

Depository Receipts (“ADRs”) between July 18, 2014 and November 14, 2017, both dates inclusive (the “Class Period”), seeking to recover damages caused by defendants’ violations of the federal securities laws and to pursue remedies under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, against the Company and certain of its top officials.

2. Mitsubishi UFJ Financial Group, Inc. (MUFG) is a holding company established through the merger of Mitsubishi Tokyo Financial Group and UFJ Holdings. As a financial group, the Company provides a variety of financial and investment services including commercial banking, trust banking, international finance, and assets management services.

3. Founded in 1880, the Company is based in Tokyo, Japan, and its ADRs trade on the New York Stock Exchange (“NYSE”) under the ticker symbol “MTU.”

4. Throughout the Class Period, Defendants made materially false and misleading statements regarding the Company’s business, operational and compliance policies. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (i) MUFG does not properly scrutinize whether clients are evading U.S. sanctions; (ii) MUFG monitors clients’ transactions in a manner inconsistent with internal compliance regulations; and (iii) as a result of the foregoing, MUFG shares traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period, and class members suffered significant losses and damages.

5. On November 7, 2017, MUFG converted the New York state license of a bank branch in New York to a federal license, with approval from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (the “OCC”).

6. On November 15, 2017, citing a letter from the New York Department of Financial Services (“DFS”) to the OCC, *The Wall Street Journal* reported that MUFG’s license

conversion followed a report by an independent monitor that “the bank was ‘taking actions that are inconsistent with complying’ with a consent order it had agreed to in 2014 related to hiding illicit transactions involving Iran and other countries, including ‘the termination of a competent and cooperative Chief Compliance Officer’ in March and a ‘lack of transparency’ with the monitor about transaction data problems.” In its letter to the OCC, the DFS asserted that it “was not given any reasonable opportunity to provide any input whatsoever” into MUFG’s application for a federal banking license, and that “[t]he precipitous nature of this approval . . . is without precedent and raises significant questions as to both the process and substance of the OCC’s decision.”

7. On this news, MUFG’s American depository receipt price has fallen as much as \$0.21, or 3.16%, during intraday trading on November 15, 2017.

8. 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.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. The claims asserted herein arise under and pursuant to §§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).

10. 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.

11. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to §27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §78aa) and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b). MUFG’s ADRs trade on the NYSE, located within this Judicial District.

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

PARTIES

13. Plaintiff, as set forth in the attached Certification, acquired MUFU securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures.

14. Defendant MUFU is headquartered in Japan, with principal executive offices located at 7-1, Marunouchi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8330, Japan. MUFU's ADRs trade on the NYSE under the ticker symbol "MTU."

15. Defendant Nobuyuki Hirano ("Hirano") has served at all relevant times as the Company's Chief Executive Officer ("CEO"), President and Representative Director.

16. Defendant Muneaki Tokunari ("Tokunari") has served at all relevant times as the Company's Chief Financial Officer ("CFO"), Senior Managing Executive Officer and Director.

17. The defendants referenced above in ¶¶ [REDACTED] are sometimes referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants."

18. The Individual Defendants possessed the power and authority to control the contents of MUFU's SEC filings, press releases, and other market communications. The Individual Defendants were provided with copies of the Company's SEC filings 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 to cause them to be corrected. Because of their positions with the Company, and their access to material information available to them but not to

the public, 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 being made were then materially false and misleading. The Individual Defendants are liable for the false statements and omissions pleaded herein.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Background

19. Mitsubishi UFJ Financial Group, Inc. (MUFG) is a holding company established through the merger of Mitsubishi Tokyo Financial Group and UFJ Holdings. As a financial group, the Company provides a variety of financial and investment services including commercial banking, trust banking, international finance, and assets management services.

Materially False and Misleading Statements Issued During the Class Period

20. The statements referenced in ¶¶ [REDACTED] were materially false and misleading because defendants made false and/or misleading statements, as well as failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company's business, operational and compliance policies. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (i) MUFG does not properly scrutinize whether clients are evading U.S. sanctions; (ii) MUFG monitors clients' transactions in a manner inconsistent with internal compliance regulations; and (iii) as a result of the foregoing, MUFG shares traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period, and class members suffered significant losses and damages.

The Truth Begins to Emerge

21. On November 7, 2017, MUFG converted the New York state license of a bank branch in New York to a federal license, with approval from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (the "OCC").

22. On November 15, 2017, citing a letter from the New York Department of Financial Services (“DFS”) to the OCC, *The Wall Street Journal* reported that MUFG’s license conversion followed a report by an independent monitor that “the bank was ‘taking actions that are inconsistent with complying’ with a consent order it had agreed to in 2014 related to hiding illicit transactions involving Iran and other countries, including ‘the termination of a competent and cooperative Chief Compliance Officer’ in March and a ‘lack of transparency’ with the monitor about transaction data problems.” In its letter to the OCC, the DFS asserted that it “was not given any reasonable opportunity to provide any input whatsoever” into MUFG’s application for a federal banking license, and that “[t]he precipitous nature of this approval . . . is without precedent and raises significant questions as to both the process and substance of the OCC’s decision.”

23. On this news, MUFG’s American depositary receipt price has fallen as much as \$0.21, or 3.16%, during intraday trading on November 15, 2017.

24. 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.

PLAINTIFF’S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. 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 those who purchased or otherwise acquired MUFG securities during the Class Period (the “Class”); and were damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures. Excluded from the Class are defendants herein, 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.

26. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, MUFG securities were actively traded on the NYSE. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can be ascertained only through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are hundreds or thousands of members in the proposed Class. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by MUFG 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.

27. 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.

28. 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. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to or in conflict with those of the Class.

29. 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:

- whether the federal securities laws were violated by defendants' acts as alleged herein;
- whether statements made by defendants to the investing public during the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the business, operations and management of MUFG;

- whether the Individual Defendants caused MUFG to issue false and misleading financial statements during the Class Period;
- whether defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and misleading financial statements;
- whether the prices of MUFG securities during the Class Period were artificially inflated because of the defendants' conduct complained of herein; and
- whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, what is the proper measure of damages.

30. 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.

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

- defendants made public misrepresentations or failed to disclose material facts during the Class Period;
- the omissions and misrepresentations were material;
- MUFG securities are traded in an efficient market;
- the Company's shares were liquid and traded with moderate to heavy volume during the Class Period;
- the Company traded on the NYSE and was covered by multiple analysts;
- the misrepresentations and omissions alleged would tend to induce a reasonable investor to misjudge the value of the Company's securities; and
- Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased, acquired and/or sold MUFG 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.

32. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to a presumption of reliance upon the integrity of the market.

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

COUNT I

(Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Promulgated Thereunder Against All Defendants)

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

35. This Count is asserted against defendants and is based upon Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the SEC.

36. During the Class Period, defendants engaged in a plan, scheme, conspiracy and course of conduct, pursuant to which they knowingly or recklessly engaged in acts, transactions, practices and courses of business which operated as a fraud and deceit upon Plaintiff and the other members of the Class; made various untrue statements of material facts and omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud in connection with the purchase and sale of securities. Such scheme was intended to, and, throughout the Class Period, did: (i) deceive the investing public, including Plaintiff and other Class members, as alleged herein; (ii) artificially inflate and maintain the market price of MUGF securities; and (iii) cause Plaintiff and other members of the Class to purchase or

otherwise acquire MUFG securities and options at artificially inflated prices. In furtherance of this unlawful scheme, plan and course of conduct, defendants, and each of them, took the actions set forth herein.

37. Pursuant to the above plan, scheme, conspiracy and course of conduct, each of the defendants participated directly or indirectly in the preparation and/or issuance of the quarterly and annual reports, SEC filings, press releases and other statements and documents described above, including statements made to securities analysts and the media that were designed to influence the market for MUFG securities. Such reports, filings, releases and statements were materially false and misleading in that they failed to disclose material adverse information and misrepresented the truth about MUFG's finances and business prospects.

38. By virtue of their positions at MUFG, defendants had actual knowledge of the materially false and misleading statements and material omissions alleged herein and intended thereby to deceive Plaintiff and the other members of the Class, or, in the alternative, defendants acted with reckless disregard for the truth in that they failed or refused to ascertain and disclose such facts as would reveal the materially false and misleading nature of the statements made, although such facts were readily available to defendants. Said acts and omissions of defendants were committed willfully or with reckless disregard for the truth. In addition, each defendant knew or recklessly disregarded that material facts were being misrepresented or omitted as described above.

39. Information showing that defendants acted knowingly or with reckless disregard for the truth is peculiarly within defendants' knowledge and control. As the senior managers and/or directors of MUFG, the Individual Defendants had knowledge of the details of MUFG's internal affairs.

40. The Individual Defendants are liable both directly and indirectly for the wrongs complained of herein. Because of their positions of control and authority, the Individual Defendants were able to and did, directly or indirectly, control the content of the statements of MUFG. As officers and/or directors of a publicly-held company, the Individual Defendants had a duty to disseminate timely, accurate, and truthful information with respect to MUFG's businesses, operations, future financial condition and future prospects. As a result of the dissemination of the aforementioned false and misleading reports, releases and public statements, the market price of MUFG securities was artificially inflated throughout the Class Period. In ignorance of the adverse facts concerning MUFG's business and financial condition which were concealed by defendants, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class purchased or otherwise acquired MUFG securities at artificially inflated prices and relied upon the price of the securities, the integrity of the market for the securities and/or upon statements disseminated by defendants, and were damaged thereby.

41. During the Class Period, MUFG securities were traded on an active and efficient market. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class, relying on the materially false and misleading statements described herein, which the defendants made, issued or caused to be disseminated, or relying upon the integrity of the market, purchased or otherwise acquired shares of MUFG securities at prices artificially inflated by defendants' wrongful conduct. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class known the truth, they would not have purchased or otherwise acquired said securities, or would not have purchased or otherwise acquired them at the inflated prices that were paid. At the time of the purchases and/or acquisitions by Plaintiff and the Class, the true value of MUFG securities was substantially lower than the prices paid by Plaintiff and

the other members of the Class. The market price of MUFG securities declined sharply upon public disclosure of the facts alleged herein to the injury of Plaintiff and Class members.

42. By reason of the conduct alleged herein, defendants knowingly or recklessly, directly or indirectly, have violated Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder.

43. 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, acquisitions and sales of the Company's securities during the Class Period, upon the disclosure that the Company had been disseminating misrepresented financial statements to the investing public.

COUNT II

(Violations of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act Against The Individual Defendants)

44. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

45. During the Class Period, the Individual Defendants participated in the operation and management of MUFG, and conducted and participated, directly and indirectly, in the conduct of MUFG's business affairs. Because of their senior positions, they knew the adverse non-public information about MUFG's misstatement of income and expenses and false financial statements.

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

47. Because of their positions of control and authority as senior officers, the Individual Defendants were able to, and did, control the contents of the various reports, press releases and public filings which MUFG disseminated in the marketplace during the Class Period concerning MUFG's results of operations. Throughout the Class Period, the Individual Defendants exercised their power and authority to cause MUFG to engage in the wrongful acts complained of herein. The Individual Defendants therefore, were "controlling persons" of MUFG within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. In this capacity, they participated in the unlawful conduct alleged which artificially inflated the market price of MUFG securities.

48. Each of the Individual Defendants, therefore, acted as a controlling person of MUFG. By reason of their senior management positions and/or being directors of MUFG, each of the Individual Defendants had the power to direct the actions of, and exercised the same to cause, MUFG to engage in the unlawful acts and conduct complained of herein. Each of the Individual Defendants exercised control over the general operations of MUFG and possessed the power to control the specific activities which comprise the primary violations about which Plaintiff and the other members of the Class complain.

49. By reason of the above conduct, the Individual Defendants are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act for the violations committed by MUFG.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

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

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

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

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

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: November , 2017

Respectfully submitted,

POMERANTZ LLP

/s/ Jeremy A. Lieberman

Jeremy A. Lieberman
J. Alexander Hood II
600 Third Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 661-1100
Facsimile: (212) 661-8665
Email: jalieberman@pomlaw.com
ahood@pomlaw.com

POMERANTZ LLP
Patrick V. Dahlstrom
10 South La Salle Street, Suite 3505
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Telephone: (312) 377-1181
Facsimile: (312) 377-1184
Email: pdahlstrom@pomlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff