facility. There can be no assurance that the Company will be successful in obtaining relief under its New Senior Credit Facility or in raising any additional financing.

21. On this news, the Company's share price fell $1.59, or 57.2%, to close at $1.19 per share on November 10, 2026, on unusually heavy trading volume.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

22. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a class, consisting of all persons and entities that purchased or otherwise acquired Montauk securities between August 5, 2026 and November 9, 2026, inclusive, and who were damaged thereby (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class are Defendants, the officers and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns, and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

23. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, Montauk's shares actively traded on the NASDAQ. 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 at least hundreds or thousands of members in the proposed Class. Millions of Montauk shares were traded publicly during the Class Period on the NASDAQ. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by Montauk 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.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

(a) whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as alleged herein;

(b) whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during the Class Period omitted and/or misrepresented material facts about the business, operations, and prospects of Montauk; and

(c) to what extent the members of the Class have sustained damages and the proper measure of damages.

27. 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 makes 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.

UNDISCLOSED ADVERSE FACTS

28. The market for Montauk's securities was open, well-developed and efficient at all relevant times. As a result of these materially false and/or misleading statements, and/or failures to disclose, Montauk's securities traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

Plaintiff and other members of the Class purchased or otherwise acquired Montauk's securities relying upon the integrity of the market price of the Company's securities and market information relating to Montauk, and have been damaged thereby.

29. During the Class Period, Defendants materially misled the investing public, thereby inflating the price of Montauk's securities, by publicly issuing false and/or misleading statements and/or omitting to disclose material facts necessary to make Defendants' statements, as set forth herein, not false and/or misleading. The statements and omissions were materially false and/or misleading because they failed to disclose material adverse information and/or misrepresented the truth about Montauk's business, operations, and prospects as alleged herein.

30. At all relevant times, the material misrepresentations and omissions particularized in this Complaint directly or proximately caused or were a substantial contributing cause of the damages sustained by Plaintiff and other members of the Class. As described herein, during the Class Period, Defendants made or caused to be made a series of materially false and/or misleading statements about Montauk's financial well-being and prospects. These material misstatements and/or omissions had the cause and effect of creating in the market an unrealistically positive assessment of the Company and its financial well-being and prospects, thus causing the Company's securities to be overvalued and artificially inflated at all relevant times. Defendants' materially false and/or misleading statements during the Class Period resulted in Plaintiff and other members of the Class purchasing the Company's securities at artificially inflated prices, thus causing the damages complained of herein when the truth was revealed.

LOSS CAUSATION

31. Defendants' wrongful conduct, as alleged herein, directly and proximately caused the economic loss suffered by Plaintiff and the Class.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

32. During the Class Period, Plaintiff and the Class purchased Montauk's securities at artificially inflated prices and were damaged thereby. The price of the Company's securities significantly declined when the misrepresentations made to the market, and/or the information alleged herein to have been concealed from the market, and/or the effects thereof, were revealed, causing investors' losses.

SCIENTER ALLEGATIONS

33. As alleged herein, Defendants acted with scienter since Defendants knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of the Company were materially false and/or misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance or dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the federal securities laws. As set forth elsewhere herein in detail, the Individual Defendants, by virtue of their receipt of information reflecting the true facts regarding Montauk, their control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of Montauk's allegedly materially misleading misstatements and/or their associations with the Company which made them privy to confidential proprietary information concerning Montauk, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

APPLICABILITY OF PRESUMPTION OF RELIANCE

(FRAUD-ON-THE-MARKET DOCTRINE)

34. The market for Montauk's securities was open, well-developed and efficient at all relevant times. As a result of the materially false and/or misleading statements and/or failures to disclose, Montauk's securities traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period. On September 29, 2026, the Company's share price closed at a Class Period high of $2.94 per share. Plaintiff and other members of the Class purchased or otherwise acquired the Company's securities

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

relying upon the integrity of the market price of Montauk's securities and market information relating to Montauk, and have been damaged thereby.

35. During the Class Period, the artificial inflation of Montauk's shares was caused by the material misrepresentations and/or omissions particularized in this Complaint causing the damages sustained by Plaintiff and other members of the Class. As described herein, during the Class Period, Defendants made or caused to be made a series of materially false and/or misleading statements about Montauk's business, prospects, and operations. These material misstatements and/or omissions created an unrealistically positive assessment of Montauk and its business, operations, and prospects, thus causing the price of the Company's securities to be artificially inflated at all relevant times, and when disclosed, negatively affected the value of the Company shares. Defendants' materially false and/or misleading statements during the Class Period resulted in Plaintiff and other members of the Class purchasing the Company's securities at such artificially inflated prices, and each of them has been damaged as a result.

36. At all relevant times, the market for Montauk's securities was an efficient market for the following reasons, among others:

(a) Montauk shares met the requirements for listing, and was listed and actively traded on the NASDAQ, a highly efficient and automated market;

(b) As a regulated issuer, Montauk filed periodic public reports with the SEC and/or the NASDAQ;

(c) Montauk regularly communicated with public investors via established market communication mechanisms, including through regular dissemination of press releases on the national circuits of major newswire services and through other wide-ranging public disclosures, such as communications with the financial press and other similar reporting services; and/or

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

(d) Montauk was followed by securities analysts employed by brokerage firms who wrote reports about the Company, and these reports were distributed to the sales force and certain customers of their respective brokerage firms. Each of these reports was publicly available and entered the public marketplace.

37. As a result of the foregoing, the market for Montauk's securities promptly digested current information regarding Montauk from all publicly available sources and reflected such information in Montauk's share price. Under these circumstances, all purchasers of Montauk's securities during the Class Period suffered similar injury through their purchase of Montauk's securities at artificially inflated prices and a presumption of reliance applies.

38. A Class-wide presumption of reliance is also appropriate in this action under the Supreme Court's holding in *Affiliated Ute Citizens of Utah v. United States*, 406 U.S. 128 (1972), because the Class's claims are, in large part, grounded on Defendants' material misstatements and/or omissions. Because this action involves Defendants' failure to disclose material adverse information regarding the Company's business operations and financial prospects—information that Defendants were obligated to disclose—positive proof of reliance is not a prerequisite to recovery. All that is necessary is that the facts withheld be material in the sense that a reasonable investor might have considered them important in making investment decisions. Given the importance of the Class Period material misstatements and omissions set forth above, that requirement is satisfied here.

NO SAFE HARBOR

39. The statutory safe harbor provided for forward-looking statements under certain circumstances does not apply to any of the allegedly false statements pleaded in this Complaint. The statements alleged to be false and misleading herein all relate to then-existing facts and conditions. In addition, to the extent certain of the statements alleged to be false may be

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

characterized as forward looking, they were not identified as "forward-looking statements" when made and there were no meaningful cautionary statements identifying important factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from those in the purportedly forward-looking statements. In the alternative, to the extent that the statutory safe harbor is determined to apply to any forward-looking statements pleaded herein, Defendants are liable for those false forward-looking statements because at the time each of those forward-looking statements was made, the speaker had actual knowledge that the forward-looking statement was materially false or misleading, and/or the forward-looking statement was authorized or approved by an executive officer of Montauk who knew that the statement was false when made.

FIRST CLAIM

Violation of Section 10(b) of The Exchange Act and

Rule 10b-5 Promulgated Thereunder

Against All Defendants

40. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

41. During the Class Period, Defendants carried out a plan, scheme and course of conduct which was intended to and, throughout the Class Period, did: (i) deceive the investing public, including Plaintiff and other Class members, as alleged herein; and (ii) cause Plaintiff and other members of the Class to purchase Montauk's securities at artificially inflated prices. In furtherance of this unlawful scheme, plan and course of conduct, Defendants, and each defendant, took the actions set forth herein.

42. Defendants (i) employed devices, schemes, and artifices to defraud; (ii) made untrue statements of material fact and/or omitted to state material facts necessary to make the statements not misleading; and (iii) engaged in acts, practices, and a course of business which

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

operated as a fraud and deceit upon the purchasers of the Company's securities in an effort to maintain artificially high market prices for Montauk's securities in violation of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5. All Defendants are sued either as primary participants in the wrongful and illegal conduct charged herein or as controlling persons as alleged below.

43. Defendants, individually and in concert, directly and indirectly, by the use, means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce and/or of the mails, engaged and participated in a continuous course of conduct to conceal adverse material information about Montauk's financial well-being and prospects, as specified herein.

44. Defendants employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud, while in possession of material adverse non-public information and engaged in acts, practices, and a course of conduct as alleged herein in an effort to assure investors of Montauk's value and performance and continued substantial growth, which included the making of, or the participation in the making of, untrue statements of material facts and/or omitting to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made about Montauk and its business operations and future prospects in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, as set forth more particularly herein, and engaged in transactions, practices and a course of business which operated as a fraud and deceit upon the purchasers of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

45. Each of the Individual Defendants' primary liability and controlling person liability arises from the following facts: (i) the Individual Defendants were high-level executives and/or directors at the Company during the Class Period and members of the Company's management team or had control thereof; (ii) each of these defendants, by virtue of their responsibilities and activities as a senior officer and/or director of the Company, was privy to and participated in the creation, development and reporting of the Company's internal budgets, plans, projections and/or

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

reports; (iii) each of these defendants enjoyed significant personal contact and familiarity with the other defendants and was advised of, and had access to, other members of the Company's management team, internal reports and other data and information about the Company's finances, operations, and sales at all relevant times; and (iv) each of these defendants was aware of the Company's dissemination of information to the investing public which they knew and/or recklessly disregarded was materially false and misleading.

46. Defendants had actual knowledge of the misrepresentations and/or omissions of material facts set forth herein, or acted with reckless disregard for the truth in that they failed to ascertain and to disclose such facts, even though such facts were available to them. Such defendants' material misrepresentations and/or omissions were done knowingly or recklessly and for the purpose and effect of concealing Montauk's financial well-being and prospects from the investing public and supporting the artificially inflated price of its securities. As demonstrated by Defendants' overstatements and/or misstatements of the Company's business, operations, financial well-being, and prospects throughout the Class Period, Defendants, if they did not have actual knowledge of the misrepresentations and/or omissions alleged, were reckless in failing to obtain such knowledge by deliberately refraining from taking those steps necessary to discover whether those statements were false or misleading.

47. As a result of the dissemination of the materially false and/or misleading information and/or failure to disclose material facts, as set forth above, the market price of Montauk's securities was artificially inflated during the Class Period. In ignorance of the fact that market prices of the Company's securities were artificially inflated, and relying directly or indirectly on the false and misleading statements made by Defendants, or upon the integrity of the market in which the securities trades, and/or in the absence of material adverse information that

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

was known to or recklessly disregarded by Defendants, but not disclosed in public statements by Defendants during the Class Period, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class acquired Montauk's securities during the Class Period at artificially high prices and were damaged thereby.

48. At the time of said misrepresentations and/or omissions, Plaintiff and other members of the Class were ignorant of their falsity, and believed them to be true. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class and the marketplace known the truth regarding the problems that Montauk was experiencing, which were not disclosed by Defendants, Plaintiff and other members of the Class would not have purchased or otherwise acquired their Montauk securities, or, if they had acquired such securities during the Class Period, they would not have done so at the artificially inflated prices which they paid.

49. By virtue of the foregoing, Defendants violated Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder.

50. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class suffered damages in connection with their respective purchases and sales of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

SECOND CLAIM

Violation of Section 20(a) of The Exchange Act

Against the Individual Defendants

51. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

52. Individual Defendants acted as controlling persons of Montauk within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act as alleged herein. By virtue of their high-level positions and their ownership and contractual rights, participation in, and/or awareness of the Company's operations and intimate knowledge of the false financial statements filed by the Company with the

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

SEC and disseminated to the investing public, Individual Defendants had the power to influence and control and did influence and control, directly or indirectly, the decision-making of the Company, including the content and dissemination of the various statements which Plaintiff contends are false and misleading. Individual Defendants were provided with or had unlimited access to copies of the Company's reports, press releases, public filings, and other statements alleged by Plaintiff to be misleading prior to and/or shortly after these statements were issued and had the ability to prevent the issuance of the statements or cause the statements to be corrected.

53. In particular, Individual Defendants had direct and supervisory involvement in the day-to-day operations of the Company and, therefore, had the power to control or influence the particular transactions giving rise to the securities violations as alleged herein, and exercised the same.

54. As set forth above, Montauk and Individual Defendants each violated Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 by their acts and omissions as alleged in this Complaint. By virtue of their position as controlling persons, Individual Defendants are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the Class suffered damages in connection with their purchases of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

(a) Determining that this action is a proper class action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

(b) Awarding compensatory damages in favor of Plaintiff and the other Class members against all defendants, jointly and severally, for all damages sustained as a result of Defendants' wrongdoing, in an amount to be proven at trial, including interest thereon;

(c) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable costs and expenses incurred in this action, including counsel fees and expert fees; and

(d) Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: ___, 2026

GLANCY PRONGAY WOLKE & ROTTER LLP

By: _____
Rebecca Dawson
745 5th Avenue, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10151
Telephone: (213) 521-8007
Facsimile: (212) 884-0988
Email: rdawson@glancylaw.com

Robert V. Prongay
Charles H. Linehan
1925 Century Park East, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 201-9150
Facsimile: (310) 201-9160
clinehan@glancylaw.com

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH
Howard G. Smith
3070 Bristol Pike, Suite 112
Bensalem PA 19020
Telephone: (215) 638-4847
Facsimile: (215) 638-4867

Counsel for Plaintiff _____

LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD G. SMITH