

POMERANTZ LLP

Jennifer Pafiti (SBN 282790)
468 North Camden Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Telephone: (818) 532-6499
E-mail: jpafiti@pomlaw.com
- additional counsel on signature page -

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

LOGAN HESSEFORT, Individually and on
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUPER MICRO COMPUTER, INC.,
CHARLES LIANG and HOWARD
HIDESHIMA,

Defendants

Case No.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL
SECURITIES LAWS**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Logan Hessefort (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated, by Plaintiff’s undersigned attorneys, for Plaintiff’s complaint against Defendants (defined below), alleges the following based upon personal knowledge as to Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s own acts, and information and belief as to all other matters, based upon, *inter alia*, the investigation conducted by and through Plaintiff’s attorneys, which included, among other things, a review of the Defendants’ public documents, conference calls and announcements made by Defendants, United States Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) filings, wire and press releases published by and regarding Super Micro Computer, Inc. (“Super Micro” or the “Company”), analysts’ reports and advisories about the Company, and information readily obtainable on the Internet. Plaintiff believes that substantial

1 evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for
2 discovery.

3 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

4 1. This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of all persons other
5 than Defendants who purchased or otherwise acquired the securities of Super Micro between January
6 27, 2017 and January 30, 2018, both dates inclusive (the “Class Period”). Plaintiff seeks to recover
7 compensable damages caused by Defendants’ violations of the federal securities laws and to pursue
8 remedies under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”)
9 and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder.
10

11 2. Super Micro Computer, Inc. designs, develops, manufactures and sells server solutions
12 based on modular and open-standard architecture. The Company’s products include servers,
13 motherboards, chassis, and accessories.
14

15 3. Founded in 1993, the Company is headquartered in San Jose, California, and its common
16 stock trades on the NASDAQ Global Select Market (“NASDAQ”) under the ticker symbol “SMCI.”
17

18 4. Throughout the Class Period, Defendants made materially false and misleading
19 statements regarding the Company’s business, operational and compliance policies. Specifically,
20 Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (i) Super Micro’s
21 financial statements contained accounting errors, including errors with respect to one of the Company’s
22 sales transactions; (ii) as such, the Company’s internal controls were not effective; (iii) Super Micro
23 lacked the capability to timely review and assess the impact of the foregoing issues; and (iv) as a result,
24 Super Micro’s public statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times.
25

26 5. On August 29, 2017, post-market, Super Micro filed a Notice of Late Filing with the
27 SEC, reporting that the Company “is not in a position to file its Form 10-K for fiscal year ended June
28 30, 2017 (the “Form 10-K”), in a timely manner because the Registrant cannot complete the Form 10-K

1 in a timely manner without unreasonable effort or expense” and that “[a]dditional time is needed for the
2 Company to compile and analyze certain information and documentation and complete preparation of
3 its financial statements.”

4 6. On this news, Super Micro’s share price fell \$1.35, or 4.96%, to close at \$25.85 on
5 August 30, 2017.

6 7. Then, on October 26, 2017, post-market, Super Micro reaffirmed its delay in filing the
7 10-K, stating that “[i]n connection with the in-process audit of the Company’s financial results for the
8 year ended June 30, 2017, a sales transaction was subject to additional inquiry and review”. Super
9 Micro advised investors that the transaction at issue “was originally recorded as revenue during the
10 quarter ended December 31, 2016. However, prior to review by the Company’s independent auditors
11 and prior to the Company’s public announcement of its results for the quarter, the recognition of
12 revenue was reversed and the revenue was subsequently recognized in the quarter ended March 31,
13 2017.”

14 8. On this news, Super Micro’s share price fell \$1.23, or 5.65%, to close at \$20.48 on
15 October 27, 2017.

16 9. On January 30, 2018, post-market, Super Micro announced that the Company’s “Audit
17 Committee has completed the previously disclosed investigation,” and that “[a]dditional time is
18 required to analyze the impact, if any, of the results of the investigation on the Company’s historical
19 financial statements, as well as to conduct additional reviews before the Company will be able to
20 finalize its Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017.” Super Micro also
21 announced the resignations of three executives: Wally Liaw, Senior Vice President of International
22 Sales; Phidias Chou, Senior Vice President of Worldwide Sales; and Howard Hideshima, Senior Vice
23 President and Chief Financial Officer (“CFO”).
24
25
26
27
28

1 10. Following this news, Super Micro's share price fell \$1.83, or 7.4%, to close at \$22.83 on
2 January 31, 2018.

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

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**
7

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

11 13. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. §1331
12 and §27 of the Exchange Act.

13 14. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to §27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C.
14 §78aa) and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b). Super Micro's principal executive offices are located within this
15 Judicial District.
16

17 15. In connection with the acts, conduct and other wrongs alleged in this Complaint,
18 Defendants, directly or indirectly, used the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce,
19 including but not limited to, the United States mail, interstate telephone communications and the
20 facilities of the national securities exchange.
21

22 **PARTIES**

23 16. Plaintiff, as set forth in the accompanying Certification, purchased Super Micro
24 securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon the revelation of
25 the alleged corrective disclosure.
26
27
28

1 17. Defendant Super Micro is incorporated in California, with principal executive offices
2 located at 980 Rock Avenue, San Jose, California 95131. Super Micro's common stock trades on the
3 NASDAQ under the ticker symbol "SMCI."

4 18. Defendant Charles Liang has served at all relevant times as the Company's Chief
5 Executive Officer ("CEO") and President.

6 19. Defendant Howard Hideshima served at all relevant times as the Company's Chief
7 Financial Officer ("CFO") and Senior Vice President, until his resignation, announced on January 30,
8 2018.

9 20. The Defendants referenced above in ¶¶ 18-19 are sometimes referred to herein
10 collectively as the "Individual Defendants."

11 21. The Individual Defendants possessed the power and authority to control the contents of
12 Super Micro's SEC filings, press releases, and other market communications. The Individual
13 Defendants were provided with copies of the Company's SEC filings and press releases alleged herein
14 to be misleading prior to or shortly after their issuance and had the ability and opportunity to prevent
15 their issuance or to cause them to be corrected. Because of their positions with the Company, and their
16 access to material information available to them but not to the public, the Individual Defendants knew
17 that the adverse facts specified herein had not been disclosed to and were being concealed from the
18 public, and that the positive representations being made were then materially false and misleading. The
19 Individual Defendants are liable for the false statements and omissions pleaded herein.
20
21
22

23 **SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS**

24 **Background**

25 22. Super Micro designs, develops, manufactures and sells server solutions based on
26 modular and open-standard architecture. The Company's products include servers, motherboards,
27 chassis, and accessories.
28

Materially False and Misleading Statements Issued During the Class Period

1
2 23. The Class Period begins on January 27, 2017, the day after Super Micro issued a press
3 release and filed a Current Report on Form 8-K with the SEC, announcing the Company’s financial and
4 operating results for the quarter ended December 31, 2016 (the “Q2 2017 8-K”). For the quarter, Super
5 Micro reported net income of \$22.0 million, or \$0.43 per diluted share, compared to net income of
6 \$34.7 million, or \$0.67 per diluted share, for the same period in the prior year. Super Micro also
7 reported net sales of “\$652.0 million, up 23.3% from \$529.0 million in the first quarter of fiscal year
8 2017.”
9

10 24. On February 7, 2017, Super Micro filed a Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q with the SEC,
11 reiterating the financial and operating results previously reported in the Q2 2017 8-K (the “Q2 2017
12 10-Q”).
13

14 25. The Q2 2017 10-Q contained signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of
15 2002 (“SOX”) by the Individual Defendants, stating that the Q2 2017 10-Q “fully complies with the
16 requirements of Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the information
17 contained in such Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial
18 condition and results of operations of Super Micro Computer, Inc.”
19

20 26. On April 27, 2017, Super Micro issued a press release and filed a Current Report on
21 Form 8-K with the SEC, announcing the Company’s financial and operating results for the quarter
22 ended March 31, 2017 (the “Q3 2017 8-K”). For the quarter, Super Micro reported net income of \$16.7
23 million, or \$0.32 per diluted share, compared to net income of \$16.7, or \$0.32 per diluted share for the
24 same period in the prior year. Super Micro also reported net sales of “\$631.1 million, down 3.2% from
25 \$652.0 million in the second quarter of fiscal year 2017.”
26
27
28

1 27. On May 10, 2017, Super Micro filed a Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q with the SEC,
2 reiterating the financial and operating results previously reported in the Q3 2017 8-K (the “Q3 2017
3 10-Q”).

4 28. The Q3 2017 10-Q contained signed certifications pursuant to SOX by the Individual
5 Defendants, stating that the Q3 2017 10-Q “fully complies with the requirements of Section 13(a) or
6 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the information contained in such Quarterly Report
7 on Form 10-Q fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations
8 of Super Micro Computer, Inc.”

9 29. The statements referenced in ¶¶ 23-28 above were materially false and/or misleading
10 because they misrepresented and/or failed to disclose the following adverse facts pertaining to the
11 Company’s business, operational and financial results, which were known to Defendants or recklessly
12 disregarded by them. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to
13 disclose that: (i) Super Micro’s financial statements contained accounting errors, including errors with
14 respect to one of the Company’s sales transactions; (ii) as such, the Company’s internal controls were
15 not effective; (iii) Super Micro lacked the capability to timely review and assess the impact of the
16 foregoing issues; and (iv) as a result, Super Micro’s public statements were materially false and
17 misleading at all relevant times.
18
19
20

21 **The Truth Begins to Emerge**

22 30. On August 29, 2017, post-market, Super Micro filed a Notice of Late Filing with the
23 SEC, reporting that the Company “is not in a position to file its Form 10-K for fiscal year ended June
24 30, 2017 (the “Form 10-K”), in a timely manner because the Registrant cannot complete the Form 10-K
25 in a timely manner without unreasonable effort or expense” and that “[a]dditional time is needed for the
26 Company to compile and analyze certain information and documentation and complete preparation of
27 its financial statements.”
28

1 31. On this news, Super Micro's share price fell \$1.35, or 4.96%, to close at \$25.85 on
2 August 30, 2017.

3 32. Then, On October 26, 2017, post-market, Super Micro reaffirmed its delay in filing the
4 10-K, stating:

5 As previously disclosed by the Company, additional time is needed for the Company to
6 compile and analyze certain information and documentation and finalize its financial
7 statements, as well as complete a related audit committee review, in order to permit the
8 Company's independent registered public accounting firm to complete its audit of the
9 financial statements to be incorporated in the Form 10-K and complete its audit of the
10 Company's internal controls over financial reporting as of June 30, 2017.

11 In connection with the in-process audit of the Company's financial results for the year
12 ended June 30, 2017, a sales transaction was subject to additional inquiry and review.
13 The transaction in question was originally recorded as revenue during the quarter ended
14 December 31, 2016. However, prior to review by the Company's independent auditors
15 and prior to the Company's public announcement of its results for the quarter, the
16 recognition of revenue was reversed and the revenue was subsequently recognized in the
17 quarter ended March 31, 2017. When the audit committee was made aware of this
18 transaction, the Audit Committee of the Company's Board of Directors initiated an
19 independent investigation to determine whether there were any similar transactions and if
20 so, whether such transactions were properly accounted for. Due to the volume of data to
21 be reviewed to complete the investigation, the Company was unable to file its Form 10-K
22 on a timely basis.

23 33. On this news, Super Micro's share price fell \$1.23, or 5.65%, to close at \$20.48 on
24 October 27, 2017.

25 34. On January 30, 2018, Super Micro announced that the Audit Committee had completed
26 its investigation. The Company advised investors:

27 *Additional time is required to analyze the impact, if any, of the results of the*
28 *investigation on the Company's historical financial statements*, as well as to conduct
additional reviews before the Company will be able to finalize its Annual Report on Form
10-K for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017 (the "Form 10-K"). *The Company is unable*
at this time to provide a date as to when the Form 10-K will be filed or to determine
whether the Company's historical financial statements will be adjusted or, if so, the
amount of any such adjustment(s) and what periods any such adjustments may impact.
The Company intends to file its Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q for the quarters ended
September 30 and December 31, 2017 promptly after filing the Form 10-K.
(Emphasis added.)

1 35. Following this news, Super Micro's share price fell \$1.83, or 7.4%, to close at \$22.83 on
2 January 31, 2018.

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

6 **PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**
7

8 37. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
9 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a Class, consisting of all those who purchased or otherwise acquired Super
10 Micro securities traded on the NASDAQ during the Class Period (the "Class"); and were damaged upon
11 the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures. Excluded from the Class are Defendants herein, the
12 officers and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and
13 their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had
14 a controlling interest.
15

16 38. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
17 Throughout the Class Period, Super Micro securities were actively traded on the NASDAQ. While the
18 exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can be ascertained only through
19 appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are hundreds or thousands of members in the
20 proposed Class. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records
21 maintained by Super Micro or its transfer agent and may be notified of the pendency of this action by
22 mail, using the form of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class actions.
23

24 39. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as all members of
25 the Class are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in violation of federal law that is
26 complained of herein.
27
28

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

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

- 7 • whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as alleged
8 herein;
- 9 • whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during the Class
10 Period misrepresented material facts about the financial condition, business,
11 operations, and management of Super Micro;
- 12 • whether Defendants caused Super Micro to issue false and misleading financial
13 statements during the Class Period;
- 14 • whether Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and
15 misleading financial statements;
- 16 • whether the prices of Super Micro securities during the Class Period were
17 artificially inflated because of Defendants' conduct complained of herein; and
- 18 • whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, what is the
19 proper measure of damages.

20 42. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient
21 adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is impracticable. Furthermore, as the
22 damages suffered by individual Class members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of
23 individual litigation make it impossible for members of the Class to individually redress the wrongs
24 done to them. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

25 43. Plaintiff will rely, in part, upon the presumption of reliance established by the fraud-on-
26 the-market doctrine in that:

- 1 • Defendants made public misrepresentations or failed to disclose material facts during the Class Period;
- 2 • the omissions and misrepresentations were material;
- 3 • Super Micro securities are traded in efficient markets;
- 4 • the Company's shares were liquid and traded with moderate to heavy volume during the Class Period;
- 5 • the Company traded on the NASDAQ, and was covered by multiple analysts;
- 6 • the misrepresentations and omissions alleged would tend to induce a reasonable investor to misjudge the value of the Company's securities; and
- 7 • Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased and/or sold Super Micro securities between the time the Defendants failed to disclose or misrepresented material facts and the time the true facts were disclosed, without knowledge of the omitted or misrepresented facts.

8
9
10
11
12
13 44. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to a
14 presumption of reliance upon the integrity of the market.

15 45. Alternatively, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to the presumption of
16 reliance established by the Supreme Court in *Affiliated Ute Citizens of the State of Utah v. United*
17 *States*, 406 U.S. 128, 92 S. Ct. 2430 (1972), as Defendants omitted material information in their Class
18 Period statements in violation of a duty to disclose such information, as detailed above.

19
20 **COUNT I**

21 **Violation of Section 10(b) of The Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5**
22 **Against All Defendants**

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

25 47. This Count is asserted against Super Micro and the Individual Defendants and is based
26 upon Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder
27 by the SEC.
28

1 48. During the Class Period, Super Micro and the Individual Defendants, individually and in
2 concert, directly or indirectly, disseminated or approved the false statements specified above, which
3 they knew or deliberately disregarded were misleading in that they contained misrepresentations and
4 failed to disclose material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the
5 circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

6 49. Super Micro and the Individual Defendants violated §10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule
7 10b-5 in that they:

- 8
- 9 • employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud;
 - 10 • made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material facts
11 necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances
12 under which they were made, not misleading; or
 - 13 • engaged in acts, practices and a course of business that operated as a fraud or
14 deceit upon plaintiff and others similarly situated in connection with their
15 purchases of Super Micro securities during the Class Period.

16 50. Super Micro and the Individual Defendants acted with scienter in that they knew that the
17 public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of Super Micro were materially
18 false and misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the
19 investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated, or acquiesced in the issuance or
20 dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the securities laws. These
21 Defendants by virtue of their receipt of information reflecting the true facts of Super Micro, their
22 control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of Super Micro allegedly materially misleading
23 statements, and/or their associations with the Company which made them privy to confidential
24 proprietary information concerning Super Micro, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

25 51. Individual Defendants, who are the senior officers and/or directors of the Company, had
26 actual knowledge of the material omissions and/or the falsity of the material statements set forth above,
27 and intended to deceive Plaintiff and the other members of the Class, or, in the alternative, acted with
28

1 reckless disregard for the truth when they failed to ascertain and disclose the true facts in the statements
2 made by them or other Super Micro personnel to members of the investing public, including Plaintiff
3 and the Class.

4 52. As a result of the foregoing, the market price of Super Micro securities was artificially
5 inflated during the Class Period. In ignorance of the falsity of Super Micro's and the Individual
6 Defendants' statements, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class relied on the statements described
7 above and/or the integrity of the market price of Super Micro securities during the Class Period in
8 purchasing Super Micro securities at prices that were artificially inflated as a result of Super Micro's
9 and the Individual Defendants' false and misleading statements.

10
11 53. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class been aware that the market price of
12 Super Micro securities had been artificially and falsely inflated by Super Micro's and the Individual
13 Defendants' misleading statements and by the material adverse information which Super Micro's and
14 the Individual Defendants did not disclose, they would not have purchased Super Micro's securities at
15 the artificially inflated prices that they did, or at all.

16
17 54. As a result of the wrongful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff and other members of the
18 Class have suffered damages in an amount to be established at trial.

19
20 55. By reason of the foregoing, Super Micro and the Individual Defendants have violated
21 Section 10(b) of the 1934 Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder and are liable to the plaintiff and
22 the other members of the Class for substantial damages which they suffered in connection with their
23 purchase of Super Micro securities during the Class Period.

24 **COUNT II**

25 **Violation of Section 20(a) of The Exchange Act Against The Individual Defendants**

26
27 56. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing
28 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

1 57. During the Class Period, the Individual Defendants participated in the operation and
2 management of Super Micro, and conducted and participated, directly and indirectly, in the conduct of
3 Super Micro's business affairs. Because of their senior positions, they knew the adverse non-public
4 information regarding the Company's inadequate internal safeguards in data security protocols.

5 58. As officers and/or directors of a publicly owned company, the Individual Defendants had
6 a duty to disseminate accurate and truthful information with respect to Super Micro's financial
7 condition and results of operations, and to correct promptly any public statements issued by Super
8 Micro which had become materially false or misleading.

9 59. Because of their positions of control and authority as senior officers, the Individual
10 Defendants were able to, and did, control the contents of the various reports, press releases and public
11 filings which Super Micro disseminated in the marketplace during the Class Period. Throughout the
12 Class Period, the Individual Defendants exercised their power and authority to cause Super Micro to
13 engage in the wrongful acts complained of herein. The Individual Defendants therefore, were
14 "controlling persons" of Super Micro within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. In this
15 capacity, they participated in the unlawful conduct alleged which artificially inflated the market price of
16 Super Micro securities.
17

18 60. By reason of the above conduct, the Individual Defendants are liable pursuant to Section
19 20(a) of the Exchange Act for the violations committed by Super Micro.
20

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:
23

24 A. Determining that the instant action may be maintained as a class action under Rule 23 of
25 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and certifying Plaintiff as the Class representative;

26 B. Requiring Defendants to pay damages sustained by Plaintiff and the Class by reason of
27 the acts and transactions alleged herein;
28

1 C. Awarding Plaintiff and the other members of the Class prejudgment and post- judgment
2 interest, as well as their reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees and other costs; and

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

4 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

5 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

6 Dated: February 8, 2018

7 Respectfully submitted,

8 **POMERANTZ LLP**

9 By: /s/ Jennifer Pafiti
10 Jennifer Pafiti (SBN 282790)
11 468 North Camden Drive
12 Beverly Hills, CA 90210
13 Telephone: (818) 532-6499
14 E-mail: jpafiti@pomlaw.com

15 **POMERANTZ, LLP**

16 Jeremy A. Lieberman
17 J. Alexander Hood II
18 600 Third Avenue, 20th Floor
19 New York, New York 10016
20 Telephone: (212) 661-1100
21 Facsimile: (212) 661-8665
22 E-mail: jalieberman@pomlaw.com
23 E-mail: ahood@pomlaw.com

24 **POMERANTZ LLP**

25 Patrick V. Dahlstrom
26 Ten South La Salle Street, Suite 3505
27 Chicago, Illinois 60603
28 Telephone: (312) 377-1181
Facsimile: (312) 377-1184
E-mail: pdahlstrom@pomlaw.com

**BRONSTEIN, GEWIRTZ
& GROSSMAN, LLC**

Peretz Bronstein
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4600
New York, NY 10165
(212) 697-6484
peretz@bgandg.com


Attorneys for Plaintiff

**CERTIFICATION PURSUANT
TO FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS**

1. I, Logan Hessefort, make this declaration pursuant to Section 27(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and/or Section 21D(a)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) as amended by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995.
2. I have reviewed a Complaint against Super Micro Computer, Inc. (“Super Micro” or the “Company”) and, authorize the filing of a comparable complaint on my behalf.
3. I did not purchase or acquire Super Micro securities at the direction of plaintiffs’ counsel or in order to participate in any private action arising under the Securities Act or Exchange Act.
4. I am willing to serve as a representative party on behalf of a Class of investors who purchased or acquired Super Micro securities during the class period, including providing testimony at deposition and trial, if necessary. I understand that the Court has the authority to select the most adequate lead plaintiff in this action.
5. To the best of my current knowledge, the attached sheet lists all of my transactions in Super Micro securities during the Class Period as specified in the Complaint.
6. During the three-year period preceding the date on which this Certification is signed, I have not sought to serve as a representative party on behalf of a class under the federal securities laws.
7. I agree not to accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of the class as set forth in the Complaint, beyond my pro rata share of any recovery, except such reasonable costs and expenses directly relating to the representation of the class as ordered or approved by the Court.

8. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed 02/07/2018
(Date)


(Signature)

Logan Hessefort
(Type or Print Name)

SUPER MICRO COMPUTER, INC. (SMCI)

Hessefort, Logan

LIST OF PURCHASES AND SALES

| DATE | PURCHASE OR SALE | NUMBER OF SHARES/UNITS | PRICE PER SHARES/UNITS |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1/30/2018 | Purchase | 6 | \$24.2500 |